



MINUTES

**PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2017 6:00 PM**

**PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7232 E. MAIN ST, REYNOLDSBURG, OH 43068**

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, Welday, King
ABSENT:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. McKenzie: Before we begin the long list here, I just want to remind you that the March minutes have not been signed yet because I have never received the updated, corrected copy of that. That was the one that we approved pending the clear statements of the provisions of the minutes that we've done and I have not seen that copy. So, that was, so if you look at the April minutes it should have all the items on there that we wanted to have updated, but those have still not come my way yet.

Mr. Snowden: Dr. McKenzie, which month are you referring to?

Dr. McKenzie: We're talking about March of 2017.

Mr. Snowden: So, I need to provide you a copy in order for you to sign?

Dr. McKenzie: So we approved it that night with the stipulation that several motions would, that we had to modify, in our, several items that we modified in our motions would be made clear in the text and that's the part that hasn't been done yet.

Mr. Snowden: I will have...

Dr. McKenzie: But it should be in the April minutes including, they were all for Mr. Welday's motions that night, so those are all part of the April minutes.

Mr. Snowden: Details that were listed in the April minutes need to be incorporated into the March minutes that were approved as amended and then that copy needs to be signed.

Dr. McKenzie: Right.

Mr. Snowden: Ok.

Dr. McKenzie: Ok.

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – June 1, 2017

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

2. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – September 7, 2017

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

3. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – October 5, 2017

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Dr. McKenzie.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

Shanette Strickland: 651 Mirandy. It's a pleasure to be in front of you today. Just to give you a little history, I am thinking about running for City Council in 2019 and I find it very important right to start going through the charter amendments. I've been going through them recently. I'm looking tonight to just get a better understanding on a couple amendments that's going to be on the November 7 ballot and I'm hoping that someone will be able to give me some information. I took a couple of notes here. The first one is the City Council will decide how many votes will be required to over-turn a decision by the commission and also City Council will also decide how many votes are needed for commission to decide anything. I am aware of the current requirements and I find that those requirements are acceptable today. Currently, the commission needs a minimum of the majority. Three votes to make decisions on its own and City Council, if need be, have to go to City Council, there is a minimum of six votes are required if it needs to go over-turn to commission if a decision needs to be over-turned, a commission decision. My question is why do we need the new language that needs to be updated for the charter amended. Why do the language need to be changed? So, I'm hoping someone can give me some information and I'm hoping that we can have some, I'm not trying to take a lot of anyone's time, but again, I'm trying to make sure that I'm preparing myself, right, for that 2019 race and I want to make sure that starting now that I'm going through these amendments and I was just kind of concerned that to me the requirements as it is written today seems acceptable and why are we starting to change the language of the amendments.

Dr. McKenzie: Thank you. I don't know if I can really give you a rationale, but Mr. King was a member of the charter review commission. Could you possibly share some of the rationale or anything?

Mr. King: I don't remember and I don't have my notes with me.

Mr. Snowden: I can provide a little bit of information as I was involved with drafting the amendments I believe you're referring to and I think that you're referring to two kind of separate although related issues. I'd be happy to set up an additional time to go over what's in there, kind of explain it. In fact, Dan maybe while I do this, would you mind just grabbing one of my business cards and give it to Ms. Strickland before she leaves in case she doesn't want to sit

through the entire meeting. The answer to your question is I'm not exactly sure what you have in front of you. The section for zoning measures, which I believe is four something. I can't remember it off the top of my head. That section, there's a lot of information in there that really needs to be appearing in the code, not in the charter, but the requirement that a 2/3 majority of the City Council is required to approve a different requirement for a zoning district change then the Planning Commission approve will remain. The idea behind that is that a Planning Commission is a neutral body that can provide the technical advice to City Council, which is more of a political body. That's the concept generally with Planning Commissions and City Councils. The 2/3rds requirement is remaining in the revised Article 4, 7, or 411, I can't, 411 seems to come to mind, that would remain. I hope that answers part of your question. I'd be happy to go over more in detail.

Shanette Strickland: If the number of votes are somehow, I want to say like wrong or, is it possible, I guess, the new numbers could be stated in the charter instead of maybe decided by Council, I guess. Because for some reason if Council alone has that discretion to possibly, you know, had that voting requirement. I can just see that somehow we can run into some issues and that's why I just want to make sure that I'm calling that out and again I'm just making sure that I'm coming in front of the body here today because I am trying to get more familiar with these amendments and again I just wanted to make sure that I bring this to the attention and I wanted to make sure that my voice is being heard.

