The Village of Yellow Springs Planning Commission will meet in regular session on Monday, September 11, 2011 at 7:00 PM in Village Council Chambers on the second floor of the Bryan Community Center, 100 Dayton Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

7:00 CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

REVIEW OF AGENDA

7:05 REVIEW OF MINUTES –August 8, 2011

7:08 REPORTS
1. Council Update
2. Bike Enhancement Committee
3. Village Staff Report

COMMUNICATIONS
   Senior Center re: Trike Program

7:15 CITIZENS’ COMMENTS

7:20 OLD BUSINESS
   Update on Parks Master Plan Progress

7:40 NEW BUSINESS

8:55 AGENDA PLANNING
   Annexation of Dayton Yellow Springs ROW
   Barr Property PUD
   Parks Master Plan

9:00 ADJOURNMENT
VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

In Village Council Chambers        August 8, 2011

CALL TO ORDER
Planning Commission Chair Matt Reed called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Matt Reed, Tim Tobey, John Struwing, Bill Bebko, Alternate Member Chris Till and Council Representative Lori Askeland were present. Village Manager Mark Cundiff was also present, as was Assistant Planner Ed Amrhein.

REVIEW OF AGENDA
The group agreed to hold REPORTS to the end of the session.

REVIEW OF MINUTES
Struwing MOVED and Bebko SECONDED a MOTION to APPROVE the Minutes of July 11, 2011 AS AMENDED. The MOTION PASSED 5-0.

REPORTS
These were passed over at the end of the meeting due to lack of time.

COMMUNICATIONS
John and Sigalia Cannon re: Barr Development
Pat Murphy re: Barr Development
Clark, Blakelock, Cooney and Hayes Families re: Alley Traffic Concerns if Barr Development Occurs

CITIZENS’ COMMENTS
There were no Citizen Comments.

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING
Barr Property PUD for Affordable Senior Housing. Struwing suggested that the group first hear comments by the Village Manager, Village Assistant Planner, and Planning Consultant Brad Schwab.

Reed concurred, and proposed that following commentary, the developer and Home, Inc. representatives present the proposal, after which the public hearing would be opened.

Cundiff noted for the record that because of funding issues, Planning Commission must approve (or deny) the request for PUD-R zoning before receiving detailed engineering studies of the proposal. For this reason, Cundiff suggested, the group may wish to allow Council the opportunity to look over the proposal a second time—after preliminary approval and funding are obtained, and the builder can supply engineering studies.
Amrhein presented the following information:

At the last Planning Commission meeting, Planning Commission considered concept drawings and a presentation concerning a proposal to establish a Planned Unit Development at 321 Xenia Ave. (the “Barr” property). The development partners are Home, Inc. and the Buckeye Community Hope Foundation (“Buckeye”). Roy Lowenstein, of Buckeye, stated in part that the partnership would be unable to invest any significant sum of money in design and engineering costs until it had secured “zoning approval” from the Village, and had successfully applied for funding from State sources. This presents some procedural questions for the Commission, as our PUD ordinance (Chapter 1264) requires a fairly advanced level of design and engineering as part of the Preliminary Plan approval process.

This is an attempt to list the requirements of our Preliminary Plan approval process, and to indicate items in the current proposal that may vary from the prescribed timetable. Some items not yet submitted by the current applicants, such as a topographic map of the area, we have retained from the approved plan submitted by Friends Care (FC) two years ago. In such cases, and where appropriate, I have included individual sheets from that prior plan for your information only. Ultimately, we will need a complete set of development plans in order to consider the project for final approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location map</td>
<td>enclosed, plan cover sheet, sheet S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist’s renderings</td>
<td>enclosed, sheets S1, A3, A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units proposed (floor plans)</td>
<td>enclosed, sheets A1 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access points, drives, walkways</td>
<td>enclosed, sheet S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking areas</td>
<td>enclosed, sheet S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage plan</td>
<td>enclosed, sheet S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping plan</td>
<td>see sheet S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic sketch</td>
<td>enclosed, from FC plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing site plan, w/ vegetation, utilities</td>
<td>enclosed, from FC plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of submittal (ownership, title)</td>
<td>not rec’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New utilities plan, connections, details incl. easements, changes to existing infrastructure</td>
<td>not rec’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants, grants, restrictions</td>
<td>not rec’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental consequences,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewage &amp; drainage reports, calculations</td>
<td>not rec’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other engineering specifics</td>
<td>not rec’d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Planning Commission has the authority to recommend that Council approve, approve with conditions or deny the Preliminary Plan. In addition to the recommendations made by Brad Schwab, Staff recommends the explicit mention of missing items, as listed above. It should be specified that submission of the missing items will be required for consideration of a Final Development Plan. The language of the resolution should specify that all missing documents be developed according to generally accepted standards of good Architectural, Engineering and Legal practice. It might also be useful to reserve the right to establish additional conditions should the need arise (“Conditions include, but are not limited to…”).
Additionally, Planning Commission could recommend now that, even though there will be no subdivision of property in the project, approval of the Final Plan be required from Council as well as Planning Commission. This would accomplish two things: Council would get a chance to weigh in on features of the Plan normally included in the Preliminary Plan, and; an additional Public Hearing, to take place when time constraints have eased, gives everyone (Staff, P.C., Council and the general public) the opportunity to consider their comments and positions more fully, and to express them for the record. All this would be accomplished without adding further “hurry up” pressure to the process prior to the State application deadline.

