



MINUTES

**PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 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: I had submitted what I remember as my own contributions to the discussion leading up to when the microphone or recording system was turned on, so you probably haven't seen those yet.

Mr. Snowden: Dr. McKenzie when was that submitted to Stephanie and April.

Dr. McKenzie: Just this afternoon.

Mr. Snowden: Ok well they're not going to be able to approve those since they haven't made the changes yet.

Dr. McKenzie: *inaudible*.. and the July 6th minutes, does anyone have any changes to those minutes?

No response.

Dr. McKenzie: Hearing none those will stand approved. And the August 3rd minutes. Any requests for changes to those?

No response.

Dr. McKenzie: Hearing none those will stand approved.

Mr. Snowden: Dr. McKenzie can you check your microphone are you sure you're online there? There you go.

Dr. McKenzie: Ok.

Mr. Snowden: Ok continue sir.

Dr. McKenzie: Ok, the LED on the President's microphone does not work.

Mr. Snowden: Ok I'll pass that to Joe in maintenance, it's been here since 1986 I'm sure it's past its life.

Dr. McKenzie: Well the LED on the button has not operated on the entire time I've been Chair.

Mr. Snowden: Just let the record reflect that the June minutes were held pending revision to the draft minutes that was submitted yesterday. Stephanie is on vacation this week but she's going to be back next week. Actually she was vacationing in Florida and I've heard she's gotten back safely and July and August minutes were approved.

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

Minutes held

2. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – July 6, 2017

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

3. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – August 3, 2017

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

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the meeting sworn in by Chairman McKenzie.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

C. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. Ordinance Approving the Modification of the Plat of the Oak Valley Subdivision, Section One; Application #179772; Applicant: Dennis and Jennifer Franko;

Application: #179772 - Plat Modification

Location: Property is located on the east side of Oak Valley Drive between E. Main Street and Palmer Road.

Request: Request for review of a plat modification.

Existing Zoning: R-2 Single Family Residence District

Current Use: Vacant Land

Proposed Use: Residential

Applicant: Dennis & Jennifer Franko

The applicant is requesting the Commission review and make a recommendation of approval for the modification of an existing plat.

The 3.29AC site is currently undeveloped. To the east, west, and south, the property is

adjacent to single family dwellings in the R-2, R-3, and R-1 zoning districts, respectively. To the north, the property abuts a cemetery in the S-1 Special District.

The site was originally platted in 1998 for 5 single family lots, and intended as part of a future development which was never completed. The development, as originally envisioned, is no longer practical or feasible. Subsequently, the original developer has sold the lots to home buyers who wish to combine the existing platted lots into two build able lots and remove the unneeded public ROW.

The applicant has provided a new plat map, which was circulated for review by the City Engineer and other representatives of the Department of Public Service prior to application for Commission review. The City Engineer suggested several changes which were incorporated into the map exhibit presented, including notes, titles, and other details. In order to satisfy the requirements for multiple owners, the applicant provided written consent to proceed with this application from the owner of the three lots that will become the proposed lot 2A, and the owner of the parcels that abut the plat to the east.

There are city water and sewer services available in the area, but no portion of the improvements required by Chapter 1123 of the Subdivision Regulations have been constructed for this plat. The normal policy is to require lot or parcel owners to extend water and sewer across their lot. The removal of the existing public ROW between proposed parcels 1A and 2A removes the need for this requirement. In order to make clear the obligations of the City to any future owners of the parcels to the east of this plat, the City Engineer recommended note #3 of Sheet #2 of the plat map exhibit. This note clarifies the responsibilities of the City and any future owners who wish to extend public water and sewer subject to City review. This information will be filed with the plat map at the County Recorder's Office. The applicant is already aware that they will be required to a sanitary sewer extension to accommodate the two proposed lots. Fees for water taps will be calculated by the Water/Wastewater Division.

At the request of Department of Public Service, the applicant proposes to vacate the existing public ROW between the two proposed lots, and replace that with a 30FT ingress/egress and utility easement for the parcels to the east. This easement could be used as a private driveway, or upgraded to a private roadway in the future for the use of those parcels. In order to prevent an awkward driveway configuration, the City Engineer requested that the applicant add a note #2 on Sheet #2 of the plat map exhibit, requiring lots 1A and 2A to have driveways directly on to Oak Valley Drive.

