

Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes

In Council Chambers @ 6:00pm

Tuesday, August 12, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission members present were Susan Stiles, Chair, Stephen Green, Scott Osterholm, Gary Zaremsky and Council Representative Gavin DeVore Leonard. Also present was Meg Leatherman, Planning and Economic Development Coordinator.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

There were no changes made.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of July 15, 2025 Regular Meeting

Stiles MOVED TO APPROVE the Minutes of the July 15, 2025 Regular Planning Commission meeting. Osterholm SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications received.

COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Active Transportation Committee. There was no report provided.

Council. There was no report provided.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

These comments were heard at the end of the meeting due to the citizen's late arrival.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no Public Hearings.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion of Possible Text Amendments to TGL Regulations. Leatherman introduced the topic, noting that Zaremsky and Green had agreed to serve as a subcommittee to gather information from other municipalities and to make recommendations.

Zaremsky offered his findings, noting that the topic of TGL regulation has been much discussed in the community, and a review seemed to be in order. He provided a comparison chart based upon the responses received, stating that several of the communities contacted stated concerns related to noise and/or increased traffic/flow of strangers.

Green noted that the issue of noise and strangers was addressed early on by the requirement that any TGL have an owner or operator living on site.

Stiles commented on the desire to limit the number of TGLs when the regulations were developed.

Stiles noted that TGL operators have noted that they are able to make much more money with TGLs as opposed to long term rentals.

Zaremsky commented that existing regulations achieve the goals intended. He did suggest that the 500 foot distance requirement be applied along street frontage rather than 500 feet from property line to property line.

Responding to a question from Stiles, Zaremsky stated that this method may result in TGLs being closer proximally, but would not result in clustering.

Green asked whether the distance requirement could be eliminated entirely, whether doing so would be more fair.

Stiles stated that she favors the current method, which does allow for a variance process.

Green asserted that the distance requirement seems arbitrary and may not be the most effective way to accomplish the goal.

Zaremsky and Stiles commented in favor of retaining the requirement.

Osterholm commented that he would consider changing the method of measurement as more practical in terms of retaining neighborhood character.

DeVore Leonard stated that he has a TGL on his property. He opined that he believes it is healthy to have regulation, and that he does not have a better solution than what currently exists.

Green stated that the bulk of the TGLs are owner occupied, which means that “the neighbors are still there—neighborhoods are not being lost.” He added that the distance requirement is limiting opportunity for others in the Village, again suggesting that the distance requirement be eliminated. He noted that in the chart provided by Zaremsky, Yellow Springs has the most comprehensive requirements for TGLs among the municipalities listed.

Stiles MOVED TO REQUEST THAT LEATHERMAN BRING A PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE 500 FOOT RULE TO BE MEASURED ALONG ROAD FRONTAGE. Osterholm SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-1, with Green voting against.

Planning Director’s Proposed Text Amendments. Leatherman explained the proposed amendments, noting them as follows, and suggesting that the amendments be brought back in September if PC was in agreement.:

- Add requirement for sewer backflow preventer to Chapter 1048
- Subdivision regulations Chapter 1226 – Remove requirements for paper copies
- Minor Sub & Replat – clarify and add utility review process
- Site Plan Review Chapter 1268- removing requirement for paper copies; remove requirements for unnecessary information
- Definitions Chapter 1284- add definitions for solar, flood administrator, others that are missing

- Add rooftop solar as a permitted use with standards or clarify that it is an accessory use in Chapter 1260.04
- Clarify Attached SFD throughout code, specifically dimensional standards
- Add Traffic Impact Study requirement

Leatherman described each proposed amendment briefly and invited comment from PC.

Leatherman provided some detail regarding adding a trigger for the requirement of a Traffic Impact Study, noting that Greene County's policy could be used as a starting point.

DeVore Leonard asked that the scope of a traffic study be defined, such as whether parking, cycling, etc. would be included. He suggested that the Village either conduct the study or contract for a study, with the cost going to the developer.

Leatherman suggested requiring a Traffic Impact Fee.

Leatherman stated that she would get Traffic Impact information out to PC a little early.

DeVore Leonard described the proposed “after Strategic Planning” code amendments are more involved and policy driven than those presented here. He expressed concern that the Strategic Plan has been delayed and that he does not want to delay addressing code changes that may be needed.

Green noted the complexity of the PUD process, suggesting that it be rewritten for clarification first, and once it is in a clear, comprehensible format, then PC could consider whether changes need to be made.

Stiles stated that PC has only been asked to address the PUD section.

DeVore Leonard asserted that PC should check back in regarding density maximums and growth in December in the event that Council has not yet addressed these issues.

Stiles stated a request that a requirement for 15% affordable housing be added to the PUD section.

DeVore Leonard stated that he would like a clear definition of “affordable”, for example a range of 40%-60% of AMI, and more defined parameters regarding the type and size of the units.

Leatherman stated that she could bring some proposed changes to the PUD section at a later point to start a discussion related to affordable housing.

Leatherman referenced the list of proposed code amendments she had provided, and PC decided not to discuss the more policy-oriented changes at this meeting.

Kathy Adams requested to speak to the issue of Transient Guest Lodging and was given permission to speak.

Adams presented objection to the overall number of TGLs in the Village, asserting that the use of such spaces for tourists rather than as longer-term lodging for residents will change the character of the village. She argued that only residents with enough money to create a TGL can do so. Adams stated that she opposes the proposed change to the 500-foot measurement.

AGENDA PLANNING

Proposed text amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:11pm, Stiles MOVED and Osterholm SECONDED a MOTION TO ADJOURN. The MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Susan Stiles, 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.