The Village of Yellow Springs Planning Commission will meet in regular session on Monday, November 13, 2017 at 6PM in Village Council Chambers on the second floor of the Bryan Community Center, 100 Dayton Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

## REVIEW OF AGENDA

## REVIEW OF MINUTES

Minutes of September 25, 2017

## COMMUNICATIONS

## COUNCIL REPORT

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

## PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Fire Station - Conditional Use and Site Plan Review - Residential C - High Density Residential District. The Miami Township Trustees has submitted a conditional use and site plan review application for the purpose of locating and constructing a new fire station and township offices at Xenia Avenue between Marshall and East Herman Streets. Parcel ID \#s F19000100080030400; F19000100080030500; F19000100080030600; F19000100080030700; F19000100080030800; F19000100080030900; F19000100080031000; F19000100080031100; F19000100080031200; F19000100080031300; F19000100080031400
2. CBE/Commerce Park - Final Plan Phase One Replat - Planned Unit Development (PUD) District (I-1 Industrial-Mixed Use). The Village of Yellow Springs has submitted a replat application for the purpose of re-dedicating right-of-ways and parcels for the development of infrastructure to the proposed Cresco Labs medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant, and future mixed use PUD development. Parcel ID \#F19000100200000300, F19000100200000600 and F19000100200000700
3. Cresco Labs - Conditional Use and Site Plan Review - PUD District (I-1 Industrial-Mixed Use) at CBE/Commerce Park. Cresco Labs has submitted a conditional use and site plan review application for the purpose of establishing and constructing a medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant. Parcel ID \#s F19000100200000300; F19000100200000600

## OLD BUSINESS

## NEW BUSINESS

## AGENDA PLANNING

## ADJOURNMENT

# Planning Commission <br> Regular Meeting Minutes 

Monday, August 14, 2017

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

## ROLL CALL

Planning Commission members present were Chair, Matt Reed, Council Representative Gerald Simms, Susan Stiles, Rose Pelzl and Alternate Chris Zurbuchen. Also present were Denise Swinger, Zoning Administrator, and Chris Conard, Village Solicitor.

## REVIEW OF AGENDA

There were no changes made.

## REVIEW OF MINUTES

Minutes of August 14, 2017 were reviewed. Stiles MOVED to APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED. Pelzl SECONDED and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 with Simms abstaining.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Chris Zurbuchan re: Silver Link Information from Complete Streets Workshop. Zurbuchan briefly reviewed the workshop.

## OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

## NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

## COUNCIL REPORT

Simms noted that the Village will be hearing an ordinance to ban or limit smoking on Village owned properties at their October $2^{\text {nd }}$ meeting.

Swinger noted that Council has passed the Lodging tax ordinance, which will go into effect on January $1^{\text {st }}$.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

Steve Bienovich inquired about a landlocked parcel he owns, seeking information as to how he could develop the lot without frontage to a street.

Swinger commented that she has not yet had an opportunity to work with Bienovich on the matter.
Reed commented that Planning Commission is cognizant that infill is to be encouraged, per Visioning and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and that if the lot is non-conforming, the matter could be heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Amend Chapter 1258.01 Table - Schedule of Uses by District - adding Pocket Neighborhood Developments (PNDs) to Residential Districts A, B and C.

Swinger commented that this table was overlooked when Planning Commission added PNDs to the zoning code.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Zurbuchan MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO SECTION1258.01. Stiles SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.
2. Text Amendments - The Village of Yellow Springs is applying for an amendment to the following zoning code sections for Short-Term Rentals:

## Amend Chapter 1262.08 (e) (6) Conditional Use Specific Requirements - changing short-term rentals to transient guest lodging and adding specific requirements.

Conard explained that the term "short term rental" (STR) is unique to the Village zoning code, while the Ohio Revised Code uses the term "transient guest lodging" (TGL). He opined that replacing "short term rental" in the Village code will lend a consistency by mirroring the state code. All of the suggested amendments, he stated, are definitional in nature, rather than substantive.

Conard explained further that the ordinance creating the lodging tax states that any homeowner who rents out a room or rooms for fewer than five total days per calendar year need not apply to the Village for a conditional use nor charge their guest(s) a lodging tax.

Conard clarified that any rental to the same person(s) of 30 days or greater is not a transient guest rental and falls outside of both zoning code and administrative regulation.

Conard noted that the adoption date of January first was selected so that the Finance Director would have time to flesh out the details and prepare information for proprietors.

Conard stated that there were no clear standards listed for the conditional use for STRs are not currently defined, and noted that this leaves a lack of guidance for the Planning Commission as well as for citizens seeking to have this use approved. He presented a prepared set of conditions which he suggested be attached to the standards for approval of a TGL establishment.

PC discussed the suggested standards of section 6(H) as listed here:

## H. Standards. When determining if the conditional use should be granted, the Planning Commission shall consider and weigh the following factors:

(1) whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the conditional use;
(2) whether the conditional use would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g., water, sewer, garbage);
(3) whether the conditional use will negatively impact affordable housing and/or whether the conditional use will decrease the potential income tax that the Village could collect;
(4) whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the conditional use.

PC discussed the standards in general, with Swinger noting that some of the language is taken from the Ohio Revised Code as Board or Zoning Appeals standards.

Simms asked for further explanation of number three, wondering how this determination could be made.

Conard explained the logic that while renting out space can assist a villager in affording to live in town, if too many affordable homes are turned into TGL, the shortage of affordable dwellings could become critical. This could become a factor to be weighed in the consideration, he stated.

Stiles objected to the subjective nature of the questions, commenting that she would prefer clearer direction.

Pelzl asked whether the conditional use follows the home, or follows the owner, wondering how information would be conveyed across ownership changes.

Conard commented that a significant issue in terms of payment of the tax is a lack of awareness, hence the importance of information to citizens early on.

Pelzl questioned the information and permitting process, seeking assurance that an establishment would be followed from application point through any moves or changes that may occur.

Conard stated that the ordinance allows the Finance Director latitude to affect the process once the use has been granted. He suggested that this is best left up to the Finance Director, since she will have a handle on what needs to be asked of whom.

Pelzl argued that the zoning administrator should stay with the process through the administrative phase so that the permits stay up to date. She expressed her concern as the possibility of a change not being properly catalogued.

PC discussed the value of section \#3 with regard to its enforceability and the general nature of the query.

Conard made an argument for the lodging tax in general, but noted that the Village does not wish to create unintended consequences, characterizing the standards as "the culmination of a thoughtful process in rolling out the lodging tax.

With regard to number (4), Conard responded to Zurbuchan's question by stating that this question attempts to bridge the gap between the right of the property owner and the interests of the community as a whole.

Zurbuchan suggested changing the limitation of occupancy in an ADU which is currently two adults, to defer to Health Department standards.

Reed noted that if PC changes this language, then the section on ADU's would have to be changed.

The group decided not to make the change.
Pelzl asked how a proprietor would prove that they would be grandfathered in to the use, asking that this be included in the code.

Conard argued that this can and properly should remain the jurisdiction of the administrative code.
In response to continued concern on the part of Pelzl, Conard explained that the zoning administrator would be in close communication with the Finance Director, and that the language permitting this is contained in the establishing ordinance.

The Clerk asked PC members whether they are agreeable to a question (\#3), which may be more political in nature rather than using the language in \#4 to address the same issues.

Reed responded that he sees a need to address the issue directly because of its potentially significant impact upon affordability. It may be difficult to hit the "sweet spot" between allowing a resident to afford to continue to live in the Village and allowing someone else to become a homeowner here, he opined, but stated that he liked the direct question.

Stiles agreed, stating that she appreciated the direct nature of the question.
Reed commented that he had an interest in limiting the number of days a home could be rented in a given year, and felt the current language is appropriate.

Simms concurred, arguing that the Village is small enough that uses in one neighborhood can affect the Village as a whole.

Swinger noted that she would like to see a distinction made between owner occupied rentals and those in which the owner is a non-Village resident, seeing that as an important distinction from an affordable housing as well as administrative standpoint.

Simms pointed out a clerical error in the proposed amendments.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Leslie Shepard spoke against any regulation of transient lodging. She opined that that Planning Commission would "subjectively say" that a person who owns an affordable home would be denied the use.

Reed attempted to explain that that was not what the question under \#3 meant, that it was a more overarching consideration.

Shepard spoke against regulation in general, and opined regarding why there is no affordable housing in the Village.

Swinger attempted to explain the nature of conditional use.

Pelzl attempted to explain that the use could have an impact on a neighborhood.

Shepard again opined that the use should not be regulated, that someone else should not be able to decide who can or cannot rent their home, characterizing it as micromanagement.

There being no further comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 1262.08 (e) (6), including correction of the clerical error. Pelzl SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 3-2 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE, with Zurbuchan and Simms voting against.

Amend Chapter 1246.02 Table - Schedule of Uses: Educational Institution Districts - changing short-term rentals to transient guest lodging.

Swinger explained that the amendment simply changes the definition from STR to TGL in this section.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 1246.02. Simms SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Amend Chapter 1248.02 Table - Schedule of Uses: Residential Districts - changing short-term rentals to transient guest lodging in sections $A ; B$ and $C$.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Pelzl MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 1248.02. Simms SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Amend Chapter 1250.02 Table - Schedule of Uses: Business Districts - changing short-term rentals to transient guest lodging.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Simms MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 1250.02. Zurbuchan SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Amend Chapter 1258.01 Table - Schedule of Uses by District - changing short-term rentals to transient guest lodging.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 1258.01. Simms SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Amend Chapter 1284.08 Definitions: R-S - removing the definition of short-term rentals.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 1284.08. Zurbuchan SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Amend Chapter 1284.09 Definitions: T-U - adding the definition of transient guest lodging.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Zurbuchan MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 1284.09. Stiles SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.
3. Text Amendments -The Village of Yellow Springs is applying for amendments to the planning and zoning codes for the addition of Pocket Neighborhood Developments (PNDs).

Amend APPENDIX B - Village of Yellow Springs Recommended Trees - updating the list of recommended trees.

Swinger explained that at the September 18, 2017 meeting of Council, the second reading of the ordinances pertaining to the Pocket Neighborhood Development legislation passed. There was only one edit to the Pocket Neighborhood Developments legislation which was in the planning code in Chapter 1226.06 DESIGN STANDARDS. In section 1226.06 C. (3) the text was changed to include the words "ADA-compliant" for sidewalks and striking out the measurement of at least four feet in width. A recent update to ODOT standards for ADA compliancy is five feet, or in certain cases four feet with a five by five foot turning radius every 200 feet.

Council passed Chapter 1226.06 with this one edit to the text and with the understanding that the Planning Commission would make recommendations for Appendix B, also referenced in this Chapter. Council member Brian Housh, after taking a look at Appendix B, realized that some of the trees on this list are no longer recommended and he asked Planning Commission to review the list for possible updates to the text.

Swinger stated that she had also reached out to Wendi Van Buren, Urban Forester at the Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources and asked for her input, which is incorporated into Appendix $B$ - Village of Yellow Springs Recommended Trees. She divided the trees by native and non-native, and created a third category for suggested removal of existing trees, which Nick Boutis had mentioned the Village consider for the Tree of Heaven species. Ms. Van Buren also provided a shortened list for the Planning Commission to consider (ATTACHMENT E).

Planning Commission discussed the recommendations.

Swinger explained that the appendix is meant as a guide for developers as well as for citizens seeking tree planting guidance.

Pelzl expressed strong feeling regarding the presence of Paw Paws as a possible street tree, and asked that this be left as a recommended native tree, but that it be added to the list of trees not recommended for street use.

Reed OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment from those present, Reed CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING and CALLED THE MOTION.

Simms MOVED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO SECTION1258.01, INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF PAW PAW TREES AS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR STREET USE. Stiles SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

## OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

## NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

## AGENDA PLANNING

Swinger noted that neither the hearing regarding the CBE/Commerce Park - Final Plan Phase One Replat - Planned Unit Development (PUD) District nor the Cresco Labs Conditional Use and Site Plan Review can be heard on October $9^{\text {th }}$, because Cresco is not yet ready for a site plan review.

PC discussed possible meeting dates, finally concluding that October 23 was an acceptable second date for October if Cresco is prepared by that time. If not, potentially both Cresco hearings and the site plan review for the Miami Township Fire Department's new station would be heard on November 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, with a 6 pm start time.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 8:30pm, Stiles MOVED and Pelzl SECONDED a MOTION TO ADJOURN. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Matt Reed, Chair

Attest: Judy Kintner, Clerk

Please note: These minutes are not verbatim. A DVD copy of the meeting is available at the Yellow Springs Library during regular Library hours, and in the Clerk of Council's office between 9 and 3 Monday through Friday.

# Village of Yellow Springs 

## PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE: Monday, November 13, 2017

## STAFF REPORT: Denise Swinger, Zoning Administrator

LOCATION: Xenia Avenue between East Herman and Marshall Streets
ZONING DISTRICT: R-C, High-Density Residential District
APPLICANT: Miami Township Trustees and MSA Architects
PROPERTY OWNER: Miami Township Trustees
REQUESTED ACTION: Request for a conditional use permit, per Yellow Springs Zoning Ordinance Table 1248.02 Schedule of Uses: Residential Districts, Table 1258.01 Schedule of Uses by District, Chapter 1262 Conditional Use Requirements and a site plan review per Yellow Springs Zoning Ordinance Chapter 1268 Site Plan Review, to allow for the location and construction of a new fire station and township offices.

HEARING NOTICE: "Fire Station - Conditional Use and Site Plan Review - R-C, High Density Residential District and R-B, Moderate Density Residential. The Miami Township Trustees has submitted a conditional use and site plan review application for the purpose of locating and constructing a new fire station and township offices at Xenia Avenue between Marshall and East Herman Streets. "

GREENE COUNTY PARCEL ID \#'s: F19000100080030400; F19000100080030500; F19000100080030600; F19000100080030700; F19000100080030800; F19000100080030900; F19000100080031000; F19000100080031100; F19000100080031200; F19000100080031300; F19000100080031400

## PROPERTY INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS:

The property consists of 11 lots sold to Miami Township by Wright State University. Located on the east side of Xenia Avenue between Marshall and East Herman Streets, it is the proposed site for Miami Township Fire-Rescue's new fire station and township offices. The property contains approximately 2.095 acres. The frontage on Xenia Avenue measures 353.95 feet. The southern side lot line measures approximately 356.51 feet, the northern side lot line measures 209 feet and the back lot line measures 323.23 feet. This location previously served as a commercial property with Wright State University Physicians operating a clinic there. The clinic was demolished around 2010.