Mr. Snowden: Ms. Strickland, I'll provide you a copy. I'm putting up on the screen, this is the item that was actually sent from the charter review commission to the City Council and if you look under, this was charter amendment to Section 4.11 zoning measures of the city charter. If you look under voting requirements, the following requirements shall apply to ordinances amending, revising, changing or appealing provisions of the planning and zoning code or zoning districts. An affirmative vote of at least 3/4 of the members of City Council shall be necessary to pass a zoning ordinance which differs from the written recommendation of the Planning Commission. That's the exact same requirement that's in the section today. That's absolutely not changing.

Shanette Strickland: I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Snowden: Let's set up a time to go over it. I'd be happy to speak with you anytime.

Shanette Strickland: Ok.

Mr. Snowden: My cards are right inside there. I think if you'll walk out with Director Havener here. He'll hand you one. Call me or shoot me an email and we'll set up a time for us to get together and just go over it because the other two, especially the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals doesn't really apply to this group, but I'll be happy to go over with you what my thoughts were generally I'll give you the report that the charter commission generally they agreed with me although they did not agree with everything. Hopefully that will answer a few of your questions.

C. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. 6900 E Main Street; Application #180598; Truro Township Fire Station; Applicant: Mark Larrimer; Major Site Plan

Mr. Snowden:

6900 E. Main Street - New Fire Station - Major Site Plan

Location: Property is located on the north side of E. Main Street between Briarcliff Road and Rosehill Road.
Existing Zoning: S-1 Special District
Request: Request for review and approval of a major site plan.
Current Use: Fire Station (Public Use)
Applicant: Jason Nicodemus

The applicant is requesting the Commission review and approve a major site plan, in order to construct a fire station/administration building and related improvements.

The site is developed with an existing fire station that was previously a commercial building. To the north, the property borders multi-family dwellings in the AR-2 district. To the east, west, and south, the property abuts various commercial businesses and restaurants in the CC and CS zoning districts. E. Main Street is designated as a major arterial street by the Thoroughfare Plan and all commercial properties that front E. Main Street are within the Community Commercial Overlay District.

The existing fire station on E. Main Street has reached the end of its lifespan and needs to be replaced from the ground up. Until September of this year, the site had a legacy commercial zoning district. In order to simplify the site plan approval process, Staff worked with the Township's Administration to rezone the property to S-1 Special District. This removed many of the design requirements for commercial structures, specifically those of the Community Commercial Overlay District, which streamlines the approval process. The Township's Administration and their design team worked with Staff to provide as much compliance with the Zoning Code as was possible, and secured variances from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals from the district's rear setback requirements, and some landscape regulations.

The applicant is proposing a two story building, with two driveway approaches connecting to E. Main Street. Access to the staff and visitor parking areas will be from the eastern curb cut and access for the fire vehicles leaving the station will be from the western driveway approach. This will be the opposite of the current configuration, but provides more distance between the signalized intersection at Briarcliff Road and the point that fire vehicles will exit the site to E. Main Street.

The applicant has submitted elevations indicating the proposed building design, materials and general location of signage. There are no specific material requirements for the S-1 District, but the proposed natural materials are consistent with other buildings in the Community Commercial Overlay District. The central tower is consistent with traditional architecture of fire stations and similar public facilities. The applicant is proposing natural brick on the front

elevation of the building and siding with brick accents on the side and rear elevations. The brick veneer and cement board siding are significantly more beautiful and durable materials than the existing painted block used in the current building.

The applicant has not proposed any signage with this application. A certificate of appropriateness will be required prior to permit issuance for ground signage.

The applicant submitted a photo-metric plan that indicates compliance with Chapter 1182. The proposed LED fixture are full cut-off and will be a significant improvement in aesthetic and lighting quality over the existing bullhorn style and wall-mounted security lights at the site. The applicant should clarify the color of the lighting fixtures because that was not indicated on the plan. Staff's only concern is that the colors be consistent with the architectural details of the rest of the building.