The Commission should apply the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations and determine if the applicant has met those regulations. Staff's position is that the provision of the Subdivision Regulations have been met, and recommends the application be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for approval by the Commission.

Dr. McKenzie: Would you please note that Mr. Comeaux arrived at 6:05

Mr. Snowden: Noted.

Mr. Comeaux: Process oriented question, were any notices required to be sent to adjacent land owners and did we hear back from them?

Mr. Snowden: They are not required by the subdivision regulations or by state law for this type of action. Mr. Comeaux to put a finer point on it, my understanding is that neighbors to the south are already aware that some development may be happening here because they've come in and talked to me and of course you have multiple property owners cooperating to get this done, that's why you have the 1A the 2A and the 3A portion. It's a pretty rare situation, if I didn't emphasize this in my report that we haven't done something like this in a very long time.

Dr. McKenzie: Just to let you know, to my knowledge, none of us have received the staff report.

Mr. Snowden: The staff report came out today at 4:00 due to my workload. You should have it on your desk, if you don't I'll bring copies around.

Dr. McKenzie: My desk?

Mr. Snowden: as in right where you're sitting.

Dr. McKenzie: No.

Mr. Snowden: Ok I'll bring copies around as the hearing continues. Mr. Chairman, it might be of interest to ask the applicant or the engineer if they have any additional comments.

Dr. McKenzie: Would anyone on this application like to address the Commission?

Voice on recording inaudible

Dr. McKenzie: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Comeaux: So, if we do nothing, what could developed there. Obviously residential, but what would it be one parcel altogether at that point or?

Mr. Snowden: So the issue here is one of, the underlying issue is that the, what we basically call a paper street is existing there and because of that, in order for the city to consistently enforce its requirements for installing public improvements next to lots that are being developed, the applicants could still build homes and could still build, combine the 2 and 3 lots respectively, but the costs that they are going to incur to have to install that street and subsequent underground utilities that would go with that, are going to be so fantastically expensive that they're not going to be able to do it. That's the reason why the property has not developed. I don't know the whole history of the area, but there is a reason why folks don't normally lop off 5 lots and install the infrastructure. You typically spread those infrastructure costs to a large development. Had that been done initially, its possible we

wouldn't have been in this situation, but the folks who were here at the time and the property owner at the time elected to just do this particular 5 lot section. It is also not possible, and I have folks from the former property owners have commented that extending the street into a cul-de-sac back here and trying to develop build able lots, that the infrastructure costs are too great to be supported given the value of the land. So at that point the only way to reduce that infrastructure cost is remove what is un needed public right of way. If you remove the un needed public right of way, you've reduced the cost and now it makes economic sense to build 2 homes on the lots. The right of way is of no value to the city. A cul de sac is not even great design when it comes to designing and laying out a residential neighborhood but it would have been the only way to get a street back in here.

Dr. McKenzie: And yet despite that we have so many of them here in Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Snowden: Don't get me started.

Mr. Welday: Mr. Snowden, for 3A you said that won't be developed at this time?

Mr. Snowden: So what's going to happen here Mr. Welday is that the Franco's who are here with us tonight, own the property that will become lot 1A, another gentleman named Mr. Cipriano who's here in the audience in the black shirt and glasses owns lots that will be come lot 2A and the lot that is the small piece of right of way that is labeled lot 3A will be given to the gentleman who owns 3 parcels behind them who is the original property owner of the area, his name is Mr. Bates. Mr. Bates was a very long time realtor and developer in the Reynoldsburg area and he's the original one that laid parts of this area and the Leighton Village subdivision out in the first place. Mr. Bates owns the property and he just wasn't able to complete this development my understanding is giving him.. right of way, when you're vacating plat, you have to be careful, like when the city vacates right of way, the city can't give right of way to somebody, right of way has to be vacated down the middle and given to property owners on either side and I think that's what Mr. Long from Hocenden is intending in this case is just to divide that and give it to Mr. Bates since its really not of use to the other two. It would be really awkward if you were trying to attach that to 1A now you'd have a really bizarre looking lot that doesn't make sense.

Dr. McKenzie: I assume the complication of ownership here is why the fee was listed as not applicable.