STAFF ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION:
The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to allow for the construction of a new fire station and offices for the Miami Township trustees. The Fire Department will consist of five
apparatus bays opening out onto Xenia Avenue, administrative offices, support spaces, living quarters for up to six full-time firefighters, and a training room. The Township offices will consist of an open office and a small conference room for use by the Township Trustees and their staff. The Township will use the training room for their twice a month Township Trustees meetings. The six lots abutting Xenia Avenue are located in the R-C, High Density Residential District and the five lots at the back of the property are located in R-B, Moderate Density Residential District.
"R-C," High Density Residential District. The R-C District is intended to promote a high quality mix of residential units, including multiple-family dwellings, at a density of up to 14 units per acre. Other compatible, nonresidential uses may also be permitted.
"R-B," Moderate-Density Residential District. The R-B District is intended to encompass much of the Village's existing single-family and medium-density residential neighborhoods and accommodate similarly situated new and infill development at densities up to eight units per acre. This district also permits the introduction of attached residential units and nonresidential uses that are compatible and in scale with the established neighborhood character. Land within this district will be served by public sanitary sewer and water facilities.

Table 1248.02 Schedule of Uses: Residential Districts

| Residential | $\boldsymbol{R}-\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{R}-\boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{R}-\boldsymbol{C}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Public/Quasi-public |  |  |  |  |
| Government offices and buildings | C | C | C |  |

Chapter 1248 - Table 1248.02 Schedule of Uses: Residential Districts and Chapter 1258 - Table 1258.01 Schedule of Uses by District allows for Government offices and buildings as a conditional use in all three residential districts.

The Zoning Code requires the Planning Commission approve all conditional uses, and consider the operational characteristics of the proposed use. Because the building is over 5,000 square feet, the Planning Commission is also required to review the site plan.

## CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS:

## Section 1248.03 Spatial Requirements.

(a) All lots and buildings shall meet the minimum area and width requirements of Table 1248.03. New lots shall not be created, except in conformance with these requirements.

| Table 1248.03 Lot and Width Requirements: Residential Districts |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zoning District | Minimum Lot Area (Sq. <br> Ft.) |  |
| R-B, Moderate-Density <br> Residential | $\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0 ^ { 2 }}$ | Minimum Lot Width <br> (Ft.) |
| R-C, High-Density Residential | $4,800^{3}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| 1 <br> 2 Public water and sanitary sewer is required for all property in these districts. |  |  |
| unit. Multi-family dwellings are permitted a density up to 8 units per acre. |  |  |
| 3 Two-family dwellings shall provide 4,000 square feet per unit. Attached single-family and |  |  |
| multi-family dwellings are permitted a density up to 14 units per acre. |  |  |

The combined square footage of the 11 lots measures $91,258.2$ square feet. The frontage on Xenia Avenue measures 353.95 feet and meets the requirements for minimum lot width.
(b) All structures and their placement on a lot shall conform to the minimum dimensional requirements listed in Table 1248.03a.

| Table 1248.03a Dimensional Requirements: Residential Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning District | Maximum Building Height (Ft./stories) | Minimum Yard Setbacks (Ft.) |  |  |  | Max. Lot Coverage (\%) |
|  |  | Front | Side |  | Rear |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Least |  |  |
| R-B | 35/2.5 | 20 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 40 |
| R-C | 35/3 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 50 |
| 4 Average established setback shall apply, where applicable, in accordance with Section 1260.02(a). |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Maximum Building Height - At its tallest point, the building height is 35 feet, which meets the maximum requirements for $R-B$ and $R-C$, even though fire stations are exempt from this requirement per the zoning code.
The proposed building has a front setback of 20 feet. Because the property lies between two streets, the front yard setback extends to both side yards - see Definition - Lot line, front. In the case of an interior lot, the line separating the lot from the street right-of-way or road easement.
Through and corner lots shall have two front lot lines.
The side yard setback for the future expansion is twenty feet on the north lot line at Marshall Street and is 61.84 feet at the south lot line by East Herman Street. The rear lot line setback is 122.36 feet. The setbacks for this building meet the minimum requirements of the zoning code.

The maximum lot coverage for R-C is $50 \%$ and $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}$ is $40 \%$. The total square footage of the property is $91,258.2$.These means that a maximum of $36,503.28$ square feet in $R-B$ is available to build on. The lot coverage requirement excludes parking areas. The building, at $\mathbf{1 6 , 1 9 9}$ square feet, meets the lot coverage requirements of the zoning code.

## Chapter 1260.05 Other Provisions

Control of Heat, Glare, Fumes, Noise, Odor, Dust and Vibration. Every use shall be conducted and operated in a way that does not create a nuisance and is not dangerous by reason of heat, glare, fumes, odor, dust, noise or vibration beyond the lot on which it is located.

Chief Altman stated, "ORC 4511.041 directs emergency vehicles to respond to emergencies with both lights AND sirens on. For emergency medical calls, call types are coded and assigned levels by our dispatchers. Calls are coded as levels Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, Echo and Omega types. We respond to all Alpha and Omega call types non-emergency (no lights or sirens); this amounts to roughly $30 \%$ of our emergency medical call volume. Department policy covers this as follows:

### 307.6 Non-Emergency Response and Travel

Non-emergency responses are made only to non-emergency incidents and at the discretion of the unit's OIC. Unless directed otherwise by a Department member on scene, medic units shall respond non-emergency to all Alpha and Omega level incidents (except mutual aid). Fire apparatus shall respond non-emergency to the following types of incidents. Responses can always be upgraded at the discretion of the OIC.

Carbon monoxide investigation with no report of illness.
Public utility calls, such as lines down, arcing wires, or transformer fires with no associated injury, fuel spill wash downs, entrapment or threat to structures.
Service calls (animal rescues, smoke removal).
Outdoor smoke investigations.
Move-up / cover details to other fire departments.
Explosive ordinance incident stand-by.
Unauthorized controlled burns with no threatened structures.
Invalid assists.

Personnel responding to the station for one of the above listed call types shall respond nonemergency. During non-emergency response and travel, MPOs shall obey all traffic control signals and signs, and all other laws and rules of the road.

When we move to our new location, I will direct our drivers to not activate their sirens (when practical and safe) until they have turned onto Xenia Avenue."

Lighting. All light fixtures shall be direct cut-off fixtures, designed to prevent light spill or trespass beyond the boundaries of the property where the fixture is located.

According to KLH Engineers, "all general site lighting fixtures will be selected with minimal uplight. Pole-mounted fixtures will provide overall illumination for the parking areas and building aprons. Fixtures will be angled away from surrounding properties and will be equipped with lighting shields to minimize spill-light. Pathways and sidewalks on the site will be illuminated with bollards. Building-mounted lighting will supplement the pole-mounted fixtures to provide uniform site illumination and provide code-required egress lighting. The building façade will be highlighted using techniques to minimize the spill of light into the night sky."

## The site electric lighting plan is identified as Exhibit C-1.

Storm Water. When land is developed or redeveloped and/or the surface characteristics of the property change (increased impervious surfaces, site grading, etc.), these activities shall not result in additional storm water runoff flowing to adjacent properties.

A proposed storm water management swale is shown on the southeast corner of the property. The Village's engineer Mike Heintz indicated concern with the detention basin showing a large number of trees and shrubs. Although some are acceptable, too many may reduce the volume of the basin. Mr. Heintz received their storm water calculations November 9, 2017 (see Exhibit C-2) and requests Planning Commission give approval based on his final review of their storm water plan unless his findings are complete by the meeting date.

## OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

## Section 1264.02 General Requirements

Staff recommended two sections of the zoning code for MSA Architects to consider when planning and designing the required parking for the new fire station. The uses will primarily be for office space, warehousing of the trucks and living quarters. For this reason, two sections of the parking code were used.

| Table 1264.02 Parking Requirements by Use |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Use | Number of Parking Spaces |
| Offices |  |
| Business offices or professional offices of lawyers, architects or similar professionals | 1 for every 300 sq. ft. of UFA, but no less than 5 parking spaces. |

Warehouses and storage buildings

1 per employee computed on the basis of the greatest number of persons employed at any one time during the day or night, or 1 for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, whichever is greater.

As a result, MSA Architects projected the following: office spaces = 1,774 sq. ft. @ $300 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. per parking space, a total of 6 spaces are required. For warehouses, MSA Architects chose 1 per employee computed on the basis of the greatest number of persons employed at any one time during the day or night. They projected 12 employees at shift change with 1 space per employee $=12$ spaces. Additionally, they have provided 2 barrier free parking spaces.

With a total of $\mathbf{2 0}$ parking spaces, the site plan meets the zoning code parking requirements by use.

Additionally, the parking space and aisle dimensions meet the requirements of Table 1264.03 below, with a parking pattern of 75 to 90 degrees.

| Table 1264.03 Dimensional Requirements (feet) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parking <br> Pattern | Parking Space | Maneuvering | Total One Row of <br> Parking and <br> Maneuvering Lane | Total Bay (Two <br> Rows of Parking <br> Lane Width Maneuvering <br> Lane) |  |
|  | 9 | 18 | 24 | 42 | 60 |


A. Ingress and egress driveways shall be located no closer than 50 feet to the intersecting right-of-way of two streets and no closer than three feet to any adjoining property line.
B. Driveways shall not exceed 30 feet in width, as measured at the right-of-way line.

The driveway width of 30 feet for Marshall and East Herman Streets meets the requirements of the zoning code. The Xenia Avenue driveway exceeds the requirement with a measurement of $\mathbf{9 6 . 5}$ feet in width. A variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals will be required.
C. A maximum of one driveway shall be permitted per street frontage; provided a second driveway may be allowed where the frontage exceeds 200 feet.
D. No driveway shall be closer than 75 feet to another driveway on the same or abutting property.
E. Driveways shall be perpendicular or no more than 30 degrees from perpendicular to the curb.
F. Driveways shall not be located closer than 25 feet to any property line, unless approved as a shared driveway for two or more properties.
G. All driveways shall be constructed in accordance with the Village engineering standards.

The three driveways meet the requirements of section $A, C, D, E$ and $F$ of the zoning code above. Section $B$ will require a variance hearing before the Board of Zoning Appeals.
(6) Curbing. A six-inch concrete curb, or alternative as determined by the Planning Commission, shall be provided around all sides of any parking lot of five or more spaces to protect landscaped areas, sidewalks, buildings, or adjacent property from vehicles that might otherwise extend beyond the edge of the parking lot. Curb openings are allowed for storm water drainage, as recommended by the Village Engineer. Plantings shall be set back two feet from curbs to allow for bumper overhang.

The plan calls for a six inch barrier curb. The location of the trees is set back at least two feet from the curbs.
(7) Landscaping. Off-street parking areas shall be landscaped and/or buffered, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 1270. See landscaping section later in this report.
(8) Lighting. Light fixtures used to illuminate off-street parking areas shall be arranged to deflect the light away from adjoining properties and adjacent streets. Lighting fixtures in parking areas adjacent to any residentially zoned or used property shall not exceed 20 feet in height. Fixtures in all other parking areas shall not exceed 35 feet in height. Light fixtures shall be designed to achieve 90 degree luminary cutoff.
(9) Fire lanes. Fire lanes shall be designated on the site and posted with signage prior to occupancy. Vehicle circulation shall meet turning radius requirements set by the Fire Department.
(c) Barrier Free Parking in Parking Lots. Within each parking lot, signed and marked barrier free spaces shall be provided at a convenient location, in accordance with the Barrier Free Parking Space Requirements of the Ohio Department of Transportation. Barrier free spaces shall be located as close as possible to building entrances.

Two barrier free parking spaces are provided for. Sidewalks shown are six feet wide.

## Section 1264.04 Off-Street Loading Requirements

(a) Uses Requiring Loading Area. On the same premises with every building, structure or part thereof, erected and occupied for manufacturing, storage, warehouse, retails sales, consumer services or other uses similarly involving the receipt or distribution of vehicles, materials or merchandise, there shall be provided and maintained on the lot adequate space for standing, loading and unloading services in order to avoid undue interference with public use of the streets, alleys and parking spaces. This provision shall not apply to uses in the B-1 District.
(b) Loading Area Requirements. Loading and unloading spaces shall be paved and, unless otherwise adequately provided for, shall be ten feet by 50 feet, with 15-foot height clearance, according to the following schedule:

| Table 1264.04 Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Building Net GFA | Minimum Truck Loading Spaces |
| $1,401-20,000$ sq. ft. | 1 space |

(c) Orientation of Overhead Doors. Overhead doors for truck loading areas shall not face a public right-of-way and shall be screened to not be visible from a public street or an adjacent residential district.

The fire station driveway entrance off Xenia Avenue will be for the purpose of ingress and egress of fire trucks and the loading and unloading of equipment. There is also ample space for truck loading and unloading at the rear of the building. Staff requests an exemption to section 1264.04 (c) regarding the orientation of overhead doors.

## Section 1266 Signs

The site plan shows a proposed monument sign for the new fire station at the southwest corner of Xenia Avenue and East Herman Street, and a wall sign on the building facing Xenia Avenue. This will require an application for a sign permit and will be processed separately through the zoning office at a future time.

## Section 1268.05 Site Plan Requirements

The site plan submitted by MSA Architects shows the Zoning Code's General Information requirements (see Exhibit A - Legal Description), the Existing Conditions requirements, the Engineering requirements, Building Details and the Proposed Development Requirements, except for exterior mechanicals which they indicated in a letter (Exhibit B) will be provided on the flat roof portion of the building, completely hidden by parapet walls,
and a generator which will be located on the ground and screened by a wall similar in appearance to the walls of the building. The site plan is identified as Exhibit C.

## Section 1270.02 Greenbelts and Parking Lot Landscaping

(a) Greenbelts Required. Greenbelts and landscaping shall be required in the following situations, except for parking areas within the B-1, Central Business District.
(1) Along the street frontage, between the right-of-way line and the parking lot of any parking lot containing four or more spaces;
(2) Within any required parking setback area; and
(3) Within the interior of any parking lot containing ten spaces or more.
(b) Greenbelt Standards for Front Setbacks. Greenbelts shall meet the requirements of this chapter.
(1) At a minimum, a required greenbelt shall contain one canopy tree, plus two additional canopy or understory trees for each 50 feet of road frontage.