Amrhein recommended to Planning Commission that they move forward with conditions. This would affirm to the Village that protocol is being followed, albeit in different order.

Brad Schwab, of Schwab Planning Group, stated that at the last meeting he had heard general support for unit density and open space. If Planning Commission does wish to work with the applicant, given his request for a modified review process, Schwab recommended proceeding, but with a clear understanding of what is recommended for approval and what is not yet approved. Schwab cautioned that these are common areas of misunderstanding.

Schwab specified that Planning Commission should, if generally comfortable with an initial approval, be very clear in the language of the motion, so that all parties know what still has to come before the group for approval.

Schwab further recommended that the group wait to require submission of details such as landscaping, screening and building design be left for the final PUD if it is the intention of Planning Commission to work with the applicant on his funding process.

Schwab cautioned that there should be further discussion on the design of the structure, and regarding the internal layout. He noted that once the structure is freed for more general use after 16 years, the common access to interior doors is not a usual design, and might limit possibilities.

Strueming asked Schwab to explain “option one” from his proposal. Option one is as below.

Option 1. Planning Commission and Village Council approves the Preliminary Plan as submitted with less information than normally required for Preliminary Plan approval. In this sense, the applicant receives “partial” Preliminary Plan approval under this scenario. The applicant submits the remaining Preliminary Plan details once housing tax credits are secured. Planning Commission and Village Council would review and approve the Preliminary Plan a second time albeit with additional details. This option allows the applicant to receive approval for the proposed use and density now while allowing Planning Commission and Village Council to negotiate and approve a complete Preliminary Plan later. It also allows the project to move forward without having to successfully negotiate every detail of the PUD keeping in mind that one tabled meeting for any reason over the next two months would most likely push Preliminary Plan approval beyond the tax credit application deadline. The disadvantage with this option is it requires the applicant and the Village to go through the Preliminary Plan review process twice.

Schwab explained that there is only a partial preliminary plan review in this option, which means that a recommendation by Planning Commission to grant the PUD-R does not exempt the applicant from having to return with the remaining preliminary plan details once he has obtained funding. Schwab suggested that that submission should again be a public hearing process. “You would be repeating the same steps twice,” Schwab noted.
Reed summarized that option one allows Planning Commission to see the full, complete proposal before approving it.

Struewing noted that he is very uncomfortable with the modified process, and that option one is the only possibility, in his view. Struewing commented that he had been willing to proceed after the last meeting on the assumption that the developer would be providing a great deal more detail on such matters as storm drainage. We don’t need engineered drawings, he commented, but we need a lot more detail than we have here.

Bebko remarked that Buckeye needs only the designation which permits the density to be able to compete for funding. Planning Commission will have to make a decision only on this matter, Bebko stated, other details will take months, and the developer does not have that time. Bebko agreed that normally, with so few details, the Commission would not consider the proposal.

In answer to a question from Struewing, Schwab concurred that the developer needs proof that the community has accepted the concept of a housing structure with the proposed density at 321 Xenia Ave.

The question as to whether there can legally be a PUD-R district at that location prior to formal plan approval is a legal question, Schwab noted.

Tobey agreed that option one is the only viable possibility at this point.