Mr. Snowden: No, the reason there is no fee listed is because there is no fee listed in our fee schedule for plat modifications despite the fact that it is listed in our subdivision regulations. Dan and I are working with the Mayor at this time to get that corrected because obviously the city having the city engineer looking at these things and my time looking at these things and so forth, the City incurs some cost from that. Obviously I cannot fee for something that is not listed in the code.

Dr. McKenzie: The confusion for me is that it is listed on the application.

Mr. Snowden: Yeah I listed it as non applicable because there simply is no fee for this type

of modification.

Dr. McKenzie: There is a little block down here for instance on this one there is a little block for plat modification.

Mr. Snowden: I added that to actually have a block to check on the applications so I would know what it was that was actually happening in this case. Like I said there is no fee in the table, but there is a process in the code.

Dr. McKenzie: And believe it or not, I have not looked at the fee table very often.

Mr. Snowden: That's ok. I'm probably the only one that ever does so...

Dr. McKenzie: Though I did look at it today.

Mr. Snowden: So I am working with the administration to propose a modified fee table to City Council because if something appears in the code that is incurring cost, that cost needs to be borne by the folks doing the development, but I can't make up a fee for the process that's there.

Dr. McKenzie: I agree, generally we charge fees for a purpose, not just because we want to and while Mr. Snowden feels very powerful there are limits to his exercise of authority.

Mr. Snowden: My power comes from what's delegated to me by City Council.

Dr. McKenzie: That's right, that's basically what I said. He has limits. The reason I'm waiting is I see people going through documents just so you know.

Mr. Comeaux: So are there any additional costs to the city to change, to do this change vs. if they were to come in and say build the road as it's currently..

Mr. Snowden: No, it's less of a cost to the City because if you leave the right of way there, the city is going to end up having to maintain that long term. If it goes away and it becomes you may have one of three things happen in the future. If you have the public right of way there, there is always a city cost. If you remove that the City now doesn't have a maintenance cost you may have one of several things happen. The property that currently belongs to Mr. Bates, if you look at the screen, they have access to the private drive down through here, so it's possible that those 3 parcels would remain in a single ownership and nothing would ever happen on that ingress egress. It's possible that one drive might be installed in here to service this home back here, it's possible that if you had up to 3-4 try to be built back here, they would have to upgrade to a private roadway. There is a limit both in our city code and state law of how many private drives you can have off of one another. I don't find that that's very likely. I think the most likely thing is that some day, whoever owns this property would say it would make a lot more sense if I could just go out to Oak Valley drive rather than down to here and here and so on. So that would be the most likely scenario but if you had a private roadway, it would be something to accommodate a couple of homes back

here, the City Engineer would have to inspect that and there would be other requirements but it's not very likely.

Mr. Comeaux: So the 5 parcels we see here, if we were to approve them, then Mr. Bates' s property could be subdivided? Is that correct? I'm just wondering about the future development that could occur at the tail end of this.

Mr. Snowden: What you're doing here, all you're being asked to decide is whether having 5 lots with a public right of way or having basically 2 lots and a little chunk being tossed over to Mr. Bates because he's adjacent there makes more sense. That's what you're being asked to decide. Mr. Bates does have the option to do additional subdivision assuming they have additional ingress/egress the problem is that Mr. Bates' s property back there is on a septic system. There is a minimum lot area I don't know what it is off the top of my head to do a septic but our city code also prohibits new septic systems within the city limits. So if you can't get water and sewer back to the back of the property, that would be at the developers cost, its not developable. Mr. Bates has owned the property since the 1970s and its only now that he's down to where he's got his last couple of pieces there. I don't think it's likely that a large development would move in behind there.

Mr. Cipriano: inaudible from 25.31 to 26:00

Dr. McKenzie: Thank you. Just for explanation, I don't know what Mr. Comeaux's interest or concerns were from his questions, could you make a statement as to why you were having this question, what your concern might be?

Mr. Comeaux: Just, not, we need to focus on what we're asked to do here but what about the parcels that are not on this plan that might be impacted adjacent to it. I know you're not going to put anything crazy in there that would have to go through a different process, but it's un-platted...