Marshall Street - 209 LF/50 = 4.18 or 4 Canopy and combination of 4 canopy or 8 understory trees. As shown, 2 existing canopy trees with 3 more proposed. As shown, 1 existing understory tree with 5 more proposed.

Xenia Avenue - 353.95 LF/50 $=7.08$ or 7 canopy and combination of 7 canopy or 14 understory trees required. As shown, 2 existing canopy trees and 2 existing understory trees. No additional trees will be planted due to the required sightlines for emergency vehicles.

East Herman Street - $356.51 \mathrm{LF} / 50=7.13$ or 7 canopy and combination of 7 canopy or 14 understory trees required. As shown, 2 existing canopy trees and 7 proposed canopy trees. As shown, 10 understory trees proposed.
(c) Parking Lot Landscaping. Where landscaping is required within parking lots, it shall meet the following requirements:
(1) One tree for every ten parking spaces shall be planted within the parking lot. Trees shall be canopy species. While drought tolerant native species are preferred, other species may be planted within parking areas if approved by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, as applicable.

## Parking Lot Requirement - 1 canopy tree per 10 spaces -20 spaces $=2$ canopy trees required. As shown, 3 canopy trees.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the information provided and any additional information available at the meeting, and consider:

- The expansion is in conformance with goals of the Village's 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the Vision: Yellow Springs and Miami Township visioning plan.
- The expansion will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the village's residents.
- The expansion is adequately served by essential public facilities.
- The expansion is compatible with the surrounding character of the general vicinity.
- The expansion will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
- The expansion will not block sight lines.
- The proposal as presented complies with most of the requirements of the Village's Zoning Code.

Utilities staff have reviewed the utility plans and have approved the site plan drawings.
Staff recommends APPROVAL of the conditional use and site plan review for the new Miami Township fire station and Miami Township offices, allowing for the overhead doors facing Xenia Avenue, and with the following conditions, 1) an approved storm water management plan by the Village's engineer, 2) a replat of the property reducing the 11 lots to one, and 3) a BZA hearing for a variance to the driveway width.

If you have any questions or if I can be of assistance please feel free to contact me at (937) 7671702 or email at dswinger@vil.yellowsprings.oh.us.

6305 Centre Park Drive West Chester, OH 45069 phone - 513.779.7851 fax -513.779.7852
www.kleingers.com

October 11, 2017

## Legal Description <br> 2.095 Acres-Rezone

Situated in Section 19, Town 4, Range 8, M.R.S., Village of Yellow Springs, Greene County, Ohio and being all of the lands conveyed to The Miami Township Board of Trustees in Instrument No. 2017-006874 of the Green County, Ohio Recorder's Office, the boundary of which being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of Lot 604 of Williams $1^{\text {st }}$ Addition to Yellow Springs as recorded in P.C. 31 Pg 244B, said point being in the north right of way line of Herman Street;

Thence along said north right of way line, $\mathrm{N} 89^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 54^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ a distance of 356.51 feet to the intersection of said north right of way line with the east right of way line of Xenia Avenue (AKA U.S. 68);

Thence along said east right of way line, $\mathrm{N} 24^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ a distance of 353.95 feet to the intersection of said east right of way line with the south right of way line of Marshall Street;

Thence along said south right of way line, N9000'00"E a distance of 209.00 feet to the intersection of said south right of way line with the west line of Lot 592 of the aforementioned Williams $1^{\text {st }}$ Addition to Yellow Springs;

Thence along said west line and along the west line of the aforementioned Lot 604, $S 00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ a distance of 323.23 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 2.095 acres, more or less and being subject to easements, restrictions and rights of way of record.

October 12, 2017
Denise Swinger
Planning and Zoning Administrator
The John Bryan Community Center
100 Dayton Street
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

## Re: Miami Township Fire-Rescue <br> MSA No. 17158.00

Dear Denise:
The new building being proposed for the east side of Xenia Avenue, between Marshall and Herman Streets will be a new station for Miami Township Fire-Rescue and will also contain offices for Miami Township. The Fire Department component will consist of five apparatus bays opening out onto Xenia Avenue, administrative offices, support spaces, living quarters for up to six full-time firefighters, and a training room. The Township component will consist of an open office and a small conference room for use by the Township Trustees and their staff. The Township will be able to use the training room for Township Trustee Meetings twice a month.

The building will be approximately 16,199 gross square feet ( 15,122 net square feet).
Per our phone conversation on September 22, 2017, we calculated our parking spaces as follows:
Offices: 1,774 s.f. @ 300 s.f. per space = 6 spaces
Warehouse: 12 employees at shift change @ 1 space per employee = 12 spaces
Total spaces required: 18
Per the zoning code, we can provide up to $20 \%$ more spaces than required by zoning. We are therefore providing a total of twenty spaces, two of which are for handicap parking. By providing these additional spaces, we can provide the required spaces without making someone park illegally in a handicap space.

Exterior mechanical equipment will be provided on the flat roof portion of the building, completely hidden by parapet walls. A generator will be located on the ground and will be screened by a wall similar in appearance to the walls of the building.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.


N:\Projects\2017\17-1\17158.00 Miami Township Fire HQ \& Township Admins Building\doclcode permit\Zoning\le17101217swinger.docx
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Name.... POND 10

File.... H:\2017\170346\Design\Storm Drainage\170346POND000.ppw

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Elevation } \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Planimeter (sq.in) | Area <br> (acres) | $\begin{gathered} \text { A1+A2+sqr(A1*A2) } \\ (\text { acres }) \end{gathered}$ | Volume ( $\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume Sum } \\ & (\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1024.00 |  | . 0085 | . 0000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1025.00 |  | . 0345 | . 0600 | . 020 | . 020 |
| 1026.00 | ----- | . 0702 | . 1539 | . 051 | . 071 |

## POND VOLUME EQUATIONS

* Incremental volume computed by the Conic Method for Reservoir Volumes.

```
Volume = (1/3) * (EL2-EL1) * (Area1 + Area2 + sq.rt.(Area1*Area2))
where: EL1, EL2 = Lower and upper elevations of the increment
                Area1,Area2 = Areas computed for EL1, EL2, respectively
                        Volume = Incremental volume between EL1 and EL2
```


## Village of Yellow Springs

## PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE:
STAFF REPORT:
LOCATION:
ZONING DISTRICT:
APPLICANT:
PROPERTY OWNER: Village of Yellow Springs

REQUESTED ACTION: A review of the Final Plan Phase One Replat for the CBE/Commerce Park to re-dedicate rights of way and parcels. This re-dedication will provide the necessary rights-of-way for future streets and utilities construction.

The Village of Yellow Springs Zoning Code requirements for replats are detailed below. Because this change effects the configuration of the rights-of-way, the Zoning Administrator has requested formal action by the Planning Commission.

## Chapter 1226.12 REPLATS.

Approval of a replat by the Zoning Administrator, without formal action by the Commission and Council, may be granted if a submitted record plan meets all of the following conditions:
(a) The proposed replat is not contrary to applicable subdivision and zoning regulations, including, but not limited to, the runoff control/sediment abatement regulations.
(b) The same number of lots as in the original plat, or less, are created.
(c) Upon approval, the replat shall be submitted by the applicant to the Greene County Recorder for incorporation into the Official Tax Map records within 90 days.
(d) The applicant will be held responsible for any negative impact on surrounding lots which becomes apparent within one year from the date of recordation of the plat.

HEARING NOTICE: The following notice was published in the Yellow Springs News on November 2, 2017: CBE/Commerce Park - Final Plan Phase One Replat - Planned Unit Development (PUD) District. The Village of Yellow Springs has submitted a replat application for the purpose of re-dedicating right-of-ways and parcels for the development of infrastructure to the proposed Cresco Labs medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant, and future mixed use PUD development. Parcel ID \#F19000100200000300, F19000100200000600 and F190001002000000700

## PROPERTY INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS:

The property is located on Dayton-Yellow Springs Road and East Enon Road just west and north of Antioch University Midwest. It currently consists of three parcels; Lot 1 containing 19.47 acres, Lot 2 containing 8.214 acres and Lot 3 containing 1.064 acres. Rights-of-way were dedicated for proposed connections to Dayton-Yellow Springs Road, to East Enon Road, and for a connection to the existing parking lot located on the Antioch University Midwest site. This plat was dedicated in 2014 following both a preliminary plat and final plat review. The site is currently undeveloped and used for farming purposes.

## STAFF ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION:

The application of the Final Plan Phase One Replat is for the purpose of re-dedicating rights-ofway to the Village of Yellow Springs. As a result of the dedication of these rights-of-way, the 35.227 acre tract known as the Center for Business \& Education as conveyed to the Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio by Official Record Deed Volume 3770, Page 803 of the Greene County Recorder's records will result in the same number of lots as in the original plat. The replat acreage of 35.227 acres will create three parcels: Lot $1-12.255$ acres will be the location of Cresco Labs. Lot $2-17.159$ acres, and Lot $3-3.737$ acres of which 1.050 acres is non-buildable. This portion of Lot 3 lies just north of the Dayton-Yellow Springs Road right-of-way and is reserved for storm water detention/retention purposes. Rights-of-way for streets and utilities total 2.076 acres and is noted on Lot 2. This acreage will remain Village owned property as permanent right-of-way forever.

Following the CBE specific guidelines in the Zoning Code, the intent of the Village of Yellow Springs is to later submit a Final Plan Phase Two to further subdivide Lot 2 and Lot 3 into smaller lots which will be developed for industrial, educational or business purposes as restricted by the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions for the Center for Business and Education, and to provide for any extension of streets and utilities infrastructure. This final plan may require easements outside of the proposed rights-of-way on future lots to allow for maintenance of some of the public infrastructure.

The infrastructure consists of the construction of a new street approximately 650 feet in length and new water, sanitary sewer and storm piping to serve the 35.227 site for new development. There is a ten (10) foot easement as required in Chapter 1226.06 Design Standards, along the side and rear lot lines. The width of the right-of-way dedication shown varies but maintains a minimum sixty (60) feet width in its entirety. The asphalt pavement width is a consistent twenty-four (24) feet wide and with the curbs and gutters the width measures twenty-nine (29) feet from the back edge of the curb to the back edge of the curb. A twenty (20) foot easement runs along the street.

According to the Codified Ordinances of The Village of Yellow Springs, public improvements relating to streets [Section 1226.08(a)] and minimum requirements for materials and installation procedures [Section 1226.08(c)] must be in compliance with the Greene County Engineer standards. The width of the right-of-way and the pavement width are both consistent with the county standards for a local street and/or a collector street.

The Village of Yellow Springs has completed the infrastructure of public water, sanitary and storm sewers from the intersection of Dayton-Yellow Springs and East Enon Roads, west on the north side of Dayton-Yellow Springs Road one thousand $(1,000)$ feet to the proposed entrance to the CBE.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff has no objections to the Final Plan Phase One Replat to re-dedicate the parcels and rights-of-way.

PLAT NOTES:
Bearings are based on Ohio State Plane Coordinates as derived
from GPS observations.
Building setback lines will be established when zoning is finalized.
Each building development is to establish a tree planting plan to
meet Village requirements.
Any future lot splits vill require Village of Yellow Springs Planning
Commission approval.
DESCRIPTION: Being a replat of a 35.227 acre tract known as
The Center for Business \& Education as conveyed to the Village
of Yellow Springs, Ohio by Official Record Deed Volume 3770 ,
Page 803 of Greene County Recorder's Records. The subdivision
results in creating three parcels of 12.255 acres (Lot\#1), 17.159
acres (Lot \#2), and 3.737 acres (Lot \#3). 2.076 acres is to remain
as permanent right-of-way dedicated for public use forever.
1.118 acres of Lot \#3 is non-buildable.
CERTIFCATION: All work has been performed vith the
publication "Minimum Standards for Boundary Surveys in the
State of Ohio". The measurements are certified correct and
monuments will be set as shown. Curve distances are measured
along the arc.

## CBE / COMMERCE PARK (Phase1) <br>  <br> 

DEDICATION:
We the undersigned, being all the owners and lien holders of
the lands herein platted, do hereby voluntarily consent to the
execution of the said plat and do dedicate the streets and
easements as shown hereon to the public use forever.
Easements as shown on this plat are for the construction,
operation, repair, maintenance, replacement, or removal of all
gas, water, sanitary sewer, electric, telephone, storm sewer,
telecommunication, drainage ditches, and other utility
services and for the priviledge of removing any and all trees
and other obstructions in the free use of said utilities or
improvements and for the providing of ingress and egress to
the property for said purposes, and are to be maintained as
such forever. such forever.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { State of Ohio - County of Greene } \\
& \text { Before me, a notary public in and for the State of Ohio, } \\
& \text { personally appeared the owner/agent of the Village of yellow } \\
& \text { Springs, Ohio who acknowledged that they did sign such } \\
& \text { instrument and that said instrument is their free act and deed. } \\
& \text { In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name } \\
& \text { and affixed my official seal at ______________ Ohio this of }
\end{aligned}
$$ ACKNOMFEDGEMENT:

# Notary Public 

Village of Yellow Springs, Ohio Date The Center for Business \& Education as conveyed to the Village
of Yellow Springs, Ohio by Official Record Deed Volume 3770 of Yellow Springs, Ohio by Official Record Deed Volume 3770,
Page 803 of Greene County Recorder's Records. The subdivision results in creating three parcels of 12.255 acres (Lot\#1), 17.159
acres (Lot \#2), and 3.737 acres (Lot \#3). 2.076 acres is to remain as permanent right-of-way dedicated for public use forever. publication "Minimum Standards for Boundary Surveys in the State of Ohio". The measurements are certified correct and
monuments will be set as shown. Curve distances are measured









# Village of Yellow Springs 

## PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE: Monday, November 13, 2017

## STAFF REPORT: Denise Swinger, Zoning Administrator

LOCATION: CBE/Commerce Park - Dayton Yellow Springs and East Enon Roads
ZONING DISTRICT: PUD Planned Unit Development - I-1 (Mixed Industrial District)
APPLICANT: Cresco Labs - Charlie Bachtell, Co-Founder
PROPERTY OWNER: Village of Yellow Springs
REQUESTED ACTION: Request for a conditional use permit, per Yellow Springs Zoning Ordinance Chapter 1254 PUD - Table 1254.03 Minimum Zoning Requirements for I-1 Industry, Chapter 1252 Industrial Districts, Table 1252.02 Schedule of Uses: Industrial Districts, Table 1258.01 Schedule of Uses by District, Chapter 1262 Conditional Use Requirements, and a site plan review per Yellow Springs Zoning Ordinance Chapter 1268 Site Plan Review, for the purpose of establishing and constructing a medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant.
HEARING NOTICE: "Cresco Labs - Conditional Use and Site Plan Review - PUD District (I-1 Industrial-Mixed Use) at CBE/Commerce Park. Cresco Labs has submitted a conditional use and site plan review application for the purpose of establishing and constructing a medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant."

