

Minutes

CEDA Regional Planning Commission

Regular Meeting
Thursday, January 8, 2026 ~ 3 pm

Springview Government Center
3130 E. National Road
Springfield, Ohio 45502

Ms. Theresa Hartley, Chairperson of the CEDA Regional Planning Commission, called the meeting to order at 3:01 PM and asked for Roll Call.

Present for Roll Call: Ms. Theresa Hartley, Mr. Greg Rogers, Mr. Tim Sheerin, Mr. Lorin Wear, Mrs. Katy Ryan Schilke, Mr. Bob Mako

Absent for Roll Call: Mr. Sunny Dhingra

Also in Attendance: Mrs. Stephanie Dunlap and Ms. Rachel Ward of Clark County Community and Economic Development.

Mrs. Katy Ryan Schilke, the new Commission member, was introduced.

The election of the vice chairperson began. Mr. Greg Rogers was the vice chairperson the year before and would be interested in serving again. Chairperson Hartley asked for any discussion or motion.

Nomination of Greg Rogers as Vice Chairperson for 2026

Motion by Mr. Mako, seconded by Mr. Wear to **elect** Greg Rogers as Vice Chairperson

VOTE: **Yes:** Mr. Mako, Mr. Wear, Ms. Hartley, Mrs. Ryan Schilke, and Mr. Sheerin

No: None

Abstain: Mr. Rogers

Motion Carried

Chairperson Hartley asked if there were any corrections or discussion of the minutes. Mr. Rogers noted that the location at the top right needed to be changed to Springfield City Hall.

Approval of Minutes: November 6, 2025

Motion by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Mako, to **Approve** the minutes with the correction of the location name.

VOTE: **Yes:** Mr. Rogers, Mr. Mako, Ms. Hartley, Mr. Sheerin, and Mr. Wear

No: None

Motion carried.

Ms. Vaidehe Agwan, City of Springfield, approached the podium to present the first case.

Case # 2026-Z-01 ~ Owners: Community Improvement Corporation of Springfield, City of Springfield, and 40 Partners LLC ~ Applicant: 40 Partners LLC ~ Location: 4025 E. National Road; City of Springfield ~ Request: Amend the 2024 Planned Development District for PID #s 3050700011305019; 3050700010201001; 3050700005313002; 3050700004100001; 3050700011403003; 3050700011404001; 3050700011404002; 3050700005000075 and 3050700010200006 in City's Planned Development (S-PD) district for mixed use development

Ms. Agwan introduced the case. She stated the applicant was requesting to amend the 2024 PD Plan and the text for Melody Parks Development. The text was being amended to show the 2025 zoning code district classifications and would apply to all parcels in the development. These parcels included the “18 parcels” and all of the subdivision parcels being built. The original development was made in 2022. An amendment in 2024 added three new parcels to the development. The current request was to increase density and revise text as explained in the analysis attached to the Commission’s packets. The County comprehensive plan described the area as mixed use, high and low intensity. Due to the scale of the project it was decided to submit phased plat maps as the project progresses. To date, there had been approvals of plat maps for Phase one, parts A, B, C, and D, and Estates at Melody Parks Phases one and two. The Sub-areas on the master plan do not indicate subdivision phases. A staff report table showing the changes was shown. Sub-areas 3, 4, 7, and 8 would not have any changes; all other sub-areas would have changes. Staff recommends approval. City planning and zoning states that the amendment are applicable to all lots as shown. Parcel numbers are subject to change as subdivision plats and lot splits are received. The final phases of the project shall match the approved preliminary plats and development standards. Any future plat submittals will have to comply with building and site standards stated in the development document attached with the application. Any amendments or modifications of the established PD district require recommendation from CEDA and the City Commission’s final decision.

Mr. Dhingra arrived at 3:08 PM.