Mr. Snowden: It is not platted that is correct, it has been subdivided through the lot split process many times over the years which is one reason why its in this situation. But Mr. Comeaux, in my professional opinion, I think Mr. Cipriano's statement is accurate, the most that you'd probably ever get here would be 3 homes. Maybe Mr. Bates' s property, the three parcels at the back could have an additional single family home, it's only zoned for single family only, so they would have to re-zone to try to get another use. But development, its all about utilities, if you got em you can do stuff. The back existing home doesn't have them so the home could be re constructed, probably have some small additions but there is going to be a limit and when the septic system goes out they can be required to tie in to our municipal water system, I would have to discuss with our City Attorney and water waste water division guys as to what that would entail but it can be required if it's ordered by the board of health.

Mr. Comeaux: I'm not too concerned that geographically its constrained, you're not going to build to the north because there's the cemetery and slightly to the east there are already houses there and to the south, so it's not like this is a massive amount but I was just curious if there were any next steps. I'm not worried about them putting in a Wal-Mart there, I'm not

suggesting that, I just wanted to see what infrastructure that's going in would support, what it would have to support...

Mr. Snowden: The infrastructure that's going to go in as part of this is ultimately going to accommodate the Franco's house and the house that Mr. Cipriano, what his buyer would propose on the lots labeled 1A and 2A. It doesn't even account for any of the previous parcels and their infrastructure, the rear parcels and that's the reason they proposed to get rid of the right of way. If they do continue to have the right of way, then our engineers continue to enforce the requirements and put in storm water and gutter and all of the things that are going to cause that lot to be impossible to build.

Mr. Comeaux: They can already cut into the curb on Oak Valley right?

Mr. Snowden: They can cut in for water, they can cut in for the drives and our City Engineer and water/waste water guys have made a determination that they are going to need to construct a sanitary sewer. The red represents city sanitary sewer right in front of you. They're going to need to construct a sanitary sewer that is going to go approximately kind of here. The reason is, its all open to our engineer what exactly needs to happens, slopes, etc.. our engineer is going to handle all that. But this is a bulkhead and you cant just have a private lateral go directly into the bulkhead so there's going to be a small amount of what's going to eventually become public infrastructure but its a lot less public infrastructure than would have been required for both sanitary and water to go all the way back here in which case they would have had to gone here, here to here and back along here and back along to the property.

Dr. McKenzie: You stated that someone was going to get the right of way, we're giving the right of way to someone. Who is that?

Mr. Snowden: So all three of the property owners are going to be taking a portion of the platted right of way. Lot 2A and 1A are going to receive the portions that are adjacent to their proposed lots which you can see the ghosting on the plat. The lot labeled 3A is going to go to the lot in the rear that is most adjacent to.

Dr. McKenzie: So you brought up the point that there is septic at the house that Mr. Bates owns now and if it were to fail he would be required to tie in and without the right of way being there, would they now have access to water and sanitary sewer.

Mr. Snowden: Yes because the ingress egress easement is also utility easement. So the right of way instead of having a 60ft right of way, its being replaced with a 30 foot ingress/egress and utility easement for the back property so in the event that a future property owner wanted to put private water and sewer in there, they theoretically could, they may according to our engineer due to the distances, be required to extend the public water and sewer in order to give themselves access but ultimately that's really not our concern. If they want the access then they'll have to provide the infrastructure to do it. But it has a utility easement there.

Dr. McKenzie: You understand, the applicants understand that your lawn might get torn up

by the right of way.

Mr. Snowden: It was the applicant's idea so I think they're good with it.

Dr. McKenzie: Any other questions?

No response.

Dr. McKenzie: Hearing none would anyone like to make a motion.

Mr. Welday: I make a motion that we approve application 179772.

Dr. McKenzie: Ok you're going to move that we forward this to Council with a recommendation they approve it. We have a Motion from Mr. Welday.

Mr. Cullinan: I second.

Dr. McKenzie asked for debate

No response.

Mr. Snowden called the roll.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Welday
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, Welday, King

2. 2365 Taylor Park Drive; Application #179812; Applicant David Keyser; Major Site Plan

Application: #179812 - Major Site Plan

Location: Property is located on the west side of Taylor Park Drive, just south of Taylor Road.

Request: Request for review and approval of a major site plan for new two-building commercial development.

Existing Zoning: CS Community Services District w/ Limited Overlay

Current Use: Retail Sales (accessory parking)

Proposed Use: Speculative Commercial Uses

Applicant: David Keyser/DBK Architecture

The applicant is requesting the Commission review and approve a major site plan, in order to construct a two-building, commercial development and related improvements. The site will be a new outlot within an existing commercial shopping center.