GREENE COUNTY PARCEL ID \#'s: F19000100200000300; F19000100200000600

## PROPERTY INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS:

The property identified as Lot \#1 measures 12.255 acres. It is located at the northern edge of the property and extends from the western to the eastern property line. It measures a total acreage of 35.227 and is owned by the Village of Yellow Springs. The property most recently was used for farming. Lot \#1 is an irregular parcel size (Exhibit 1-Cresco Labs Site Plan).

## STAFF ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION:

The Zoning Code requires the Planning Commission approve all conditional uses, and consider the operational characteristics of the proposed use. Because the building is over 5,000 square feet, the Planning Commission is also required to review the site plan.

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit and a site plan review to allow for the construction of a medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant. The CBE/Commerce Park is a PUD (Planned Unit Development) and is zoned as I-1, Mixed Industrial District. The medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant is a conditional use under the categories of greenhouse/nursery and medical and dental laboratories. The other aspects of Cresco Labs
operations are permitted under the use of "manufacturing, compounding, processing, packaging, treating or assembly from previously prepared materials," and "research, development and testing laboratories." The zoning code has no specific conditions that the Planning Commission must review for the two conditionally permitted uses. The first phase of the cultivation and processing plant proposed is 49,740 sq. ft. and is two buildings, a 26,445 sq. ft. Processing Head House, onestory, slab-on-grade structure, and a 23,294 sq. ft. Grow-Building, one-story steel building with glass roof. Exhibit 2 with this report is a letter from Cresco further explaining the Processing Head House and Greenhouse use.

## CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

"I-1," Mixed Industrial District. The I-1 District is intended to provide dedicated locations within the community for office, research, knowledge-based industry, services, light manufacturing and related uses that offer employment opportunities and create economic vitality for the Village and its residents.

| Table 1252.02 Schedule of Uses: Industrial Districts |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USE | I | I- 2 |  |
| Agriculture, Food and Animal-related Uses |  |  |  |
| Greenhouse/nursery (not including retail sales) | C | P |  |
| Health Care and Social Assistance |  |  |  |
| Medical and dental laboratories | C | C |  |
| Manufacturing |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing, compounding, processing, packaging, treating or assembly from previously prepared materials | P | C |  |
| Offices, Research and Technical Facilities |  |  |  |
| Research, development and testing laboratories | P | P |  |

## Section 1252.03 SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS

(a) All lots and buildings shall meet the minimum area and width requirements of Table 1252.03. New lots shall not be created, except in conformance with these requirements.

| Table 1252.03. Lot and Width Requirements: Industrial Districts |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zoning District | Minimum Lot Area ${ }^{1}$ | Minimum Lot Width (Ft.) |
| I-1, Industrial | 1 acre | 150 ft. |
| $1 \quad$ Public water and sanitary sewer are required for all property in this district. |  |  |

Cresco Labs Lot \#1 meets the minimum area and width requirements. Public water and sanitary sewer to the site is being paid for by Cresco Labs.
(b) All structures and their placement on a lot shall conform to the minimum dimensional requirements listed in Table 1252.03a.

| Table 1252.03a. Dimensional Requirements: Industrial Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning District | Maximum Building Height (Ft.) | Minimum Yard Setbacks (Ft.) |  |  |  |  | Lot <br> Coverage (\%) |
|  |  | Front ${ }^{2}$ |  | Side |  | Rear |  |
|  |  | Parking | Building | Total | Least |  |  |
| I-1 | 40 | 3 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 25 | 70 |
| 2 Average established setback shall apply, where applicable, in accordance with Section $1260.02(a)$. <br> 3 Parking and loading shall not be permitted in any front yard. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The building height measures 26 feet, 6 inches and is well below the maximum building height of 40 feet. The front yard setback measures 51 feet, 4 inches, the rear yard setback measures 34 feet, the western side yard measures approximately 897 feet and the eastern side yard setback measures approximately 34 feet at its closest point.

## The Cresco Labs building meets the required setbacks for I-1, Mixed Industrial District.

Lot \#1 is 12.255 acres or 533,828 square feet. The proposed buildings measure 49,740 square feet. Seventy percent of the total square footage of the lot equals 373,679 . The proposed building is well below the 70 percent lot coverage requirement, with 323,940 sq. ft. of available acreage to build on. Parking lots are not included in the lot coverage requirement.

## The Cresco Labs building meets the lot coverage requirement for I-1, Mixed Industrial

 District.Parking is not permitted in the front yard in an I-1 District - see footnote 3 in Table 1252.03a. However, Section 1254.03(d) allows the modification of minimum requirements if certain criteria are met. Please review the following for an exemption to this requirement.

## Section 1254.03 PUD REQUIREMENTS

(b) Minimum Lot Size and Zoning Requirements. Lot area, width, setbacks, height, lot coverage, minimum floor area, parking, landscaping, lighting and other requirements for the district applicable to the proposed use, as provided in Table 1254.03, shall be applicable for all such uses within a PUD, unless modified in accordance with Section 1254.03(d). In the case of a mix of uses, the zoning requirements applicable to each use category shall apply to that use.

| Table 1254.03 Minimum Zoning Requirements |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Land Use | Applicable Zoning District |
| Single-family | R-B |
| Two-family | R-B |
| Townhome | R-B |
| Multiple-family | R-C |
| Retail, office, service business | B-2 |
| Industry | I-1 |
| Institutional | E-I |

This is an industrial use, so parking requirements for I-1 Mixed Industrial District are followed.

## Section 1254.03 PUD REQUIREMENTS.

(d) Modification of Minimum Requirements. District regulations applicable to a land use in the PUD may be altered from the requirements specified in Table 1254.03, including but not limited to, modification from the lot area and width, building setbacks, height, lot coverage, signs and parking. The applicant for a PUD shall identify, in writing, all intended deviations from the zoning requirements. Modifications may be approved by the Village Council during the preliminary development plan review stage, after Planning Commission recommendation. These adjustments may be permitted only if they will result in a higher quality and more sustainable development consistent with the purposes of PUD expressed in Section 1254.01. The modifications shall also satisfy at least four of the following criteria:
(1) Preserve the best natural features of the site;
(2) Create, improve or maintain open space for the residents, employees and visitors beyond the minimum required by subsection (f) of this section;
(3) Commit that at least ten percent of all dwelling units in the PUD will be "permanently" affordable units or $20 \%$ affordable units, or commit to a payment in lieu of constructing such units, as agreed to with the Village Council;
(4) Provide a mix of residential types such as single family, townhome and/or multiple family;
(5) Employ low impact design and/or other best practices to manage storm water and reduce the off-site impacts of runoff;
(6) Employ practices in site layout, building construction and materials that will result in a measurable reduction in energy consumption;
(7) Introduce new development concepts, such as co-housing: and/or
(8) Include a mix of residential and nonresidential uses.

Because this is not a PUD approval, but a site plan approval for an existing PUD, staff has requested that Cresco Labs follow the criteria as outlined above. If modifying the parking requirement will result in a higher quality and more sustainable development and meets four of the eight criteria, then the requirement that parking not be allowed in the front yard may be modified. In this case, there are four of the eight criteria that may apply. Those are (1), (2), (5), and (6). If Planning Commission feels that those four criteria are met, then parking may be allowed in the front yard.

Cresco Labs has submitted a response to the four criteria above (Exhibit 3).
To further strengthen their request, staff has reviewed the only other option, which would be to have the frontage off of East Enon Road. However, this location did not meet the 150 foot frontage requirement with a measurement of 56.05 feet. Section 1260.02 (e) Minimum Lot Frontage states, "Any lot created after the effective date of this code shall have frontage on an improved public street or approved private street or access easement, equal to the minimum required lot width in the zoning district in which it is located."

## Section 1260.05 Other Provisions

Control of Heat, Glare, Fumes, Noise, Odor, Dust and Vibration. Every use shall be conducted and operated in a way that does not create a nuisance and is not dangerous by reason of heat, glare, fumes, odor, dust, noise or vibration beyond the lot on which it is located.

| TABLE 1: Maximum Permissible Sound Levels (in dBA) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Source Property | Receiving Property |  |  |
|  | Residential and <br> Agricultural | Business and <br> Educational | Light <br> Industrial |
| Residential and <br> Agricultural | 65 7:00 a.m. $-10: 00$ p.m. <br> 45 10:00 p.m. - 7:00 a.m. | 65 (all times) | 75 (all times) |
| Business and <br> Educational | 65 daytime <br> 45 nighttime | 65 (all times) | 75 (all times) |
| Light Industrial | 65 daytime <br> 45 nighttime | 65 (all times) | 75 (all times) |

Cresco has indicated the noise levels should not exceed 55 dBA at the lot line. This is based on the sound power level of 87 dBA for the rooftop HVAC system.

Lighting. All light fixtures shall be direct cut-off fixtures, designed to prevent light spill or trespass beyond the boundaries of the property where the fixture is located.

According to the architect Mark Filoramo, the parking light pole locations are shown on the landscape plan (A02) and the photometric for this is located on (E101) at the end of the set. The building's wall mounted lights are shown on the exterior elevations (A201) and are $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ downlight that will not project past the property lines.

Storm Water. When land is developed or redeveloped and/or the surface characteristics of the property change (increased impervious surfaces, site grading, etc.), these activities shall not result in additional storm water runoff flowing to adjacent properties.

The Village's engineer Mike Heintz has indicated the storm water plan met the requirements but some revisions need to be made. He is requesting approval of the site plan contingent on final approval of the revisions. A letter was forwarded to both Mark Filoramo of Filoramo Talsma, the architectural firm and to Jeff Kunk of Choice One Engineering. (Exhibit 4 Letter from Village Engineer and Exhibit 5 Storm Water Retention Report from Choice One Engineering.

## OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING

## Section 1264.02 General Requirements

Cresco Labs architect, Mark Filoramo followed the zoning code's parking requirements for an industrial use. However, he did not use the 550 sq. ft. of gross floor area. See below:

| Table 1264.02 Parking Requirements by Use |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Use | Number of Parking Spaces |
| Industrial Uses | 1 for every 1.5 employees or <br> 550 sq. ft. of gross floor area, <br> whichever is greater. |
| Industrial establishments, including manufacturing, <br> research and testing laboratories, creameries, bottling <br> works, printing, plumbing or electrical work-shops |  |

The calculation for required parking was based on 1 for every 1.5 employees. With 45 employees at their largest shift, this would require 30 spaces. The parking plan shows 45 spaces, including 2 barrier free parking spaces, and the location of an additional 26 spaces for future expansion of the Cresco facility. The plan shows two spaces for loading/unloading.

Mr. Filoramo indicated that the large greenhouse portion of the facility may only have two or three employees at work during a shift. Cresco has provided a letter further explaining their reason for the lower number of parking spaces (Exhibit 6). Planning Commission will need to consider an exemption to the above which would require 90 spaces.

Section 1264.02 (d) Modification of Parking Requirements. The Planning Commission may reduce the parking space requirements of this chapter for any use, based upon a finding that other forms of travel are available and likely to be used and, in particular, the site design will incorporate both bicycle parking facilities and pedestrian connections. In addition, one or more of the following conditions shall also be met:
(1) Shared parking by multiple uses where there will be a high proportion of multi-purpose visits or where uses have peak parking demands during differing times of the day or days of the week and meeting the following requirements:
A. Pedestrian connections shall be maintained between the uses.
B. For separate lots, shared parking areas shall be adjacent to each other, with pedestrian and vehicular connections maintained between the lots.
C. Unless the multiple uses all are within a unified business center, office park or industrial park all under the same ownership, shared parking agreements shall be filed with the Clerk of Council after approval by the Planning Commission.
(2) Convenient municipal off-street parking or on-street spaces are located adjacent to the subject property.
(3) Expectation of walk-in trade is reasonable due to sidewalk connections to adjacent residential neighborhoods or employment centers. To allow for a parking space reduction, the site design shall incorporate pedestrian connections to the site and on-site pedestrian circulation, providing safe and convenient access to the building entrance.
(4) Where the applicant has provided a parking study, conducted by a qualified traffic engineer, demonstrating that another standard would be more appropriate based on actual number of employees, expected level of customer traffic, or actual counts at a similar establishment.
(5) The Planning Commission may require a parking study to document that any one or more of the criteria in subsections (d)(1) through (4) above would be met.

Additionally, excerpted from the Planned Unit Development (PUD) purpose is "The Planned Unit Development (PUD) District is established as an optional development tool to permit flexibility in the regulation of land development; to encourage innovation in land use, form of ownership and variety of design, layout and type of structures constructed; to achieve economy and efficiency in the use of land"

The parking space and aisle dimensions meet the requirements of Table 1264.03 below, with a parking pattern of $\mathbf{7 5}$ to $\mathbf{9 0}$ degrees.

| Table 1264.03 Dimensional Requirements (feet) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parking <br> Pattern | Width | Length | Maneuvering <br> Lane Width | Total One Row of <br> Parking and <br> Maneuvering Lane | Total Bay (Two <br> Rows of Parking <br> and Maneuvering <br> Lane) |
|  | 9 | 18 | 24 | 42 | 60 |


A. Ingress and egress driveways shall be located no closer than 50 feet to the intersecting right-of-way of two streets and no closer than three feet to any adjoining property line.
B. Driveways shall not exceed 30 feet in width, as measured at the right-of-way line. The driveway entrance measures 24 feet.
C. A maximum of one driveway shall be permitted per street frontage; provided a second driveway may be allowed where the frontage exceeds 200 feet.
D. No driveway shall be closer than 75 feet to another driveway on the same or abutting property.
E. Driveways shall be perpendicular or no more than 30 degrees from perpendicular to the curb.
F. Driveways shall not be located closer than 25 feet to any property line, unless approved as a shared driveway for two or more properties.