Mr. Mako had several questions. First, he noted that detailed summaries had been requested by the Commission from each department, and that those had not been provided. Ms. Agwan stated that the City had switched to a Google Sheets system among other changes to their permitting system and processes, but summaries had been provided. Mr. Mako said that the summary only said “approved.” Mr. Mako noted that this would be a significant amount of population added with this proposal and asked if the city could meet the needs of that population, as at that moment the City was struggling to meet the current needs. He also noted that the City was relying on the township and the state highway patrol to answer up to 15% of the calls made. The project would be in a remote area away from the city, and Mr. Mako wanted to see the staff reports and see the departments’ reasoning for why they approved it. Mr. Mako added that if he did not see that he did not see how he could approve it, because he had big questions that would be important for the future residents. He also noted that the lack of staff reports could be strategic or oversight but that he did not know which. Ms. Agwan apologized for the lack of reports but said that each department had recommended approval based on all of the factors involved with the development. Mr. Mako said that the commission did not know that and that if it did not get presented it did not exist. He also noted that some of the slides were helpful but were not part of the information the Commission received.

Mr. Mako asked to go back to an earlier map and then asked if the Meadows restaurant was an island due to the development around it. Ms. Agwan said no because it had road frontage.

Mr. Mako stated that there would be 40-foot multi-family housing buildings, and then said that according to City zoning 35 feet was the limit in a residential district, and added that

something had gone wrong. He also noted that all he had was what was in front of him, and that he could not approve something that was a known violation of zoning. He also asked if there would be apartment buildings, patio homes, or town houses in area 8. He also asked what the buildings in area 6 would be. The development had been presented as single-family with some mixed use, but apartments would be a significant change to the original design. He also said that apartments did not fit in with the nature of the area, because it was both residential and rural. He then asked if the density was planned from the beginning or if it had changed during development, and if so why was the change was made. He noted that Ms. Agwan might not be able to answer the questions and asked that the developer answer the questions in that case. He reiterated his concerns, and noted that these were more statements than questions.

Ms. Agwan said that the developers and owners were here but that she could answer some of the questions. First, she said multi-family buildings could be 45 feet tall. Mr. Mako said that it was 45 feet if it was an apartment building in a high-density residential area, and 35 feet everywhere else. He added that this was not a high-density residential area. Ms. Agwan said 45 feet is also allowed. Mr. Mako asked if these were apartments, because townhouses and patio homes can't be that high. He also noted that in the other area, where the patio homes were going, the buildings were proposed at 40 feet but that by the City's zoning they should only be 35 feet. Ms. Agwan then said that any of the sub-uses listed for an area would be the ones permitted. Mr. Mako said that there would have to be a variance, and Ms. Agwan said that for uses there would have to be an amendment, but if there was a dimensional change they could apply for a variance. Mr. Mako said that this was also incomplete information. Ms. Agwan said that there were no density-capping requirements in the zoning code, so the developer was free to choose the density.

The owner/developer's representative Connor Westerheide, of 277 W. Nationwide Boulevard, Suite 150 came to the podium. He said that the zoning for the 40-foot height had been planned for and approved by both CEDA and the City. Also he said that apartments were previously planned for in sub-section 4. He said this would have up to 395 apartments. He also said that patio homes were in section 5 and potentially section 6, and that the building choices were due to parties stating they were interested in a certain type of building. There has been interest in developing a three-story walkup type product. He said that because this was a PUD and not in the middle of nowhere, this was making its own ecosystem where, for example, apartments were needed. Other areas of the country and state have these types of developments. It allows people a place to start and has four or five different product types along the way. There would be a "full life-cycle of ownership" along with the commercial outlots. The intent was not to mass-raise density, but rather to respond to national parties interested in building on the site. Currently there is one site for multi-family and someone has already "spoken" for it. Others are also in the area if they can do a three story walk up apartment style building as opposed to the currently proposed patio homes. If they were to receive approval, the patio homes might still be built. He said that the current plan was more responding to what they were seeing from outside with regards to demand and to provide more options. The leasing demand will show what people want and why they are moving out there. This provides additional options. This was intended to get ahead of deals that were being looked at so the process of approval did not stop them, rather than waiting until

someone was specifically interested and then being delayed by the process and having them move on to the next deal.