Reed expressed concern on the issue of establishing a precedent which changes process, and advised caution. He noted that the “hurry up” process lessens the ability of the Village to achieve due diligence. Reed urged that an approval of the PUD-R designation not be seen as any kind of a proposal acceptance on the part of the applicant.

Askeland agreed that caution is advised, and observed that the solicitor would need to weigh in on the status of the property should Council approve the decision to permit the density. The precedent regarding the number of approved units on the property was previously set with the Friends Care proposal, Askeland noted.

Struewing cautioned against equating the proposals, noting that the FCC proposal was the result of a great deal of negotiation, without which they might not have received the density approval.

Schwab added that much of what Planning Commissions do is to consider conditional approval, and that the most important piece of the picture is a crystal clear motion for approval.

Amrhein noted that PUD regulations do allow Planning Commission to vary from the requirements therein, legal review notwithstanding. Variation from the process itself is not specified, Amrhein noted.

Amrhein commented that while the Friends Care proposal was exciting in its attempt to qualify the structure for certification from the German Passive Home group, it should be noted that it was never built, partly because of the massive scope of the project.

John Eastman, Sanitary Engineer, spoke, stating that he is unaffiliated with the project in any official way. Because he was the site engineer for the Friends Care project, Eastman stated, he is able to make some preliminary observations.
Eastman stated that he did not see a way to make a two-story structure with the proposed footprint feasible on that site, given the drop in grade from the north side to the south side of the site.

Further, he stated, permeable pavement does not get rid of water, and the underlying bedrock will simply move it to the adjacent homes. More information on water detention, and more information on addressing the grade inequity is necessary. Density is related to the size and bulk of the building, Eastman stated, and to keep the proposed density but lessen the footprint would push the structure to three stories, which would bring back the problem of height.

From a purely engineering standpoint, Eastman stated, there are a number of significant barriers to this structure succeeding as proposed.

Emily Seibel, Executive Director of Home, Inc. spoke, introducing the proposal for those who had not attended the previous Planning Commission meeting, and introduced Roy Lowenstein, Vice President of Buckeye Hope Community Foundation.

Lowenstein provided an overview for those who had not attended the prior meeting.

Lowenstein noted that he had addressed the issue brought up by Schwab regarding first floor access. He moved a wall so that access to the units is through a corridor.

Lowenstein noted that Buckeye had received feedback regarding the design, and had made some adjustments accordingly, elevating some of the elements to provide more “pop” on the Xenia Avenue frontage.

Lowenstein spoke at some length regarding the structural and open space/meeting space aspects of the design, most of which were a repeat of his presentation at the prior Planning Commission meeting. He noted several times that these are not final plans.

Lowenstein addressed the issue of drainage, stating that Buckeye is aware that they must prevent the development from worsening any neighbor’s water problems. He agreed that permeable pavement is not a solution to the drainage issue, stating that much of the water that flows through the pavement will likely need to be stored underground. He did not see this as a major issue, and stated that Buckeye has budgeted for this anticipated expenditure.

Regarding the drop in elevation raised by Eastman, Lowenstein stated that he had not been aware that the drop was as much as five feet. He noted that a civil engineer will have to determine “where to move dirt” so that the floor is level. A topographic survey will have to be done, he acknowledged, but stated that he did not see the issue as insurmountable.

Cundiff asked Lowenstein whether they might receive funding but be required to make so many changes or conduct so many studies that they might have to back out of the project.

Lowenstein responded that that was of course a possibility, but stated that Buckeye is well aware of their responsibility regarding energy efficiency. The biggest problem would be likely to be related to cost around site engineering, he noted. A five percent leeway one way or the other is typical, he said.

Cundiff asked Lowenstein to explain the relationship between Buckeye and Home, Inc. more thoroughly.

Lowenstein explained that Buckeye has been chosen by Home, Inc as their primary development partner. They will serve as the intermediary between Buckeye and the community.
In order to make the venture profitable, said Lowenstein, Buckeye needs to find for-profit investors who need the tax credits provided through the federal initiative. These partners then own the bulk of the venture, while Buckeye and Home, Inc. manage the operations of the facility through RLJ Management. After 15 years, those investors leave the transaction, changing the structure. Buckeye would be prepared to offer Home, Inc the ability to control the structure at that point, said Lowenstein.