## The location of the driveway meets the requirements of the zoning code.

G. All driveways shall be constructed in accordance with the Village engineering standards.
(6) Curbing. A six-inch concrete curb, or alternative as determined by the Planning Commission, shall be provided around all sides of any parking lot of five or more spaces to protect landscaped areas, sidewalks, buildings, or adjacent property from vehicles that might otherwise extend beyond the edge of the parking lot. Curb openings are allowed for storm water drainage, as recommended by the Village Engineer. Plantings shall be set back two feet from curbs to allow for bumper overhang.
(7) Landscaping. Off-street parking areas shall be landscaped and/or buffered, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 1270. Please refer to the landscaping section later in this report.
(8) Lighting. Light fixtures used to illuminate off-street parking areas shall be arranged to deflect the light away from adjoining properties and adjacent streets. Lighting fixtures in parking areas adjacent to any residentially zoned or used property shall not exceed 20 feet in height. Fixtures in all other parking areas shall not exceed 35 feet in height. Light fixtures shall be designed to achieve 90 degree luminary cutoff.

## See 1260.05 (d) Lighting on page 6.

(9) Fire lanes. Fire lanes shall be designated on the site and posted with signage prior to occupancy. Vehicle circulation shall meet turning radius requirements set by the Fire Department.

Cresco Labs has consulted with the Fire Chief and a 20' wide fire lane was added to access the front and rear of the proposed buildings. A future fire lane is also included in the site plan around the perimeter of the property as Cresco expands their operations.
(c) Barrier Free Parking in Parking Lots. Within each parking lot, signed and marked barrier free spaces shall be provided at a convenient location, in accordance with the Barrier Free Parking Space Requirements of the Ohio Department of Transportation. Barrier free spaces shall be located as close as possible to building entrances.

Two barrier free parking spaces are provided for. Sidewalks shown are five feet wide.

## Section 1264.04 Off-Street Loading Requirements

(a) Uses Requiring Loading Area. On the same premises with every building, structure or part thereof, erected and occupied for manufacturing, storage, warehouse, retails sales, consumer services or other uses similarly involving the receipt or distribution of vehicles, materials or merchandise, there shall be provided and maintained on the lot adequate space for standing, loading and unloading services in order to avoid undue interference with public use of the streets, alleys and parking spaces. This provision shall not apply to uses in the B-1 District.
(b) Loading Area Requirements. Loading and unloading spaces shall be paved and, unless otherwise adequately provided for, shall be ten feet by 50 feet, with 15 -foot height clearance, according to the following schedule:

| Table 1264.04 Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Building Net GFA | Minimum Truck Loading Spaces |
| $20,001-100,000$ sq. ft. | 1 space plus 1 space for each 40,000 sq. ft. in excess of 20,000 sq. ft. |

There is a $20^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ area (two spaces) in front of the shipping and receiving dock, which meets the criteria of the zoning code for off-street loading requirements.
(c) Orientation of Overhead Doors. Overhead doors for truck loading areas shall not face a public right-of-way and shall be screened to not be visible from a public street or an adjacent residential district.

There is one $10 \times 12$ foot door at the south side of the Processing Head House building. See architectural review report (Exhibit 7) regarding screening of the buildings.

## Section 1268.05 Site Plan Requirements

The site plan (Exhibit 1) submitted by Filoramo-Talsma and Choice One Engineering shows the Zoning Code's General Information requirements, minus a legal description of the property and the correct location address. It also shows the Existing Conditions requirements of which many did not apply as it is an undeveloped site, the Proposed Development requirements and the Engineering and Building Details requirements.

Section 1270.02 Greenbelts and Parking Lot Landscaping
(a) Greenbelts Required. Greenbelts and landscaping shall be required in the following situations, except for parking areas within the B-1, Central Business District.
(1) Along the street frontage, between the right-of-way line and the parking lot of any parking lot containing four or more spaces;
(2) Within any required parking setback area; and
(3) Within the interior of any parking lot containing ten spaces or more.
(b) Greenbelt Standards for Front Setbacks. Greenbelts shall meet the requirements of this chapter.
(1) At a minimum, a required greenbelt shall contain one canopy tree, plus two additional canopy or understory trees for each 50 feet of road frontage.

The road frontage on the south property line is $\mathbf{1 5 0} \mathrm{LF} / 50=3$ canopy trees, plus six canopy or understory trees for a total of 9 canopy and understory trees. Four trees are in the front setback area. Five additional trees are required. Appendix B in Exhibit 7 outlines the type of trees and their diameter.
(c) Parking Lot Landscaping. Where landscaping is required within parking lots, it shall meet the following requirements:

One tree for every ten parking spaces shall be planted within the parking lot. Trees shall be canopy species. While drought tolerant native species are preferred, other species may be planted within parking areas if approved by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, as applicable.

The plan calls for 45 parking spaces, including 2 barrier free spaces. The plan also shows an additional 26 spaces for future expansion of the facility. Including the future parking spaces, there are 71 parking spaces indicated. At the minimum 5 canopy trees ( 45 spaces) to 7 canopy trees ( 71 spaces) are required. Eight trees are shown in the parking lot area, which meets the criteria for parking lot landscaping.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Included with this report (Exhibit 8) is the preliminary construction plan for the access road and utilities infrastructure. This is being included for your information as it will be the responsibility of Cresco Labs to fund the project, and the Village of Yellow Springs to oversee the infrastructure construction in order to ensure the standards required by local, state and federal agencies are met.

## Any signs for the Cresco facility will require a permit through the Village of Yellow Springs zoning office.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the information provided and any additional information available at the meeting, and consider:

- The expansion is in conformance with goals of the Village's 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the Vision: Yellow Springs and Miami Township visioning plan.
- The expansion will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the village's residents.
- The expansion is adequately served by essential public facilities.
- The expansion is compatible with the surrounding character of the general vicinity.
- The expansion will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
- The expansion will not block sight lines.
- The proposal as presented complies with most of the requirements of the Village's Zoning Code.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the conditional use and site plan review, allowing for an exemption to the front yard parking and loading area and the number of parking spaces, and with the following conditions, 1) a legal description of the property, 2) a revised storm water management plan approved by the Village's engineer, 3) a revised landscaping plan showing the additional tree plantings, and 4) a plan for implementing the recommendations of the Architectural Review Committee.

If you have any questions or if I can be of assistance please feel free to contact me at (937) 7671702 or email at dswinger@vil.yellowsprings.oh.us.

CRESCO LABS－YELOWSPRINGS OHOMMJ CULTIVATION FACILTY
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|  <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  <br>  <br> 5. RISER PIPE BASE -THE ROSER PIPE SHNLL BE SET A MNILUM OF 6 NL IN THE CONCRETE BASE |
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CRESCOlabs-

November 10, 2017

## VIA E-MAIL

Denise Swinger
Planning \& Zoning Administrator
Village of Yellow Springs
(937) 767-1702

## Re: Facility Use Narrative

Dear Denise:

The proposed building located within an l-1 zoning district will be comprised of two (2) distinct areas of use, Manufacturing and Greenhouse. Manufacturing is a Permitted Use and Greenhouse/Nursery is a Conditional Use. We are seeking Conditional Use approval.

The Processing Head House is considered a manufacturing, compounding, processing and packaging use due to the following activities:

- Drying and processing of medical marijuana;
- Manufacture of infused products such as edibles, capsules, topical and oils; and
- Final packaging of medical marijuana products.

The Greenhouse is considered an agricultural greenhouse/nursery use due to the following activities:

- Cultivation and harvesting of medical marijuana within a greenhouse structure.

The use of appropriate GyPs will allow Cresco Labs Ohio to distribute products that possess the safety, quality, identity, purity, and potency ("SQuIPP") that qualified patients deserve while maintaining compliance with the permitted land use.

## CRESCOlabs

November 9, 2017

## VIA E-MAIL

Denise Swinger
Planning \& Zoning Administrator
Village of Yellow Springs
(937) 767-1702

## RE: FRONT YARD PARKING VARIANCE

Dear Denise:

Pursuant to the effective Yellow Springs zoning code, Cresco Labs Ohio is requesting an exception to spatial requirements, Section 1252.03(b) / Table 1252.03a, to permit parking and loading in the front yard due to a hardship. The hardship exists due to the lot configuration that results in a lack of sufficient parcel length and width along with storm water to place the parking lot in any other location, the front yard is the only suitable location remaining.

Crisco Labs Ohio is requesting approval to deviate from the Minimum Lot Size and Zoning Requirements enumerated in Section 1254.03(b). The process to modify minimum lot size and zoning requirements is defined within Section 1254.03(d) which allows zoning adjustments if the modification will result in a higher quality and more sustainable development consistent with the purposes of PUD expressed in Section 1254.01.

This hardship modification will satisfy four (4) of the following criteria:

- 1254.03(d)(1) - Preserve the best natural features of the site;
- 1254.03(d)(2) - Create, improve or maintain open space for the residents, employees and visitors beyond the minimum require by subsection (f) of this section;
- 1254.03(d)(5) - Employ low impact design and/or other best practices to manage storm water and reduce the off-site impacts of runoff;
- 1254.03(d)(6) - Employ practices in site layout, building construction and materials that will result in a measurable reduction in energy consumption;


Michael L. Heintz, P.E.,P.S.
231 Sandpiper Place
Sidney, Ohio 45365
937-710-3310
mike@heintzengineering.com www.heintzengineering.com

November 8, 2017.
Village of Yellow Springs
100 Dayton Street
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387
Attn: Denise Swinger
RE: Cresco Site Plan Review

Dear Ms. Swinger,
I have completed a preliminary site plan review of the proposed Cresco facility.
There is only one issue that I have found that needs to be addressed. The existing Cresco site currently drains into two watersheds, one to the northeast which drains to Yellow Springs Creek and the other drain to the northwest which drains to Jacobs Run. It appears that the current site design is changing that drainage pattern and releasing all of the runoff water into the Yellow Springs Creek watershed. Since all of the proposed development with the first phase of construction drains into the Yellow Springs Creek watershed, there is no problem, other than the retention basin and storm piping are probably oversized if the drainage is divided.

I would recommend the following revisions:

1. Show the entire site with existing contours which will delineate the two watersheds.
2. Add a second detention/retention basin near the northwest property corner for future construction that will receive approximately $40 \%$ of the site's stormwater and release into the Jacoby Run watershed. A similar release structure (pipe) as shown on the current plan should work well.
3. Storm piping sizes and the current retention basin size (approximately $60 \%$ of the runoff) can both be reduced since the drainage areas are being separated.

I will do a more exhaustive plan review when storm and detention calculations are provided. If you have any questions or concerns, please give me a call at 937-710-3310.

Sincerely,


Michael L. Heintz, P.E., P.S.
Heintz Engineering

## Village of Yellow Springs, Greene County Cresco Labs Site Plan Storm Water Retention Calculations

## Site Description:

Site is an existing open row crop field that curently has no onsite detention to control the storm water runoff. The proposed site will increase the impervious a rea and require a retention basin on site to control the runoff. Water Quality measures will be added to the proposed retention basin and the size of the basin will be increased to control the existing and additional runoff that will be produced by the increased impervious area.

## Hydrologic Methodologies:

The hydrologic methodology used for this design was the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) TR-55 Method, which wascomputed via the Bentley PondPack program.

## Existing Hydrologic Conditions:

The storm water on the existing site moves via overland flow through the row crop field to the north where it enters another open farm field.

## Developed Hydrologic Conditions:

The proposed site will move the rain water through the site via proposed storm sewer. Once the storm water has entered the storm sewer it will then be caried to the proposed retention basin. The first $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ of rain will be detained for the required 24 hours to treat that water for water quality. Once that volume of water has been reached, the retention basin outlet structure will increase its release rate for up to the critic al storm (5-year), but will not exc eed the pre-developed 1 -year storm peak outflow rate.

## Storm Water Mana gement Plan:

The proposed site will move the runoff through the site by having the proposed pavement sloped towards proposed catch basins. Once the water enters the storm structures, it will then travel through proposed storm sewerto the retention basin.

## Applicable Permits:

The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Notice of Intent.

## Calculation Sheets:

Below is a summary of the storm water retention calculations. Please see the attached computer printouts for add itional details.

Hydrologic Soil Groups C and D were used forthese calculations based upon soil in the surrounding area. A soil map from the USDA's Web Soil Survey website was utilized to determine this Soil Group.

The retention basin will be constructed to accommodate the additional water that will need to be retained based upon additional impervious a rea and water quality volume requirements.

## Proposed Retention Basin

- Time of Concentration (Tc)
o Pre-developed drainage area $=32$ minutes ( 0.541 hrs ) - See page 7 of 24 of computer calcs
o Post-developed drainage area $=23$ minutes ( 0.387 hrs ) - See page 5 of 24 of computer calcs
- CN Number
o Pre-developed $=84$ - see page 10 of 24 of computer calculations
o Post-developed $=90$ - see page 9 of 24 of computer calculations
- Total Acreage $=14.00$ acres

| Pre-developed Hydrograph Volume |  | Post-developed Hydrograph Volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stom | Peak Volume | Stom | Peak Volume |
| 1 year | $1.124 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1 year | $1.579 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 2 year | $1.485 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 2 year | $1.996 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 5 year | $2.061 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 5 year | $2.638 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 10 year | $2.562 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 10 year | $3.185 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 25 year | $3.286 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 25 year | $3.961 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 50 year | $3.816 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 50 year | $4.522 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| 100 year | $4.353 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 100 year | $5.086 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |

- Critic al Storm Calculation using hydrograph volumes. Volume providesa 5-yearcritical storm. On page 2 of the Pond Pack calculations it shows the hydrograph volumes. The calculation would be as follows: $((1.579-1.124) / 1.124)=0.40=40 \%$. Therefore a 5 -year c ritic al storm shall be used.
- Storm Requirements = C ontrol runoff from a 1, 2 and 5-year storm on the post developed site to the runoff from a 1-year storm on the pre-developed site. Then control the runoff from the 10, 25, 50 and 100-year stom on the post-developed site to the runoff from their respective stoms for the pre-developed site.
- Retention Volume provided to a n elevation of $1029.00=1.887$ acre-feet - see page 11 of 24
- Retention Outlet Structure consists of:
o A 2-3 catch basin with a $3.3^{\prime \prime}$ dia. O rifice at Inv. 1026.50. This orifice will cover the WQv requirements. The next openings are two $2^{\prime}$ wide by 6 " tall window openings with inverts of 1027.20. The $2-3$ catch basin hasa top of 1028.00. The outlet for the pond will be two $15^{\prime \prime}$ pipes that will T-off a nd run along the property line 100 each direction. On the $15^{\prime \prime}$ pipes will be $150-2$ " holes, equally spaced, that will help to disperse the flow across the farm field. The below calculations support that the critical storm pre vspost release ratesare acceptable. The emergency overflow will be the overflow weir which is depressed from the top of the pond, with an invert elevation of 1029.00. The overflow weir is at an elevation that provides 12 inches of free board. This allows water to overflow the top of the basin and discharges down the bank into the existing farm field.