The site of the proposed development is the accessory parking lot to a commercial shopping center. Neighboring uses in that shopping center include retail sales. The east, the property abuts a restaurant (eating and drinking establishment), also in the CS district. To the south, the property abuts a large, two-tenant commercial retail center. To the north, the existing

shopping center abuts a senior living complex in the AR-3 zoning district.

The applicant is proposing two, one-story commercial buildings. The site's existing access to Taylor Park Drive will be maintained. The applicant is proposing to configure the site for drive-thru service. Given that no specific tenant is yet identified, a special exception use permit will be required to begin operation of the drive-thru use in the future. This configuration has the effect of pushing the building further back from Taylor Park Drive, but this is not avoidable given the proposed use.

The applicant has submitted elevations indicating the proposed building design, materials and general location of signage. There are no specific material requirements for the CS district, therefore, the style of design presented by the applicant is appropriate. Generally speaking, previous Commissions and Design Review Board members have asked for natural materials, such as the proposed brick veneer. The applicant is also proposing metal awning and storefront window systems, which are very typical to commercial retail buildings.

The applicant has proposed the general location and type of sign. Staff has no concerns with the proposal, but a comprehensive sign plan approval will be required in the future. This should be done when detailed sign plans are available.

The applicant did not provide a lighting plan for the proposed development. Since the overall site is existing, the requirements of Chapter 1182 can only be applied to the new development. The applicant's site plan does not indicate any site lighting to be removed. Staff would like the applicant to submit a photometric plan indicating any proposed building lighting complies with Chapter 1182.

The applicant has provided a landscape plan that meets the general requirements of Chapter 1180. The site has existing tree and shrub plantings along Taylor Park Drive. The applicant has proposed some foundational plantings along portions of the proposed building facades.

At the request of Staff, the applicant relocated the dumpster enclosure to the west portion of the proposed new buildings. Previously, this was proposed to front Taylor Park Drive. The applicant has provided significant screening plantings along the dumpster area, but it not clear from the plans if the dumpster will be screened with fencing or masonry walls. Staff would also like the applicant to clarify how the dumpster area will be accessed from the proposed service area.

Between the two proposing buildings, the applicant has designed an outdoor seating area. This is a nice amenity, which will be partly shaded by the proposed buildings, and is screened from the adjacent service area. Given that the service area between the buildings will be visible from the main entrance drive, Staff proposes that the landscape buffer adjacent to the east side of the dumpster enclosure area be extended to the east. This will screen the area from traffic where it enters the site.

The applicant has provided a facilities demand worksheet, which indicated that the proposed development met the threshold for a traffic access study. That study is currently under review, but due to the City's main engineering firm's membership on the project team, the City is using another consultant. This has caused a delay in the review, but given the existing

lane controls and stacking space along the exit drives, Staff would not expect significant additional requirements.

The applicant has 270 existing parking spaces, and including the new development, 236 spaces will be required. The applicant's revised site plan, including the proposed new development and the existing shopping center, indicates that 250 parking spaces are proposed. Given the variety of uses the site supports, and the time differential of many possible tenants, Staff's believes the site is adequately parked.

The applicant has provided sidewalks along the north side of the proposed development, which will serve as the main entrance, but has not connected that area to the public sidewalk along Taylor Park Drive. Staff would like this to be considered.

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 applicant has significant stormwater detention basins already on site, which would have accommodated the existing impervious surface. The City Engineer will be required to review the proposed increase in impervious surface area and determine if the existing catch basins are adequate per the Stormwater 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 a certificate of appropriateness on the following condition:

1. That the landscaped bed along the south side of the proposed development shall be extended eastward, in order to screen the designated service area in a manner acceptable to the Planning & Zoning Administrator; and that this revision shall be reflected on the site plan submitted with the application for a zoning certificate;
2. That the applicant shall screen the dumpster with masonry walls and gate that match the building architecture; and that the Planning & Zoning Administrator may order additional changes to the dumpster enclosure area to provide a direct path to the service area of the proposed buildings;
3. That the applicant shall receive final approval of the required traffic access study; and
4. That the applicant shall submit a photo-metric plan, indicating the lighting levels around the immediate area of the proposed development, which shall be reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Administrator for compliance with Chapter 1182.