The applicant has provided a landscape plan that meets the general requirements of Chapter 1180. Variances were secured from the BZBA from some perimeter screening requirements of Chapter 1180. This was required to fit the building on the existing site. The applicant was also approved for variances from the street tree requirements, to maintain the existing vehicle site-lines. The applicant worked with Staff to add landscaped islands to the parking area, maintain an existing mature tree, screen the existing transformer, and screen the new generator and service area at the rear with landscaping. The applicant's site plan indicates that the existing 6FT wood privacy fence along the north side of the site will remain. Staff found it to be in good condition, and it screens the site from the senior housing complex to the north. Staff likes that the applicant is reusing the current flag pole and has designed a landscape lawn in front of the building that can be used for special events. There is room in this area for additional memorials, benches, etc., that might typically accompany a fire station/public building. This will soften the structure when compared to the current site configuration.

The applicant has proposed a masonry trash enclosure to be located at the rear of the site. The proposed enclosure area includes a concrete pad, which will be more durable than asphalt during tipping operations. The current dumpster is unscreened, so this will be a significant improvement to the site.

Given the current use of the site, no traffic study was required. There are no specific parking requirements for this use in Chapter 1179 of the Zoning Code. The applicant is proposing 31 parking spaces compared to the current 41 parking spaces. Given that current daytime usage is less than half of the provided spaces, Staff has no reason to believe this will be inadequate.

The area is already well served by the public sidewalks along the north side of E. Main Street. The applicant has provided a direct pedestrian path from the public ROW to the visitors entrance at the front of the building and from the main parking lots to the side and rear doors.

The applicant has provided a facilities demand worksheet which indicates their demand for City water and sewer services and indicated on their site plan where they will tap into

utilities. This information has been distributed to the Water/Wastewater Division and City Engineer for review. The proposed site plan reduces the overall amount of impervious surface on the site. The applicant proposes underground storm water catch basins to accommodate all storm water. The City Engineer will be required to review the proposed storm water plan and determine if the facilities are adequate per the Storm water Manual of the City.

The Commission should apply the standards for review of major site plans contained in Section 1143.05 of the Zoning Code and determine if the site plan as proposed complies with those standards. Staff's position is that the applicant has met those standards, recommends the Board approve the application for major site plan approval as submitted.

Dr. McKenzie: Would you be able to put 1143.05 on the screen, so I can look through the requirements?

Mr. Snowden: Sure, it's listed for you on page 2 of the Staff Report. Yes, I'll be happy to put it on the screen.

Dr. McKenzie: I see it. Thank you. Actually, really what I want to look at is the standards for, maybe, I don't know, perhaps the design review in 1103.12.

Mr. Snowden: Absolutely, I can put those up.

Dr. McKenzie: I'm really just trying to get a list of the things that we were being told were met in the designs.

Mr. Snowden: And by the way, just for the record, I actually hate how this section is written, but this is what we have at the time.

Dr. McKenzie: Well, this is what I was interested in. Thank you.

Mr. Snowden: You're welcome. This is less a set of standards and more a set of things that the board is just supposed to look at. It really actually needs to be re-written, but unfortunately this is all we have at the moment.

Dr. McKenzie: And that's why I was asking for it to come up because I was really at, not quite sure what we were supposed to be looking at when we did our stuff. We had your recommendations which refer to this.

Mr. Snowden: Until section 1143, whatever it is, was enacted by you guys and City Council a year ago there were no standards for site plan review. It was really unclear what you guys and BZBA before you were really supposed to be approving when they reviewed a major site plan.

Dr. McKenzie: And of course, before that, we weren't doing site plan reviews. It was not the Planning Commission.

Mr. Welday: The generator that they have planned for that site is that going to be diesel or is that going to be propane generators?

Mr. Snowden: They will have to answer that. The requirements per the zoning code are not going to change based on it, but that's a really good question. You guys, are you able to answer that?

Dr. McKenzie: This is the time, I think, when if you would like to address it you could. So, if you'd like to have any presentation of your own to make or simply answer Mr. Welday's and anyone else's questions this would be a good time for it.

Jay Boone w/Moody & Nolan Architects: 300 Spruce St, Columbus. Thank you for having us. The generator is going to be a diesel with a belly tank capable of handling the entire building under emergency status.

Mr. Welday: Is that shown where that tank is going to go?

Jay Boone: Yes, it's in the back. It's on the north side. There's kind of an area with compressors. The air conditioner compressors, the transformer, and the generator.