## Proposed Retention Basin Summary:

| STORM | PEAK <br> INFLOW | PEAK <br> OUTFLOW | ALOWABLE FLOW | STORAGE | PEAKBASIN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELEVATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 YEAR | 18.46 cfs | 4.06 cfs | 10.56 cfs | $0.779 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1027.61 |
| 2 YEAR | 23.29 cfs | 5.75 cfs | 10.56 cfs | $0.956 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1027.85 |
| 5 YEAR | 30.64 cfs | 9.13 cfs | 10.56 cfs | $1.232 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1028.21 |
| 10 YEAR | 36.79 cfs | 12.88 cfs | 24.79 cfs | $1.435 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1028.46 |
| 25 YEAR | 45.40 cfs | 15.69 cfs | 31.80 cfs | $1.745 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1028.83 |
| 50 YEAR | 51.54 cfs | 19.91 cfs | 36.86 cfs | $1.952 \mathrm{ac}-f t$ | 1029.08 |
| 100 YEAR | 57.66 cfs | 26.71 cfs | 41.96 cfs | $2.090 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ | 1029.23 |

NOTE: The post developed release rates from the 1, 2, 5 -year stoms are less than the 1-year predeveloped release rate (per the required critical stom method) and the post-developed release rates from the 10, 25, 50 and 100 year stomms are less than their respec tive pre-developed release rates.

Below is a summary of the stom water runoff quality calculations that would be needed to fully contain the water quality runoff for the site.

- OEPA Requirements
- Retention Pond:
o Release the runoff from a $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ rain event on the drainage a rea over 24 hours or longer.
o The first half of the total volume generated by the runoff from a $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ ra in event must be reta ined for greater than 8 hours.


## Water Quality Calculations

- Post-Construction storm water ma na gement water quality volume for development of both lots using 0.75 inches of rain:
o $W Q_{v}=0.39 * 0.75 * 14.00 / 12=0.345$ AC-FT
o 0.485 AC-FTProvided to elev. 1027.20. Therefore $0.485>0.345$ a nd water quality volume is deta ined.


## Retention Basin

Retention Outlet Structure c onsists of:

- A $3.3^{\prime \prime}$ diameter hole at Inv. 1026.50 would be required to hold back the water quality runoff from the site.
- Perthe draw down calculation we satisfy the requirement of not releasing more than $50 \%$ before 8 hours and not more than $100 \%$ by 24 hours. Per the calculations the pond relea ses about $30 \%$ at 8 hours a nd about 89\% at 24 hours.


## OEPA REQUIREMENTS :

1) Release the runoff from a $3 / 4$ " rain event on the drainage area over 24 hours or longer
2) The first half of the total volume generated by the runoff from a $3 / 4$ " rain event must be detained for greater than 8 hours

|  | WQv VOLUME CALCULATIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| Precipitation (Inches) | 0.75 |
| Area (Acres) | 14 |
| Impervious \% | $58 \%$ |
| Cq | 0.39 |
| WQv (CF) | 15014.80 |

$W Q v=0.39 * 14.00^{*} 0.75 / 12=0.345 \mathrm{AC}-\mathrm{FT}=15,015 \mathrm{CF}$
RETENTION BASIN HOLDS 21,118 CF AT ELEV. OF 1027.20. 21,118 CF > 15,015 CF THEREFORE WQv SATISFIED. THEREFORE MUST RELEASE WQv THRU PROPERLY SIZED ORIFICE UNTIL $1027.20\left(0.70^{\prime} \mathrm{HIGH}\right)$ TO ENSURE WQv IS PROPERLY DETAINED AND RELEASED.

## WQv DRAW DOWN CALCULATIONS

INSTALL 3.3" ORIFICE IN FACE OF CATCH BASIN AT INV. 1026.50 TO RELEASE WQv AT REQUIRED RATE SET NEXT ORIFICE AT OR ABOVE 1027.20

Per the draw down calculation below we satisfy the requirement of not releasing more than $50 \%$ before 8 hours and not more than $100 \%$ by 24 hours. Per the calculations the 3.3" dia. orifice releases about $30 \%$ at 8 hours and about $89 \%$ at 24 hours.

## NORTH DETENTION BASIN

| Basin Invert:........... | 1026.50 Ft. |
| :--- | ---: |
| Orifice Opening.... | 3.30 In. |
| Orifice Coefficient... | 0.55 |
| Average Head... | 0.35 |
| Average Discharge | 0.155 In. |
| Average Discharge Volume | 279.16 cfs |


| Time (hour) | Time (min) | Starting Volume (CF) | Total <br> Discharged <br> Volume <br> (CF) | Percentage <br> Volume Discharged (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.0 | 0 | 15,014.80 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| 0.5 | 30 |  | 279.16 | 1.86\% |
| 1.0 | 60 |  | 558.32 | 3.72\% |
| 1.5 | 90 |  | 837.48 | 5.58\% |
| 2.0 | 120 |  | 1,116.64 | 7.44\% |
| 2.5 | 150 |  | 1,395.80 | 9.30\% |
| 3.0 | 180 |  | 1,674.97 | 11.16\% |
| 3.5 | 210 |  | 1,954.13 | 13.01\% |
| 4.0 | 240 |  | 2,233.29 | 14.87\% |
| 4.5 | 270 |  | 2,512.45 | 16.73\% |
| 5.0 | 300 |  | 2,791.61 | 18.59\% |
| 5.5 | 330 |  | 3,070.77 | 20.45\% |
| 6.0 | 360 |  | 3,349.93 | 22.31\% |
| 6.5 | 390 |  | 3,629.09 | 24.17\% |
| 7.0 | 420 |  | 3,908.25 | 26.03\% |
| 7.5 | 450 |  | 4,187.41 | 27.89\% |
| 8.0 | 480 |  | 4,466.57 | 29.75\% |
| 8.5 | 510 |  | 4,745.74 | 31.61\% |
| 9.0 | 540 |  | 5,024.90 | 33.47\% |
| 9.5 | 570 |  | 5,304.06 | 35.33\% |
| 10.0 | 600 |  | 5,583.22 | 37.18\% |
| 10.5 | 630 |  | 5,862.38 | 39.04\% |
| 11.0 | 660 |  | 6,141.54 | 40.90\% |
| 11.5 | 690 |  | 6,420.70 | 42.76\% |
| 12.0 | 720 |  | 6,699.86 | 44.62\% |
| 12.5 | 750 |  | 6,979.02 | 46.48\% |
| 13.0 | 780 |  | 7,258.18 | 48.34\% |
| 13.5 | 810 |  | 7,537.34 | 50.20\% |
| 14.0 | 840 |  | 7,816.51 | 52.06\% |
| 14.5 | 870 |  | 8,095.67 | 53.92\% |
| 15.0 | 900 |  | 8,374.83 | 55.78\% |
| 15.5 | 930 |  | 8,653.99 | 57.64\% |
| 16.0 | 960 |  | 8,933.15 | 59.50\% |
| 16.5 | 990 |  | 9,212.31 | 61.35\% |
| 17.0 | 1020 |  | 9,491.47 | 63.21\% |
| 17.5 | 1050 |  | 9,770.63 | 65.07\% |
| 18.0 | 1080 |  | 10,049.79 | 66.93\% |
| 18.5 | 1110 |  | 10,328.95 | 68.79\% |
| 19.0 | 1140 |  | 10,608.11 | 70.65\% |


| 19.5 | 1170 | 10,887.28 | 72.51\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.0 | 1200 | 11,166.44 | 74.37\% |
| 20.5 | 1230 | 11,445.60 | 76.23\% |
| 21.0 | 1260 | 11,724.76 | 78.09\% |
| 21.5 | 1290 | 12,003.92 | 79.95\% |
| 22.0 | 1320 | 12,283.08 | 81.81\% |
| 22.5 | 1350 | 12,562.24 | 83.67\% |
| 23.0 | 1380 | 12,841.40 | 85.52\% |
| 23.5 | 1410 | 13,120.56 | 87.38\% |
| 24.0 | 1440 | 13,399.72 | 89.24\% |
| 24.5 | 1470 | 13,678.88 | 91.10\% |
| 25.0 | 1500 | 13,958.05 | 92.96\% |
| 25.5 | 1530 | 14,237.21 | 94.82\% |
| 26.0 | 1560 | 14,516.37 | 96.68\% |
| 26.5 | 1590 | 14,795.53 | 98.54\% |
| 27.0 | 1620 | 15,074.69 | 100.40\% |
| 27.5 | 1650 | 15,353.85 | 102.26\% |
| 28.0 | 1680 | 15,633.01 | 104.12\% |
| 28.5 | 1710 | 15,912.17 | 105.98\% |
| 29.0 | 1740 | 16,191.33 | 107.84\% |
| 29.5 | 1770 | 16,470.49 | 109.70\% |
| 30.0 | 1800 | 16,749.65 | 111.55\% |
| 30.5 | 1830 | 17,028.82 | 113.41\% |
| 31.0 | 1860 | 17,307.98 | 115.27\% |
| 31.5 | 1890 | 17,587.14 | 117.13\% |
| 32.0 | 1920 | 17,866.30 | 118.99\% |
| 32.5 | 1950 | 18,145.46 | 120.85\% |
| 33.0 | 1980 | 18,424.62 | 122.71\% |
| 33.5 | 2010 | 18,703.78 | 124.57\% |
| 34.0 | 2040 | 18,982.94 | 126.43\% |
| 34.5 | 2070 | 19,262.10 | 128.29\% |
| 35.0 | 2100 | 19,541.26 | 130.15\% |
| 35.5 | 2130 | 19,820.42 | 132.01\% |
| 36.0 | 2160 | 20,099.59 | 133.87\% |
| 36.5 | 2190 | 20,378.75 | 135.72\% |
| 37.0 | 2220 | 20,657.91 | 137.58\% |
| 37.5 | 2250 | 20,937.07 | 139.44\% |
| 38.0 | 2280 | 21,216.23 | 141.30\% |
| 38.5 | 2310 | 21,495.39 | 143.16\% |
| 39.0 | 2340 | 21,774.55 | 145.02\% |
| 39.5 | 2370 | 22,053.71 | 146.88\% |
| 40.0 | 2400 | 22,332.87 | 148.74\% |
| 40.5 | 2430 | 22,612.03 | 150.60\% |
| 41.0 | 2460 | 22,891.19 | 152.46\% |
| 41.5 | 2490 | 23,170.36 | 154.32\% |
| 42.0 | 2520 | 23,449.52 | 156.18\% |
| 42.5 | 2550 | 23,728.68 | 158.04\% |
| 43.0 | 2580 | 24,007.84 | 159.89\% |
| 43.5 | 2610 | 24,287.00 | 161.75\% |
| 44.0 | 2640 | 24,566.16 | 163.61\% |
| 44.5 | 2670 | 24,845.32 | 165.47\% |
| 45.0 | 2700 | 25,124.48 | 167.33\% |
| 45.5 | 2730 | 25,403.64 | 169.19\% |
| 46.0 | 2760 | 25,682.80 | 171.05\% |
| 46.5 | 2790 | 25,961.96 | 172.91\% |
| 47.0 | 2820 | 26,241.13 | 174.77\% |
| 47.5 | 2850 | 26,520.29 | 176.63\% |
| 48.0 | 2880 | 26,799.45 | 178.49\% |
| 48.5 | 2910 | 27,078.61 | 180.35\% |
| 49.0 | 2940 | 27,357.77 | 182.21\% |
| 49.5 | 2970 | 27,636.93 | 184.06\% |
| 50.0 | 3000 | 27,916.09 | 185.92\% |
| 50.5 | 3030 | 28,195.25 | 187.78\% |
| 51.0 | 3060 | 28,474.41 | 189.64\% |
| 51.5 | 3090 | 28,753.57 | 191.50\% |
| 52.0 | 3120 | 29,032.74 | 193.36\% |
| 52.5 | 3150 | 29,311.90 | 195.22\% |
| 53.0 | 3180 | 29,591.06 | 197.08\% |
| 53.5 | 3210 | 29,870.22 | 198.94\% |
| 54.0 | 3240 | 30,149.38 | 200.80\% |
| 54.5 | 3270 | 30,428.54 | 202.66\% |
| 55.0 | 3300 | 30,707.70 | 204.52\% |
| 55.5 | 3330 | 30,986.86 | 206.38\% |
| 56.0 | 3360 | 31,266.02 | 208.23\% |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

| Project Summary |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Cresco Labs |
| Retention |  |
| Title | Calculations |
|  | TJT |
| Engineer | COEC |
| Company | $11 / 6 / 2017$ |
| Date |  |
| Notes |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Master Network Summary

## Catchments Summary

| Label | Scenario | Return Event (years) | Hydrograph Volume (ac-ft) | Time to Peak (hours) | Peak Flow $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 1 yrs | 1 | 1.124 | 12.200 | 10.56 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 2 yrs | 2 | 1.485 | 12.200 | 14.18 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 5 | 5 | 2.061 | 12.200 | 19.88 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 10 yrs | 10 | 2.562 | 12.200 | 24.79 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 25 yrs | 25 | 3.286 | 12.200 | 31.80 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 50 yrs | 50 | 3.816 | 12.200 | 36.86 |
| Pre-Developed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Greene County - , } \\ & 100 \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 100 | 4.353 | 12.200 | 41.96 |
| Post Developed | $\text { Greene County - , } 1$ yrs | 1 | 1.579 | 12.100 | 18.46 |
| Post Developed | Greene County - , 2 yrs | 2 | 1.996 | 12.100 | 23.29 |
| Post Developed | Greene County - , 5 yrs | 5 | 2.638 | 12.100 | 30.64 |
| Post Developed | Greene County - , 10 yrs | 10 | 3.185 | 12.100 | 36.79 |
| Post Developed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Greene County - , } 25 \\ & \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 3.961 | 12.100 | 45.40 |
| Post Developed | Greene County - , 50 yrs | 50 | 4.522 | 12.100 | 51.54 |
| Post Developed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Greene County - , } \\ & 100 \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 100 | 5.086 | 12.100 | 57.66 |