Bebko MOVED TO OPEN THE FLOOR FOR A PUBLIC HEARING on the ISSUE OF OVERLAY ZONING OF THE BARR PROPERTY. Struewing SECONDED the Motion. The Motion PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Citizen Brad Myers spoke vehemently against the project, stating that the density is exorbitant, and the site plan is inadequate, and tantamount to a naked PUD request. He opined that the way “affordable” is defined would allow “someone with a million dollars in savings” to reside in the housing unit.

Pat Murphy, Research Director for Community Solutions, member of Energy Board, and a former custom home builder. Murphy recalled many discussions regarding drainage with the Friends Care project, and worried that the enormity of the issue might not be immediately apparent to Buckeye. Murphy went on to state his concern regarding the energy aspect of the project. He noted that multiple energy rating groups have called for conservation rates well above that referenced by Lowenstein, which would be about 15%, he estimated.

Murphy noted that without the final building plan, it is impossible to accurately determine where the structure will fall in terms of conservation.

Murphy commented that many builders, such as Habitat for Humanity, are increasing their energy efficiency with the awareness that the reduction in these costs will contribute to the overall affordability of the project. Murphy closed by stating his support for the project on that site, but his deep concern at the potential lost opportunity. He advocated assigning the Energy Board to oversee that aspect of the project.

Linda Radowsky, who works with affordable housing in Champaign County, and is a local resident, urged Planning Commission to support the project so that funding can be obtained, and to require the details at a later date so that the project can move forward. She noted that this is the way federal funding works, and not doing so eliminates future options. Radowski urged the Commission to support the project, and stated that there are many people in the Village who have few resources and would love to be able to remain in town as senior citizens, but who will not be able to do so if too many requirements kill the project.

Jean Payne asked for clarification regarding the square footage of the apartments, and was informed that the balcony is not calculated into the total. Cundiff informed Payne that a site engineer would need to reconfirm that there is 25% green space. Payne expressed concern about the project disrupting traffic flow downtown.

Villager Carmen Milano commented that this location affords a unique opportunity to allow seniors a quality of life unusual in senior housing. She asked that Planning Commission consider the needs of an aging population of limited resources who would love to remain in town as senior citizens.

Andree Bognar spoke in strong support of the project, stating that she hopes to move into the facility one day.
Mark Babb, a near neighbor and a board member of Home, Inc spoke in support of the project. It would be great to continue to have a beautiful open space across from me, he said, but this is a tremendous use of the property. The plan details are important, he said, but it would be easy to get bogged down, and he urged the Commission to “keep moving forward.”

Resident Richard Zopf commented that he sees affordable senior housing as important to a segment of Village residents. “When we were working to find local space for a business to move in to, did we insist that the Antioch Company upgrade their building to the highest efficiency standards? We have to think about when to apply standards.” Zopf commented that this is a good place to bring up issues important to the Village, but that where and when to apply stricter standards is a judgment call. Zopf encouraged cooperation with Buckeye and Home, Inc.

Cundiff noted that the application for increased density opens the door for negotiation around issues such as green space and energy efficiency.

Askeland stated that it is unfair to hold one project to higher standards in one particular area. Askeland commented that putting 37 units in one building would in and of itself create vastly more energy savings than 37 separate housing units.

Joan Ackerman, the neighbor immediately to the east of the property in question, spoke at length regarding what she believes will be a “stunning” violation of the sanctity of her home. She objected most strongly to the un-challenged removal of the “old growth boundary” which would ensure her quality of life.

Pat Murphy spoke as a long-term member of the Energy Board. There are few ways we have to demand greater efficiency, he stated, and one of the few is new development. If we’re not concerned about energy, he asserted, I see no reason to have an Energy Board.

Jackie Clark, who lives in the neighborhood in question, asked why the density level needed to be 37. Could it be 10? How is that determined?

Reed called for a motion to close the public hearing. Struewing MOVED and Askeland SECONDED a MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. The MOTION PASSED 5-0.

Lowenstein addressed Meyers’ statement regarding income eligibility, stating that the maximum income level for this year for Greene County is $30,000 for a two person family, so persons on fixed income from assets and social security could have in the neighborhood of $100,000 in savings. Citizens with a quarter of a million dollars or more in savings, Lowenstein observed, are simply unlikely to want to live in an affordable housing unit, and are more likely to look for a condominium option.