Mr. Mako asked if this was in response to outside entities being interested in building larger buildings to market. Mr. Westerheide said yes, and added that the less walls that entities had to build the more efficient buildings would be. Entities that had interest in patio homes had put them to the side for now. Demand was higher for more traditional multi-family housing, so the developer was trying to make options for later and be proactive. Mr. Mako asked if the density increases were due to the outside requests. Mr. Westerheide said yes. The areas where the density was changing was not where the single-family homes are proposed, and was instead in areas where the patio homes were already approved. This would give the option to do a three story apartment if needed. Mr. Mako said that he didn't think it was where the single family homes were and then said that he had thought the entire development was going to be single-family homes. Mr. Westerheide said that this had been the plan from the very beginning and that they had never proposed any single-family without multi-family mixed-use and commercial involved. It has been like this from the start. Mr. Mako asked why the density change if this was the plan from the beginning. Mr. Westerheide said that four years ago, patio homes were moving, but now the markets have changed and now that rent is more efficient for a denser building, they were hearing that builders were not interested without the higher-density buildings. Having the option for three story walk up apartments makes the site more desirable for a larger group of developers. This request is in response to that.

Hearing no further questions, Chairperson Hartley asked for a motion. Mrs. Dunlap explained to the new Board member that all motions are made in the affirmative, so the motion will always be to approve the request and then the yes or no vote was based on that. Mr. Rogers made a motion to recommend approval that was seconded by Mr. Sheerin.

From the audience, Mr. Brian Kuhn asked if there would be public comment. Chairperson Hartley stated there is not because it is a regular meeting. Mrs. Dunlap explained that the Board would make a recommendation to the City and that the City would hold a public hearing. From the audience, Mr. Kuhn asked additional questions that are inaudible on the recording. Chairperson Hartley reiterated that the Board makes a recommendation. Mr. Kuhn questioned the Board if they were missing information or aware of the court order. He said he didn't know if the Board had all the facts. Mr. Rogers and Chairperson Hartley both stated the request goes to the City and there is a public hearing there. This meeting isn't a public hearing so there is not public comment. Another audience member asked when it will go to the City for public hearing. Chairperson Hartley asked Ms. Agwan if there is a date set. Ms. Agwan responded and Chairperson Hartley confirmed it will be next month. She then asked staff to proceed with the vote.

ACTION ON Case # 2026-Z-01 ~ Owners: Community Improvement Corporation of Springfield, City of Springfield, and 40 Partners LLC ~ Applicant: 40 Partners LLC ~ Location: 4025 E. National Road; City of Springfield ~ Request: Amend the 2024 Planned Development District for PID #s 3050700011305019; 3050700010201001; 3050700005313002; 3050700004100001; 3050700011403003; 3050700011404001;

Minutes

CEDA Regional Planning Commission

3050700011404002; 3050700005000075 and 3050700010200006 in City's Planned Development (S-PD) district for mixed use development

Motion by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Sheerin to **recommend approval** of Case # 2026-Z-01/Resolution CEDA-2026-01 as presented.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Rogers, Mr. Sheerin, Mr. Dhingra, and Mr. Wear

No: Mr. Mako and Mrs. Ryan Schilke

Motion carried.

Mr. Rogers asked how long it would be until the City announced the meeting. Ms. Agwan stated that once information is received from CEDA, the packet goes to the City Manager's Office with a draft ordinance. This is all then reviewed. It would be around a month and a half. Mrs. Dunlap added that the notice of decision and the draft minutes would go out sometime next week.

Staff Comments

Mrs. Dunlap stated there would be a meeting on February 5th.

Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Dhingra, seconded by Mr. Rogers to **adjourn**.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:26 PM.

Ms. Theresa Hartley, Chairperson