## Node Summary

| Label | Scenario | Return <br> Event <br> (years) | Hydrograph <br> Volume (ac-ft) | Time to Peak (hours) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peak Flow } \\ & \left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 1 yrs | 1 | 1.124 | 12.200 | 10.56 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 2 yrs | 2 | 1.485 | 12.200 | 14.18 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 5 yrs | 5 | 2.061 | 12.200 | 19.88 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 10 yrs | 10 | 2.562 | 12.200 | 24.79 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 25 yrs | 25 | 3.286 | 12.200 | 31.80 |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 50 yrs | 50 | 3.816 | 12.200 | 36.86 |
| 2017-10-31-Pre vs Post Retention.ppc 11/6/2017 |  | Systems, In | aestad Methods Sol nter |  | Bentley PondP |
|  |  | iemon Com | Drive Suite 200 W |  | Page |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Master Network Summary

Node Summary

| Label | Scenario | Return Event (years) | Hydrograph Volume (ac-ft) | Time to Peak (hours) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peak Flow } \\ & \left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Developed | Greene County - , 100 yrs | 100 | 4.353 | 12.200 | 41.96 |
| Outlet | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Greene County -, } 1 \\ & \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1.561 | 12.650 | 4.06 |
| Outlet | Greene County - , 2 yrs | 2 | 1.977 | 12.600 | 5.75 |
| Outlet | Greene County - , 5 yrs | 5 | 2.619 | 12.500 | 9.13 |
| Outlet | Greene County - , 10 yrs | 10 | 3.166 | 12.450 | 12.88 |
| Outlet | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Greene County - , } 25 \\ & \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 3.942 | 12.450 | 15.69 |
| Outlet | Greene County - , 50 yrs | 50 | 4.503 | 12.450 | 19.91 |
| Outlet | Greene County - , 100 yrs | 100 | 5.067 | 12.400 | 26.71 |

## Pond Summary

| Label | Scenario | Return <br> Event <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  years) | Hydrograph <br> Volume <br> $(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft})$ | Time to Peak <br> (hours) | Peak Flow <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ | Maximum <br> Water |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Surface | (ac-ft) |  |

(ft)
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|r|r|r|r|r|r|}\hline \text { Pond (IN) } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Greene County } \\ -, 1 \text { yrs } \\ \text { Greene County }\end{array} & 1 & 1.579 & 12.100 & 18.46 & \text { (N/A) } & \text { (N/A) } \\ \text { Pond (OUT) } & \begin{array}{l}-, 1 \text { yrs }\end{array} & 1.561 & 12.650 & 4.06 & 1,027.61 & 0.779 \\ \text { Pond (IN) } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Greene County } \\ -, 2 \text { yrs } \\ \text { Greene County }\end{array} & 2 & 1.996 & 12.100 & 23.29 & \text { (N/A) } & \text { (N/A) } \\ \text { Pond (OUT) } & 2 & 1.977 & 12.600 & 5.75 & 1,027.85 & 0.956 \\ \text {-, 2 yrs } \\ \text { Greene County }\end{array}\right)$

2017-10-31-Pre vs Post Retention.ppc 11/6/2017

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Master Network Summary

| Pond Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Label | Scenario | Return Event (years) | Hydrograph Volume (ac-ft) | Time to Peak (hours) | Peak Flow $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ | Maximum Water Surface Elevation (ft) | Maximum Pond Storage (ac-ft) |
| Pond (OUT) | Greene County $\text { - , } 50 \text { yrs }$ | 50 | 4.503 | 12.450 | 19.91 | 1,029.08 | 1.952 |
| Pond (IN) | Greene County $- \text {, } 100 \text { yrs }$ | 100 | 5.086 | 12.100 | 57.66 | (N/A) | (N/A) |
| Pond (OUT) | Greene County -100 yrs | 100 | 5.067 | 12.400 | 26.71 | 1,029.23 | 2.090 |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Time of Concentration Calculations Label: Post Developed

Return Event: 100 years

Time of Concentration Results

| Segment \#1: TR-55 Sheet Flow |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Hydraulic Length | 117.00 ft |
| Manning's n | 0.240 |
| Slope | $0.010 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| 2 Year 24 Hour Depth | 2.7000 in |
| Average Velocity | $0.08 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Segment Time of | 0.387 hours |
| Concentration |  |


| Time of Concentration (Composite) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time of Concentration <br> (Composite) | 0.387 hours |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Time of Concentration Calculations
Label: Post Developed
Return Event: 100 years
Storm Event: TypeII 24hr (2.3 in)

## ==== SCS Channel Flow

|  | $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Qa} / \mathrm{Wp}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{Tc}=\quad$ | $\mathrm{V}=\left(1.49 *\left(\mathrm{R}^{* *}(2 / 3)\right) *\left(\mathrm{Sf}^{* *}-0.5\right)\right) / \mathrm{n}$ |
|  | $(\mathrm{Lf} / \mathrm{V}) / 3600$ |
| $\mathrm{R}=$ Hydraulic radius |  |
|  | $\mathrm{Aq}=$ Flow area, square feet |
| $\mathrm{Wp}=$ Wetted perimeter, feet |  |
|  | $\mathrm{V}=$ Velocity, $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ |
| Where: | $\mathrm{Sf}=$ Slope, $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ Manning's n |
|  | $\mathrm{Tc}=$ Time of concentration, hours |
|  | $\mathrm{Lf}=$ Flow length, feet |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Time of Concentration Calculations Label: Pre-Developed

| Time of Concentration Results |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Segment \#1: TR-55 Sheet Flow |  |
| Hydraulic Length | 300.00 ft |
| Manning's n | 0.170 |
| Slope | $0.020 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| 2 Year 24 Hour Depth | 2.7000 in |
| Average Velocity | $0.18 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Segment Time of | 0.473 hours |
| Concentration |  |
| Segment \#2: TR-55 Shallow Concentrated Flow |  |
| Hydraulic Length | 250.00 ft |
| Is Paved? | False |
| Slope | $0.030 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Velocity | $2.79 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Segment Time of | 0.025 hours |
| Concentration |  |
| Segment \#3: TR-55 Shallow Concentrated Flow |  |
| Hydraulic Length | 250.00 ft |
| Is Paved? | False |
| Slope | $0.010 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Average Velocity | $1.61 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Segment Time of | 0.043 hours |
| Concentration |  |
| Time of Concentration (Composite) |  |
| Time of Concentration |  |
| Composite) |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Time of Concentration Calculations
Label: Pre-Developed
Return Event: 100 years
Storm Event: TypeII 24hr (2.3 in)

## === = SCS Channel Flow

$\mathrm{Tc}=$

Where:
$\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{Wp}$
$\mathrm{V}=\left(1.49 *\left(\mathrm{R}^{* *}(2 / 3)\right) *(\mathrm{Sf**}-0.5)\right) / n$
(Lf / V) / 3600
$\mathrm{R}=$ Hydraulic radius
Aq= Flow area, square feet
Wp= Wetted perimeter, feet
$\mathrm{V}=$ Velocity, ft/sec
$\mathrm{Sf}=$ Slope, $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$
$\mathrm{n}=$ Manning's n
Tc= Time of concentration, hours
Lf= Flow length, feet

## ==== SCS TR-55 Shallow Concentration Flow

Unpaved surface:
$\mathrm{V}=16.1345{ }^{*}(\mathrm{Sf} * * 0.5)$
$\mathrm{Tc}=$
Paved Surface:
$\mathrm{V}=20.3282$ * (Sf**0.5)
(Lf / V) / 3600
$\mathrm{V}=$ Velocity, ft/sec
Where:
$\mathrm{Sf}=$ Slope, ft/ft
Tc= Time of concentration, hours
Lf= Flow length, feet

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Runoff CN-Area
Return Event: 100 years
Label: Post Developed
Storm Event: TypeII 24hr (2.3 in)

## Runoff Curve Number Data

| Soil/Surface Description | CN | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | C <br> $(\%)$ | UC <br> $(\%)$ | Adjusted CN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| GRASS (D SOIL) | 80.000 | $255,960.000$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 80.000 |
| IMPERVIOUS | 98.000 | $353,888.000$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 98.000 |
| COMPOSITE AREA \& WEIGHTED CN ---> | (N/A) | $609,848.000$ | $(\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A})$ | $(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A})$ | 90.445 |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Runoff CN-Area
Label: Pre-Developed
Return Event: 100 years

Runoff Curve Number Data

| Soil/Surface Description | CN |  | Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | C <br> $(\%)$ | UC <br> $(\%)$ | Adjusted CN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ROW CROP C | 82.000 | $304,924.000$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 82.000 |  |
| ROW CROP D | 86.000 | $304,924.000$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 86.000 |  |
| COMPOSITE AREA \& WEIGHTED CN ---> | (N/A) | $609,848.000$ | $(\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A})$ | $(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A})$ | 84.000 |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Elevation-Area Volume Curve
Return Event: 100 years Label: Pond

| Elevation (ft) | Planimeter (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Area $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A} 1+\mathrm{A} 2+\mathrm{sqr} \\ \left(\mathrm{~A} 1^{*} \mathrm{~A} 2\right) \\ \left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Volume (ac-ft) | Volume (Total) (ac-ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,026.50 | 0.0 | 28,585.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 1,027.00 | 0.0 | 30,238.000 | 88,222.885 | 0.338 | 0.338 |
| 1,028.00 | 0.0 | 33,708.000 | 95,871.891 | 0.734 | 1.071 |
| 1,029.00 | 0.0 | 37,369.000 | 106,568.326 | 0.815 | 1.887 |
| 1,030.00 | 0.0 | 41,135.000 | 117,710.808 | 0.901 | 2.787 |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Outlet Input Data
Return Event: 100 years
Label: Outlet

| Requested Pond Water Surface Elevations |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Minimum (Headwater) |  |
| Increment (Headwater) | $1,026.50 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Maximum (Headwater) | 0.25 ft |

## Outlet Connectivity

| Structure Type | Outlet ID | Direction | Outfall | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} 1 \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} 2 \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orifice-Area | Orifice - 2 | Forward | Culvert - 1 | 1,027.20 | 1,030.00 |
| Inlet Box | Riser - 1 | Forward | Culvert - 1 | 1,028.00 | 1,030.00 |
| Orifice-Circular | Orifice | Forward | Culvert - 1 | 1,026.50 | 1,030.00 |
| Culvert-Circular | Culvert - 1 | Forward | TW | 1,026.50 | 1,030.00 |
| Rectangular Weir | Weir - 1 | Forward | TW | 1,029.00 | 1,030.00 |
| Tailwater Settings | Tailwater |  |  | (N/A) | (N/A) |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Outlet Input Data
Return Event: 100 years
Label: Outlet

| Structure ID: Orifice |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Structure Type: Orifice-Circular |  |
| Number of Openings | 1 |
| Elevation | 3.026 .50 ft |
| Orifice Diameter | 0.600 |
| Orifice Coefficient |  |
| Structure ID: Riser -1 |  |
| Structure Type: Inlet Box | 1 |
| Number of Openings | $1,028.00 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Elevation | $3.3 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{2}$ |
| Orifice Area | 0.600 |
| Orifice Coefficient | 12.00 ft |
| Weir Length | $2.70(\mathrm{ft} \wedge 0.5) / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Weir Coefficient | 1.000 |
| K Reverse | 0.000 |
| Manning's n | 0.000 |
| Kev, Charged Riser | False |
| Weir Submergence | False |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Outlet Input Data
Return Event: 100 years
Label: Outlet

| Structure ID: Culvert - 1 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Structure Type: Culvert-Circular |  |
| Number of Barrels | 2 |
| Diameter | 15.0 in |
| Length | 35.00 ft |
| Length (Computed Barrel) | 35.00 ft |
| Slope (Computed) | $0.004 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Outlet Control Data |  |
| Manning's n | 0.013 |
| Ke | 0.200 |
| Kb | 0.023 |
| Kr | 0.000 |
| Convergence Tolerance | 0.00 ft |
| Inlet Control Data |  |
| Equation Form | Form 1 |
| K | 0.0045 |
| M | 2.0000 |
| C | 0.0317 |
| Y | 0.6900 |
| T1 ratio (HW/D) | 1.093 |
| T2 ratio (HW/D) | 1.195 |
| Slope Correction Factor | -0.500 |

Use unsubmerged inlet control 0 equation below T1
elevation.
Use submerged inlet control 0 equation above T2
elevation
In transition zone between unsubmerged and submerged
inlet control,
interpolate between flows at T1 \& T2...

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Outlet Input Data
Return Event: 100 years
Label: Outlet

| Structure ID: Weir-1 <br> Structure Type: Rectangular Weir |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Number of Openings | 1 |
| Elevation | 1,029.00 ft |
| Weir Length | 25.00 ft |
| Weir Coefficient | 3.00 (ft^0.5)/s |
| Structure ID: Orifice-2 <br> Structure Type: Orifice-Area |  |
|  |  |
| Number of Openings | 2 |
| Elevation | 1,027.20 ft |
| Orifice Area | $1.0 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |
| Top Elevation | 1,027.70 ft |
| Datum Elevation | 1,027.45 ft |
| Orifice Coefficient | 0.600 |
| Structure ID: TW <br> Structure Type: TW Setup, DS Channel |  |
|  |  |
| Tailwater Type | Free Outfall |
| Convergence Tolerances |  |
| Maximum Iterations | 40 |
| Tailwater Tolerance (Minimum) | 0.01 ft |
| Tailwater Tolerance (Maximum) | 0.50 ft |
| Headwater Tolerance (Minimum) | 0.01 ft |
| Headwater Tolerance (Maximum) | 0.50 ft |
| Flow Tolerance (Minimum) | $0.001 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow Tolerance (Maximum) | $10.000 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Composite Rating Curve Label: Outlet

Return Event: 100 years
Storm Event: TypeII 24hr (2.3 in)

Composite Outflow Summary

| Water Surface Elevation (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flow } \\ \left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Tailwater Elevation (ft) | Convergence Error <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,026.50 | 0.00 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,026.75 | 0.09 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,027.00 | 0.17 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,027.20 | 0.21 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,027.25 | 0.67 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,027.50 | 3.03 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,027.75 | 5.30 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,028.00 | 6.42 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,028.25 | 9.72 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,028.50 | 13.51 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,028.75 | 15.20 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,029.00 | 16.68 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,029.25 | 27.39 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,029.50 | 45.76 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,029.75 | 69.16 | (N/A) | 0.00 |
| 1,030.00 | 96.58 | (N/A) | 0.00 |

Contributing Structures

```
(no Q: Orifice - 2,Riser -
1,Orifice,Culvert - 1,Weir - 1)
Orifice,Culvert - 1 (no Q: Orifice -
2,Riser-1,Weir-1)
Orifice,Culvert - 1 (no Q: Orifice -
2,Riser-1,Weir - 1)
Orifice,Culvert - 1 (no Q: Orifice -
2,Riser-1,Weir-1)
Orifice-2,Orifice,Culvert-1 (no Q:
Riser-1,Weir-1)
    Orifice - 2,Orifice,Culvert - 1 (no Q:
Riser-1,Weir-1)
    Orifice-2,Orifice,Culvert-1 (no Q:
Riser-1,Weir-1)
    Orifice-2,Orifice,Culvert-1 (no Q:
Riser-1,Weir-1)
    Orifice - 2,Riser-1,Orifice,Culvert - 1
(no Q: Weir - 1)
    Orifice - 2,Riser-1,Orifice,Culvert - 1
(no Q: Weir - 1)
Orifice - 2,Riser-1,Orifice,Culvert - 1
(no Q: Weir - 1)
    Orifice - 2,Riser-1,Orifice,Culvert - 1
(no Q: Weir - 1)
    Orifice - 2,Riser - 1,Orifice,Culvert -
1,Weir-1
```


## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Composite Rating Curve
Label: Outlet

Composite Outflow Summary
Contributing Structures

```
Riser-1,Culvert-1, Weir-1 (no Q: Orifice-2,Orifice)
Riser - 1 ,Culvert - 1 , Weir - 1 (no Q: Orifice - 2,Orifice)
Riser - 1,Culvert - 1, Weir - 1 (no Q: Orifice-2,Orifice)
Orifice-2,Orifice)
```

Return Event: 100 years
Storm Event: TypeII 24hr (2.3 in)

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Infiltration Method <br> (Computed) | No Infiltration |
| Initial Conditions |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, | $1,026.50 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | 0.050 hours |
| Time Increment |  |


| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flow (Peak In) | $18.46 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $4.06 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.650 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,027.61 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | 0.779 ac-ft |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $1.579 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | $1.561 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.018 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infiltration Method (Computed) | No Infiltration |  |  |
| Initial Conditions |  |  |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Initial) | 1,026.50 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Time Increment | 0.050 hours |  |  |
| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| Flow (Peak In) | $23.29 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $5.75 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.600 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,027.85 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | $0.956 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $1.996 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | 1.977 ac-ft |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.018 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Infiltration Method <br> (Computed) | No Infiltration |
| Initial Conditions |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, | $1,026.50 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | 0.050 hours |
| Time Increment |  |


| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flow (Peak In) | $30.64 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $9.13 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.500 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,028.21 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | $1.232 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $2.638 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | 2.619 ac-ft |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.018 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infiltration Method (Computed) | No Infiltration |  |  |
| Initial Conditions |  |  |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Initial) | 1,026.50 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Time Increment | 0.050 hours |  |  |
| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| Flow (Peak In) | $36.79 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $12.88 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.450 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,028.46 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | $1.435 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $3.185 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | 3.166 ac-ft |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | 0.018 ac-ft |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infiltration Method (Computed) | No Infiltration |  |  |
| Initial Conditions |  |  |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Initial) | 1,026.50 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Time Increment | 0.050 hours |  |  |
| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| Flow (Peak In) | $45.40 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $15.69 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.450 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,028.83 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | $1.745 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | 3.961 ac-ft |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | $3.942 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.019 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Infiltration Method <br> (Computed) | No Infiltration |
| Initial Conditions |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, | $1,026.50 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft} 3 / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | 0.050 hours |
| Time Increment |  |


| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flow (Peak In) | $51.54 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $19.91 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.450 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,029.08 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | $1.952 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $4.522 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | $4.503 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.019 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |

## Cresco Labs Retention Calculations

Subsection: Level Pool Pond Routing Summary Label: Pond (IN)

| Infiltration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Infiltration Method (Computed) | No Infiltration |  |  |
| Initial Conditions |  |  |  |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Initial) | 1,026.50 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Outlet) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial Infiltration) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Flow (Initial, Total) | $0.00 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |  |
| Time Increment | 0.050 hours |  |  |
| Inflow/Outflow Hydrograph Summary |  |  |  |
| Flow (Peak In) | $57.66 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, In) | 12.100 hours |
| Flow (Peak Outlet) | $26.71 \mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | Time to Peak (Flow, Outlet) | 12.400 hours |
| Elevation (Water Surface, Peak) | 1,029.23 ft |  |  |
| Volume (Peak) | 2.090 ac-ft |  |  |
| Mass Balance (ac-ft) |  |  |  |
| Volume (Initial) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Inflow) | $5.086 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Infiltration) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Total Outlet Outflow) | $5.067 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Retained) | $0.019 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Volume (Unrouted) | $0.000 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}$ |  |  |
| Error (Mass Balance) | 0.0 \% |  |  |



Natural Resources

## Hydrologic Soil Group

| Hydrologic Soil Group-Summary by Map Unit - Greene County, Ohio (OH057) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Map unit symbol | Map unit name | Rating | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| Bs | Brookston silty clay loam, fine texture, 0 to 2 percent slopes | C/D | 1.5 | 11.5\% |
| CrA | Crosby silt loam, Southern Ohio Till Plain, 0 to 2 percent slopes | C/D | 5.2 | 39.0\% |
| MhB | Miamian silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | C | 6.6 | 49.5\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  |  | 13.3 | 100.0\% |

## Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group $D$ are assigned to dual classes.

## Rating Options

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition

Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified
Tie-break Rule: Higher

|  | \% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

CRESCOlabs

November 10, 2017

## VIA EMAIL

Denise Swinger
Planning \& Zoning Administrator
Village of Yellow Springs
(937) 767-1702

## Re: Phase 1 / 2 Employee Headcount and Parking Lot Development

## Dear Denise:

As part of our operational launch a limited number of employees will be necessary during the initial cultivation cycle. Per our application operational timetable, we anticipate an employee headcount that will not exceed 10-15 resources until Phase 2 cultivation expansion. Phase 2 expansion is expected to kickoff once the registered patient population requires an increased production volume, necessitating a facility expansion beyond 25,000 square feet of cultivation canopy. Per the operational timeline below and expected Phase 2 start date, we will only require (15) employee parking spaces and (3) visitor parking spaces until 2020.

It is important to note that our application timetable was drafted for a September 2017 notification of license award. Based upon projected patient population growth rates, we do not expect Phase 2 launch to occur until sometime in mid to late 2020.

We are proposing the construction of 45 parking spaces for Phase 1 construction and areas to support up to 26 additional spaces as needed for future expansions. The number of parking spaces proposed is significantly more than the number of parking spaces the facility will need to support based on our current facility's headcounts.

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Denise Swinger, Village of Yellow Springs Architectural Review Committee Representative for the CBE/Commerce Park

DATE: $\quad$ November 9, 2017
RE: Review of Cresco Labs development of Lot \#1
When the land for the commerce park was purchased by Education Village, Inc., a Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions for the CBE was filed with the Greene County Recorder's Office. This declaration includes a set of standards, rules and regulations for an Architectural Review Committee. The individual or individuals designated shall review and either approve, modify or reject all development, construction, landscaping and site plans involving improvements for the property. After the transfer of the land to the Village of Yellow Springs, I was appointed the designated representative by Council. Because this is new construction. In fulfillment of these covenants, please accept the following recommendations to be made part of the conditional use requirement for Cresco Labs site plan review.

We understand Cresco Labs requires high-security for their medical marijuana cultivation and processing plant. Because it is located in a mixed-use commerce park, it is important the aesthetics of the property be maintained. This can be accomplished with a few landscaping requirements:

- Use the Village of Yellow Springs Recommended Tree List (Appendix B) which is included with this report and is in revised form pending codification.
- The plan indicated an 8 foot chain link fence with barbed wire. We recommend black chain link fencing with NO barbed wire.


Black chain link fence has a softer appeal and easily blends into residential and commercial environments. When installed with shrubs and trees, it can become nearly invisible.


- Screening to be provided around the building to break up large areas of solid walls. This screening can be done with natural landscaping, such as evergreens or arborvitaes as pictured above, or an attached lattice with climbing ivy or other vine as pictured below. This does not have to be across the entire length of the building, but will be most important along the east side facing East Enon Road and along the south side of the building where the row of exterior ventilation fans, the shipping dock, and the parking lot are located, and which is visible to Dayton-Yellow Springs Road.

- Add a row of trees around the detention area of a size that is visible to the public
- Provide recommended exterior paint colors for approval by the Architectural Review Committee.

Upon completion of the building construction, Cresco will provide a plan for these requirements to Denise Swinger, Zoning Administrator - Village of Yellow Springs, for approval.

Yellow Springs, OH Code of Ordinances

## APPENDIX B <br> VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS <br> RECOMMENDED TREES

The following list of trees has been placed on file with the Village for use by developers, businesses and individuals seeking advice on the types of trees to use:

As a rule, Some consider streets are more attractive when they contain only one kind of tree species. However, the pest risk is multiplied in that situation; therefore, such plantings should be made with caution.

Tree selection is extremely important in ensuring survivability and long-term health of trees. The most important thing to remember when selecting trees is to match the tree to the site, not the site to the tree. Where you have space for a large species always plant a large species. It is the large tree species that will give Yellow Springs the most benefits in the long run. In addition, they tend to be longer lived than smaller species when planted in the right location.

Tree species diversity is important to a healthy, resilient community tree population, as well as age diversity. A good rule to follow for the community urban forest as a whole is the 10-20-30 Rule. The breakdown to shoot for is no more than $30 \%$ of a single family, $20 \%$ of a single genus (maple, oak, etc.), and no more than $10 \%$ of a single species. This can be accomplished by street or by the community as a whole.

The trees suggested in this list were selected because their characteristics make them suitable for urban and home use. The criteria used include: deep roots, minimal fruit or leaf litter, regular and predictable form, stress tolerance, disease and insect resistance, transplanting facility, availability and ornamental value.

Due to the culture and goals set forth by the Yellow Springs community, native tree species should be given preference where a native species will thrive within the constraints of diversity goals. All of the trees listed below are good for planting in both tree lawn areas and for landscape use in yards.

## Small Trees with single-stem forms (under 25 feet at maturity) - If planting in the tree lawn, the width should be at least 3 feet

## Native

Serviceberry (Amelachier canadensis)
Pawpaw (Asimina triloba)
American hornbeam (Carpinus caroliniana)
Redbud (Cercis canadensis)
Washington Hawthorn (Crataegus phaenopyrum)
Sweet bay magnolia (Magnolia virginiana)

## Non-Native

Amur Maple (Acer ginnala)
Paperbark Maple (Acer griseum)
Cornelian cherry (Cornus mas)
Flowering Crabapple (Malus sp.) Selected cultivars with small or minimal fruit and disease resistance Japanese Tree Lilac (Syringa reticulata)


Medium Trees (under 40 feet at maturity) - If planting in the tree lawn, the width should be at least 5 feet
Flowering Pear (Pyrus calleryana) Selected cultivars
Lacebark Elm (Ulmus parvifolla)
Japanese Zelkova (Zelkova serrata) Selected cultivars
Native
Persimmon (Diospyros virginiana)
Eastern hornbeam (Ostrya virginiana)
Canada Red Chokecherry (Prunus virginiana)
Sassafras (Sassafras albidium)

## Non-Native

State Street Maple (Acer miyabi)
Sargent Cherry (Prunus sargentii)
Japanese pagoda (Sophora japonica)
Littleleaf Linden (Tilia cordata)
Silver Linden (Tilia tormentosa)

## Large Trees (no wires) - If planting in the tree lawn, the width should be at least 7 feet

## Native

Red Maple (Acer rubrum)
Sugar Maple (Acer saccharum)
Hackberry (Celtis occidentalis)
White ash (Fraximus Americana)**
Green Ash (Fraxines pennsylvanica lanceolate)
Yellowwood (Cladrastis lutea)
Beech (Fagus grandifolia)
Thornless Honeylocust (Gleditsia triacanthos var. inermis) such as 'Sunburst' or 'Imperial'
Kentucky Coffeetree (Gymnocladus dioicus)
Sweetgum (Liquidambar estyraciflua) Seedless cultivars
Tuliptree (Liriodendron tulipifera)
Cucumbertree (Magnolia acuminata)

Blackgum (Nyssa sylvatica)<br>White Oak (Quercus alba)<br>Swamp White Oak (Quercus bicolor)<br>Scarlet Oak (Quercus coccinea)<br>Shingle Oak (Quercus imbricartia)<br>Bur Oak (Quercus macrocarpa)<br>Chinkapin Oak (Quercus muehlenbergii)<br>Chestnut Oak (Quercus prinus)<br>Red Oak (Quercus rubra)<br>Shumard Oak (Quercus shumardii)<br>Baldcypress (Taxodium distichum)<br>Basswood (Tilia americana)

## Non Native

Ginkgo (Ginkgo biloba) male Cultivar tree species only! Cultivars such as 'Magyar' or 'Autumn Gold'
London Planetree (Platanus x acerfolia)
Lacebark Elm (Ulmus parvifolla)
Japanese Zelkova (Zelkova serrata) such as 'Green Vase’
White Ash (Fraxinus americana)**
Green Ash (Fraxintus penmsylvaniea lanceolata)

## Trees Not Recommended for Tree Lawn Areas (can be planted for landscape use in yards)

Box Elder (Acer negundo)
Silver Maple (Acer saccharinum)
Buckeye or Horsechestnut (Aesculus species)
Birch (Betula specles)
Northern Catalpa (Catalpa)
Ginkgo-female (Ginkgo biloba)
Osage Orange (Maclura pomifera)
Common fruit trees
Mulberry (Morus)
Poplar (Populus species)
Willow (Salix species)
European Mountain Ash (Sorbus aucuparia)
Siberian Elm (Ulmus pumila)
Norway Maple
Black Walnut (Juglans nigra)
Flowering Pear (Pyrus calleryana) Selected cultivars
Ash (Fraxinus sp.)

## Program to Remove Invasive Species to Protect the Health of your Mature Trees

Ailanthus (Ailanthus altissima)
Tree of Heaven (Ailanthus altissima)
Bush Honeysuckle
Autumn Olive
Buckthorn
Flowering Pear (Pyrus calleryana) Selected cultivars

## Do Not Use Trees (for tree lawn areas or new developments)

Osage Orange (Maclura pomifera)
Siberian Elm (Ulmus pumila)
Flowering Pear (Pyrus calleryana) Selected cultivars
Ash (Fraxinus sp.)
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