Regarding energy efficiency, Lowenstein stated, we are “just getting started”. He agreed that the Enterprise Green standard which must be met is a moderate degree of efficiency. Lowenstein said that Buckeye would soon hold a focus session soliciting community input on the matter, and noted that this is just a start. “We will try to do better than the minimum,” Lowenstein said.

Regarding the unit density concern, Lowenstein pointed out that obtaining funding is difficult, and stated that “this is a one-time opportunity with a site like this to meet the housing needs of lower income seniors.” As the density drops, the structure becomes more expensive to operate, Lowenstein explained—you rarely see developments of under 32 units for this reason.

Lowenstein stated that he appreciated the remarks made by Ackerman with regard to feeling overwhelmed at the prospect of this development being built next to her property, but pointed out that it
“will only be two stories”. Keeping the structure roughly to the same scale as the surrounding homes was a goal, he said—we are trying not to go to three stories. He went on to say that he is trying to preserve as many trees as possible, trying to achieve the most reasonable balance possible.

Tobey observed that the group now needs to stipulate conditions.

Askeland noted two separate issues—one the issue of accepting the level of density for a project that may need to evolve from the submitted plans, and the second being the process the applicant is to be held to if Planning Commission does agree to conditional approval of the increase in density.

Struewing wondered how the Commission could grant approval with things “as incomplete as they are.”

Askeland noted that option makes the applicant go through preliminary plan approval twice.

Reed agreed, and suggested that the group could approve density, with the awareness that all other aspects of the project are contingent upon preliminary plan approval.

Reed noted that Ackerman should be included in some of the negotiations as those evolve.

Bebko asked whether, if Planning Commission recommend to Council approval of a PUD-R for density only, would that be sufficient?

Schwab weighed in on the question, and suggested careful wording of the motion to Council. This wording bounced back and forth several times. Cundiff noted that Council’s public hearing must be advertised 30 days before hand, and that they will need to approve the holding of that hearing at their next meeting, which leaves September 19th as the earliest possible date.

In answer to a question from Struewing, Schwab crafted some statements which could be used in forming a motion.

Following input back and forth, it was determined that the proposal should be for an overlay zone, which is by nature specific to a project, and which is removed from consideration if the project for which it is approved does not move forward.

Planning Commission, Schwab and the Clerk read back and forth the language until they arrived at a final statement.

Struewing then MOVED to approve PUD-R zoning for the property at 321 Xenia Ave. for the proposed use and density only, up to 37 units, all other outstanding items required in the PUD chapter or otherwise requested by Planning Commission will be reviewed in a separate preliminary plan review process. Planning Commission recommends to Council a modified review process requiring the preliminary plan review to be presented once project financing is obtained. This amended process is at the request of the applicant, and approval of this motion in no way guarantees approval of the applicant’s preliminary plan. Bebko SECONDED the MOTION. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Bebko stated that his decision was difficult. This piece of property is essentially the gateway into the Village, he noted. What we are dealing with is an apartment house. Bebko stated his sympathy towards the need for affordable senior housing, but “this location would make a whole lot more sense as a park.” The bottom line, Bebko stated, is that these people have a plan, and I am willing to support the plan, given that they have a one in three chance of success.
AGENDA PLANNING

Parks Master Plan. Tobey is currently working on a spreadsheet listing all park assets, as well as a list of potential volunteers to work on the plan.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, Struewing MOVED and Askeland SECONDED a MOTION to ADJOURN. The MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY at 9:16p.m.

Matt Reed, Chairperson

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.

“Approve PUD-R zoning for the (Add: property at 321 Xenia Ave.--?) proposed use and density and recommend to Council a modified review process requiring the preliminary plan review to be presented once project financing is obtained. This amended process is at the request of the applicant, and approval of this motion in no way guarantees approval of the applicant’s preliminary plan.”
There are several planning-related items that Staff wants to provide an update on to Planning Commission.

**CBE Update** – The Phase II plans are still being reviewed by our engineer and ODOT. The Greene County Commissioners passed a resolution approving the annexation this past Tuesday. Now the Clerk of the County Commission will deliver the petition and all supporting material to the Village Clerk. Unfortunately, the Village Clerk needs to hold on to the petition for 60 days before Council can act on it. During that time, Planning Commission can, however, make a recommendation to Council on the establishment of Village zoning for the property being annexed. Therefore, once the Village approves the annexation by Ordinance and Ordinance becomes effective, Council can consider the adoption of an Ordinance establishing the zoning. Staff continues to meet with representatives of Community Resources to keep everyone up-to-date on the project and we will continue to meet monthly until the project is completed.