Dr. McKenzie: Would the applicants or their engineer like to address the commission at this time?

Audience member: No additional statements at this time.

Mr. Comeaux: So the second, you had listed 4 things, additional screenings...

Dr. McKenzie/Mr Snowden: Page 6

Dr. McKenzie: Keep in mind whoever decides to make the motion, they've got a lot to remember fortunately its in the staff report.

Mr. Snowden: I think the commission should inquire with the applicant and just see which of those comments they're open to and they're not open to, if the applicant is not able to respond then the Commission will have to decide what to do at that point.

Mr. Welay: Going back through for them, the applicants, right now you've got the staff and the staff review there is no specific tenant and on the one diagram its Starbucks, is that what you're proposing or planning to have a coffee shop through there for the drive through, am I correct?

Audience member: The owners are targeting a coffee *inaudible

Mr. Welay: They don't have a specific one but they're targeting a coffee drive through? Anything on the second building?

Audience member: No specific *inaudible

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Kiser just for record keeping sake would you introduce yourself and give us your address.

Mr. Kiser: David Kiser, DKB Architects 52 E. Lynn Street, Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Snowden: Thank you sir.

Mr. Comeaux: Mr. Snowden suggested that you all have access to storm water retention pond behind Target, is that accurate as well? Obviously the engineer will have to determine whether you have enough capacity, but if you have access to that I think capacity isn't an issue.

Mr. Peltier: James Peltier, EMH&T 5500 New Albany Rd, Columbus Ohio as far as the basin behind the Target, I'm not familiar how it interacts, its something we'll have to study and work with engineering on.

Mr. Snowden: but there are 2 basins on site.

Mr. Peltier: There are 2 basins just south of the project that we would study to confirm they have capacity.

Mr. Snowden: Stormwater is all about how much impervious surface, so when you have a parking lot your converting that to building, your not really increasing the impervious surface

by that much, am I correct in that summary, Mr. Cullinan you deal with that all of the time.

*Inaudible

Mr. Peltier: We haven't studied pre or post yet, that would come with the plot grade utility.

Mr. Snowden: I always like to comment that they've at least looked at them, the detention basins and they have a game plan. We've had a major site plan come in where they've had no idea what they're going to do in stormwater- that raises some red flags.

Mr. Comeaux: The other question I have, did you say the City would hire someone to look at the traffic? The only thing I would say is with the fire station back there the traffic pattern has to be contemplated in different ways.

Mr. Snowden: The applicant qualified for a traffic access study so what that generally looks at the immediate periphery where private drives go into private right of ways, how much stacking space, are their lane controls.. it usually doesn't look at a... maybe if there would be some small public infrastructure that would help such as a turn lane on a 2 lane country road, it generally not for super intense uses but in this case I'm sure that's something they would have taken into consideration. The issue was that EMH&T is our engineer so when they're on a project team, we have to go with a back up engineer without getting into the inside baseball, I didn't catch that it was EMH&T until the person that was assisting me had already opened the PO with EMH&T which we then had to close and get open with our back up firm which is called CT Consultants and CT is reviewing at this time and I've talked with Mr. Parkinson and he didn't have any additional comments but he said they're not done yet just due to their workload so I would think we'll have a response back within the next couple of weeks. It usually takes a good 3-4 weeks.

Mr. Peltier: We studied the intersection of Taylor Parkway Dr and post development the level of services is A or B and that's great for a drive through so we should be in good shape.

Mr. Comeaux: I think in general its great the only thing I don't know is if we need special accommodations for the Fire Department as far as ingress and egress. One final question. There were 4 suggestions that Mr. Snowden was making to us, can you speak to whether or not you can commit to them or can't commit or what. The first was landscape bed along the bed of the south side of the development should be extended eastward in order to screen the designated service area in a manner acceptable.

Mr. Kiser: Agreed

Mr. Comeaux: the second screening the dumpster area with masonry walls and a gate.

Mr. Kiser: Would the commission entertain a wood screen wall? I have some details that I can show you today for what that might look like.

Mr. Comeaux: So can we make it screening contingent upon consulting with the Planning

Administrator or something of that sort?