Mr. Welday: I see the generator, but the tank itself?

Jay Boone: The tank is a belly tank underneath the generator.

Mr. Snowden: If I could just follow up to Mr. Welday's question. The fact that they're using that crushed stone material and they have access there through the fence is important. That way the area around the generator is not going to get torn up as it needs to be re-fueled. So, that's a good site design choice because those belly tanks, if it's a diesel belly tank, it will have to be re-filled. That's a good design choice with the crushed stone that they're indicating and giving themselves access with the fence.

Dr. McKenzie: Access with the fence. Which fence are we referring to?

Jay Boone: There's a 6 foot high chain link fence around that entire utility area with gates that face the apparatus bay face west. A pair of 6 foot gates.

Mr. Snowden: And then outside of that they have landscaping to screen that as well because that's required by the code.

Mr. Cullinan: Just looking at the dumpster enclosure, there's no *inaudible in the sanitary easement. Is that acceptable?

Jay Boone: I'm sorry, it's what?

Mr. Cullinan: The dumpster enclosure in the southwest corner. It looks like that's in the

sanitary easement and on top of the main.

Jay Boone: That's on the northwest corner.

Mr. Cullinan: I'm sorry, northwest.

Jay Boone: Yes it is.

Mr. Cullinan: I just wanted to make sure that was ok with the City.

Mr. Snowden: I'll have to ask engineering when the time comes. They received notification and the service department received notification and nobody got back to me. Their current dumpster is stored over the sanitary easement. There's no other enclosure. That's something pretty minor that if it needed to move a couple feet, probably wouldn't be a big deal.

Mr. Cullinan: I was just more pointing out that I saw it. Not a hold up.

Mr. Snowden: I can follow up with engineering about that and remind them that they will need to make a decision about that. It will probably depend upon the age and whether they think...

Mr. Cullinan: I know that some cities will do waivers or something where it's the private entities responsibility.

Mr. Snowden: We can do that. I will follow up with engineering and make sure that's on their radar. Clearly, you've gotten that brought up before in one of your meetings.

Mr. Cullinan: City of Westerville.

Dr. McKenzie: Mr. Boone, was there any presentation that you'd care to make separate from what Mr. Snowden said?

Jay Boone: I don't believe so. I would like to just comment on Mr. Snowden's lighting question. Yes, we anticipate that the wall packs on the building, as well as the light poles that light the entire site will be either black or bronze and keeping with the architecture.

Dr. McKenzie: I can see people looking through documents. Just giving them time.

Mr. Comeaux: My apology, I'm probably the least adept of all of these fellows of reading these things. Can you give me the sense of the footprint of this? Would it be significantly larger than the existing footprint or will it be about the same?

Jay Boone: The footprint itself is going to be about the same of probably a little bit smaller. The advantage that we're going with here is that we've got a second floor for all the firefighter's personal activities, as in sleeping, dining, day room, some offices up there. The first floor footprint is in the 10,000 square foot range. The second floor and mezzanine are

about 6,000, so it's 16,000 plus or minus total square feet. It's really going to be about the same.

Mr. Comeaux: So the profile of it, like right now, it's basically a one story?

Jay Boone: It is a one story, yes.

Mr. Comeaux: Unrelated to approval, are you going to just raise it or tear it down totally?

Jay Boone: Totally taking it down. I believe January 5th, in that ballpark, there's some abatement that needs to be done and then it's going to be raised and hopefully start construction around the middle of February.

Mr. Snowden: Just to follow up from Mr. Comeaux. I visited the site 3 weeks ago as part of the prep to all this. I had a tour from Township Administrator Nicodemus and the inside condition is not good. Not by any fault of the township. It's just worn out. It was never designed to be a fire station. I believe it was like a five and dime store or a hardware store.

Dr. McKenzie: It was a J-Mart.

Mr. Snowden: I don't even know the brand.

Dr. McKenzie: That store brand is gone.

Mr. Snowden: There's really nothing that's salvageable in term of the interior.

Mr. Welday: Eric, since you took the tour, is there going to be office space? I haven't been inside that facility. Are they adding office space?