**Annual Street Paving** – This work began this week and is expected to continue into next week.

**Zoning Code Update RFQ/RFP** – We originally received 16 responses from consultants who responded to the RFQ. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) pared the list down to five firms:

- Compass Point Planning
- Duaney Plater-Zybeck & Co.
- LSL Planning
- McBride Dale Clarion
- McKenna Associates

One of the finalists, Duaney Plater-Zybeck & Co., withdrew from consideration because they felt the amount of money budgeted for this project, $75,000, was not enough to do the work.

The remaining four finalists submitted RFPs. The TRC met to review these proposals. As a result of this meeting, the TRC has recommended that Village Council interview LSL Planning and McBride Dale Clarion as the finalists for the Zoning Code Update Project. Village Council has set Thursday, September 29th as the date of these interviews. All Planning Commission members are encouraged to attend.
Dear Dan and Members of the Bicycle Enhancement Committee,

Accompanying this letter is a one page description of the Senior Center trike program. Please see below.

We would like the Bicycle Enhancement Committee to be a collaborator in the YSSC Trike Program by offering the following service and support:

a) A member of your committee or other trained person you designate to orient the new trike user in the safe use of the trike and to offer a once-a-year course in trike safety.

b) We would also like to request a letter from the Committee in support of this program as we seek grant funding to purchase the trikes. We hope the letter could say whether you agree to provide the safety programs mentioned above.

I expect to attend the August 10 meeting, 7:30 at the Graham meeting room, to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely yours,
David Scott

Yellow Springs Senior Center Trike Program

This program is a collaboration between YSSC, Yellow Springs Bicycle Enhancement Committee, Village Cyclery and the Yellow Springs Police Department. The purpose of the program is to encourage the use of safe and healthful transportation opportunities for Seniors in Yellow Springs. Funding is being requested for ten Sun EZ-tri trikes. Each trike would be given to a qualified senior who is interested in using a trike to transport themselves and a basket of cargo around town. These low-seat trikes are stable and comfortable. Each trike would be given to a senior, and an appropriate-sized helmet and a bike lock and safety flag would be given with it. The senior would be trained in the use of the trike by a member of the YSBEC. These trikes are appropriate for seniors because of their low profile, stable and comfortable seating, locked-wheels-when-stopped feature, and large rear basket. Each trike would also be supplied with a flag pole and flag to increase the visibility of the trike while in use. The flag would have the logo of the Senior Center, and would say “I support YSSC.” Village Cyclery would donate the fitting and servicing of the trikes and would donate storage for those that are not in use. The program would be administered by YSSC and the trikes would be returned to YSSC at such time that the recipient no longer desires or is capable of using it. The trikes would be given to seniors who meet low or moderate income requirement that would make it difficult for them to purchase a trike on their own. Individuals who do not qualify but want to try out a trike could be given one for a month to help decide if they want to purchase one for themselves.
Yellow Springs Senior Center

**Trike Program Owner Agreement**  Draft 8-10-11

The gift to the new owner of the trike by the Senior Center Trike Program transfers ownership of the trike to the owner.

The owner assumes all liability with regard to the trike. It is recommended that the owner explore homeowner or renter insurance or a rider that covers your liability as owner of the trike.

The Senior Center Trike Program requires that the owner **must** take the orientation program offered by the Bicycle Enhancement Committee, phone no. _____________. Time requirement for this?

The Senior Center strongly recommends that the owner take the Bicycle Safety Enhancement group's safety program once a year.

The trike owner agrees to return the trike to the Senior Center Trike Program when there is no longer a need for the trike, so someone else may have it.

The Village Cyclery, 110 Dayton Street, 767-9330, has agreed to adjust the trike to fit you in your initial phase of using it. And they have agreed to maintain the trike. If you notice a mechanical problem with the trike, please take it to Village Cyclery for no-charge adjustment or repair. If the problem could affect the safety of the trike, please take it in, without riding it, by walking or trucking it.

With your trike you may also expect to receive a donated helmet from the Police Department, a lock, and a tall safety flag-pole on the trike with a flag that says, "I support the Senior Center. It is strongly recommended to use these items for the safety and security of the tricycle. It is also recommended that you wear gloves and knee and elbow protection.

If you are being given this trike for a trial period, the above items also apply.