Mr. Snowden: if the Commission wants to leave the fencing or masonry decision up to me, that's fine just state some sort of screen. The code states that masonry is preferred and it's preferred when it can be integrated to the building, you're not going to be able to integrate it to the building here without having a really awkward configuration. I was less concerned about that and more concerned about making sure we have a path to get around there because to think someone that is pushing a trash rolling cart is going to be able to go all the way around to do a dump on the Southwest side, you want to have some sort of path or access on the back or something. I would just like to see Mr. Kiser lay out a detail on that.

Mr. Welday: Just to expand upon that point, I see there is only 12 ft clearance, if that is a dumpster, how are you going to get a truck in there in order to dump that dumpster.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Welday that's really why I was asking for clarification. Why don't we just let Mr. Kiser tell us how it's going to operate?

Mr. King: My question is, are those doors actually going to block the driveway for the emergency facility in the back? That's my thought right now.

Mr. Kiser: You're right, for some reason it's showing up there are the gate doors which would be.. based on the comments from staff, we've relocated the dumpster from the other side to this location and there would be some traffic crossing issues if you had a service condition during an emergency perhaps. Let me bring up an item on that question. We had it originally located it in that area basically, and the idea was that yes it was further away from the service area/traffic patterns. Ideally we wouldn't want it on Taylor Park but it seemed like it was the most real estate. We thought we could do a better job with the landscape screening. I think if we can look at sort of an enlargement of the plan, there is a lot bigger area we could provide landscape buffer with. If it was perhaps in that location, but it was staff's concern with the proximity to Taylor Park Drive that it perhaps would be better in this location here. If you see where we've got a much larger area in that island we can landscape buffer around with plant materials, evergreen screening and try and do a better job at screening as well as the vehicular congestion at the current location.

Mr. Snowden: This is a fence line with some mature shrubs and what Mr. Kiser is saying is it would be placing it right here.

Mr. Kiser: Yeah and it would be an entry landscape, decorative screenings and a much larger area around the dumpster that would serve as an entrance feature landscape wise and provide some buffer for that utility dumpster.

Mr. Comeaux : and the idea would be to access it then from the parking lot.

Mr. Kiser: Yeah. So you would have an access drive where the ** is and it would basically line up with that and get all of that vehicular congestion out of the way.

Mr. Cullinan: I think the idea about moving the dumpster enclosure to that location makes sense, better use and there is some more space to be able to screen it and be able to utilize the enclosure.

Mr. Snowden: The remaining items we were going to ask about and we can re-write number 2 we can discuss the enclosure, was getting approval of the traffic access study and taking care of getting me a photometric of just the area around the, that was just an oversight on the application, but I can't enforce 1182 for the entire site, just the area around your proposed development.

Mr. Kiser: Agreed.

Mr. Snowden: So in that case gentlemen, all we need to do is just revise staffs suggested number 2 and let me see if we can do this quickly, or you can if you prefer Mr. Comeaux.

Mr. King: I think if it moves there's a lot more there to figure out.

Dr. McKenzie: Mr. Comeaux I take it you're preparing a motion?

Mr. Comeaux: I'd like to make a Motion to approve item #179812 with the following provisions 1. additional landscaping be provided along the south side of the development headed eastward and that that plan be approved by the Planning Administrator; 2. that the dumpster be moved to the location on the south east corner of the parcel and that it be screened in a way that is consistent with the discussion tonight and approved by the Planning Administrator; 3. that the traffic access study be completed and submitted to the Planning Administrator; 4. That the photometric study for the additional development be provided to the Planning Administrator.

Dr. McKenzie: Mr. Comeaux moves, is there a second?

Mr. King: I second

Dr. McKenzie: Mr. King Seconds, any debate?

Mr. Snowden called the roll, motion adopted.

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

3. Origins of Brookside/Huber Housing Developments Presentation by Mark Myers

Mr. Havener: Mr. Chairman due to the late time of the meeting and due to the fact that the DRB is supposed to start at 7 I would recommend that we either postpone the proposed discussion or of the Commission would want to hear this, we do it after the DRB meeting.

Dr. McKenzie: I would ask Mr. Myers if he had any input would he be willing to come back next month, he would be the first item on the agenda?

Mr. Myers: That would be fine.

Mr. Snowden: that would be the only thing on the agenda at this point as there have been no applications.

D. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman

Planning and Zoning Administrator