Mr. Snowden: Nothing significant. It's kind of more incidental. I think some of the firefighter areas are poorly configured, especially the fitness area because the firefighters are taking their personal fitness much more seriously than maybe they did in 1975 when they started to layout that building. Some of the personal areas are larger. If you look at the building layout there's a much larger climate controlled storage area and some of other things that are required for the turnout equipment and so forth, but in terms of the offices it's about the same. Their administrative staff is very small. There's a room for a trustee meeting. There's a training area. There's a couple of offices, road superintendent administrator, fiscal officer, and fellows that's about it. Really, it's the personal areas for the firefighters. They're using space more efficiently, especially with the 2nd story compared to what's there now. When I was in it, you have rooms that have been repurposed. The fire department when they purchased that building was a volunteer fire department; whereas now it's full time, so the crews are staying there. There was no facilities for women back in 1975, so that had to be added. There just using space more efficiently. The building footprint isn't really growing that much, but they're using the height and space more efficiently on the site. That's why they have room for the landscaped areas vs more pavement.

Dr. McKenzie: Just to clarify, Mr. Boone, so currently the administrative offices are in the building along the west wall?

Jay Boone: That's correct.

Dr. McKenzie: There's not very many of them, but the offices are there and the offices are going to remain part of this building?

Jay Boone: Yes, there's 2 offices, a fiscal and a roads supervisor, I believe, plus shared amenities spaces.

Dr. McKenzie: I did have a question about height. I, like Mr. Comeaux, was not good enough to find an estimation of height of the building roof line on the plans. It seems in the drawings to be a rather tall 2 story building. Do you have an idea of how tall the roof line is?

Jay Boone: The tower itself, which is out the most forward portion of the building, the tower, which is not occupied space, I believe the peak of that is 44 feet. The peak of the main building is probably 4 feet less than that, so in the 40 foot range.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, the maximum height in the S-1 Zoning District is 45 feet, so they're within the max height for the zoning district.

Dr. McKenzie: Thank you. Also, you said you've been to the BZBA to get relief from the rear setback and so what is the rear setback?

Jay Boone: Do you want the actual setback or the stated setback that we varied from?

Dr. McKenzie: Both would be great.

Jay Boone: We are at 50 foot setback and the stated setback was 60.

Mr. Snowden: Mark, I know you guys can't see, but I'm putting on the screen in front of you the statement of hardship that was provided to BZBA.

Dr. McKenzie: Where it says rear yard requirement varied from 50 to 60 feet this is based on building setback from Main Street or space between the building and the property line to the north?

Mr. Snowden: The building and the property line to the north. The code required 60 in the S-1 District and they went to 50.

Unknown: Is that about where you're at now?

Mr. Snowden: No, they're at like less than 20 right now.

Unknown: So, it's improving the buffer?

Mr. Snowden: Correct. It just didn't meet the... If they had been keeping it, at least 60% of the building, it would have been considered improving a non-conformance situation. Since they are, what they say, scraping the site and starting over, it has to meet the new code requirements, but it overall the situation in terms of zoning compliance is improving significantly.

Jay Boone: Just for your information, we pushed the building back a little bit further; so that they could park the trucks out front, as well as when they are coming out of the apparatus bays they have a little bit better visibility up and down Main Street.

Dr. McKenzie: So, the depth of this building is considerably less than the existing building.

Jay Boone: I would say it's less than the existing, yes.

Dr. McKenzie: If you have more space out front and you have more space in back *inaudible building in between. Trying to follow along here. This is not our *inaudible. It's been proposed that we would also start doing, that this commission would also start handling design reviews as well and so I was thinking of that. The height of the building is considerably taller than it is now and it seemed to me that it would be possibly for 5 months out of the year, during the winter months, permanently shading the balconies of the senior apartments that are directly behind the building and also in contrast to the fire station at 162 which I had heard people talking about, is this being equivalent to, it seems like the east facing wall and really to some extent the south facing wall as well are much more *inaudible structures. More like a fortress rather than a fire house per se and so that's just something that had caught my eye on that. Because I also did a site visit, but then I know that area. Trying to visualize this building from the drawings and it does seem like it's going to be a much more in your face type of building as it appears in the drawings here. So, anyway, but we aren't considering that yet, so.

Mr. Comeaux: Motion to approve this proposal with the only additional caveat being the color of lights you specified, in bronze or black.

Mr. King: Seconded.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Jim Comeaux
SECONDER:	Ivan King
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, Welday, King

D. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. McKenzie adjourned at 6:39 pm.

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator