



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Cullinan, Zollars, Hicks, Bizjak
ABSENT: Bowman

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes stand approved

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands approved

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Mr. Zollars.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. 6492 E Main St; Application #2018-23; Applicant Steve Moore; Certificate of Appropriateness - Wall Sign

RE: 6492 E. Main Street - COA #2018-23; Hobbytown
Staff Report

Planning Commission:

Enclosed is the staff review of the above referenced application.

1. Project Summary

- a. The property is located at 6492 E. Main Street. It is currently a vacant building and is zoned CS Community Services District.
- b. The applicant is requesting Planning Commission approval to erect a 62.7 sf wall sign on the front façade of the building. The lineal building frontage on E. Main is approximately 100 feet.

2. Zoning Review (Section 1181.00 - Signs and Graphics)

- a. The proposed sign conforms to current zoning standards in terms of allowable sign area and colors. Because the sign exceeds 32 sf, a certificate of appropriateness is required. (Section 1181.02(b))

Based on the above review of the application, staff recommends APPROVAL of the application.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Mr. Zollars: Is the applicant here and would you like to say anything that hasn't already been stated? Ok, I'll entertain a motion and a second for approval.

Mr. Bizjak: I motion that we approve the application.

Mr. Cullinan: I second that.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, any questions on that? Ok, please call the role.

RESULT:	APPROVED [3 TO 1]
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Hicks
NAYS:	Bizjak

2. 7362 E Main St; Application #2018-22; Applicant Kim Mikanik. Create Collaborative; Certificate of Appropriateness - Exterior Modification, Signage, Historic District

RE: 7360 E Main St - COA #2018-22: Tempe Taco / Staff Report

To Planning Commission:

Below is our review of the above referenced application.

1. Project Summary

- a. The property is located at 7360 E Main St. It is currently a vacant 2,698 sf building and is zoned CC Community Commerce District with an Historic District Overlay.
- b. The applicant is requesting Planning Commission approval for exterior modifications in the Historic District and new signage. No change to the existing building footprint is being requested.

2. Zoning Review

- a. The proposed building modifications conform to current zoning standards in terms of land use, building setbacks, and height. A special exception for eating and drinking establishments is not required given the Historic District Overlay.
- b. The proposed exterior modifications uphold the purpose of the Historic District overlay to preserve pedestrian-oriented development.
- c. The existing off-street parking on the site is 12 spaces. The Historic District code allows for a 50% reduction in parking spaces if shared parking and public lots are available. With the allotted parking at Prost and future municipal parking on the corner of Lancaster and E Main, the parking requirement is met.
- d. The proposed signage conforms to current zoning standards in terms of allowable sign area and colors. Because the signage exceeds 32 sf, a certificate of appropriateness is required. (Section 1181.02(b))

Based on the above review of the application, staff recommends APPROVAL of the application(s).

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Mr. Zollars: Is the applicant here? Would you like to add anything to this?

Mr. Maklezon: Basically, if you have any additional questions I can answer them here for you.

Mr. Hicks: With the (Inaudible).

Mr. Maklezon: I think we are going to go parallel with Prost's (Inaudible) boxes. We are basically going to take it parallel with the boxes in front of Prost.

Mr. Hicks: There will be plenty of sidewalk area, correct?

Mr. Maklezon: I think there will actually be more space than what is in front of Prost.

Mr. Hicks: The other note on the plan is the light fixtures on the front of the building that just says decorative light fixture as selected by owner. Applicant would you be ok if I (Inaudible).

Mr. Maklezon: For the wall scones? Yes, definitely.

Mr. Hicks: I'm not sure but here is just says, selected by owner. This is acceptable for construction and zoning but (Inaudible). (Mr. Hicks asked that the light fixtures be approved by staff.)

Mr. Maklezon: Yes

Mr. Hicks: My only other comment would be at the top of the building it has a masonry rectangular shape. On a few of the other downtown buildings they have the date that the building was constructed in that spot. (Inaudible) (Mr. Hicks asked if the applicant would be willing to include the date.)

Mr. Maklezon: Put the date up there? Absolutely, we have that next door at Prost as well, 19**. Labeling it as such, I'm sure we can come up with something creatively to label it as such. It is a historical building and we would like to present that.

Mr. Hicks: Inaudible

Mr. Maklezon: I'm not opposed to that.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Hicks any further questions? Would you like to add anything? Any other questions or comments from he board? Ok, if not I would entertain a motion followed by a second.

Mr. Hicks: I would like to move that we... (Inaudible) (Mr. Hicks motioned to present the light fixtures to staff, and work on dating the building for historical dates.)

Mr. Bizjak: I second.

RESULT:	APPROVED [3 TO 0]
AYES:	Cullinan, Hicks, Bizjak
ABSTAIN:	Zollars

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED: Changing the Zoning District of a 24.3 Acre Parcel on the West Side of Taylor Road Known as 9366 Taylor Road SW, 9370 Taylor Road SW, and 9333 Taylor Chase, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from AR-2 Multiple Family Residence District and CC Community Commerce District to PND Planned Neighborhood Development District.

This is a request to change the zoning district for the site from CC Community Commerce District and AR-2 Multiple Family Residence District and CC Community Commerce district to PND Planned Neighborhood Development District.

Mr. Bowsher: This comes back to you from City Council, before they went on break. This is the same unfinished business that Planning Commission has seen in the past.

Mr. Zollars: Is the applicant here? Would you mind giving us a high level change that you are coming back with this time?

Mr. Thomas: Simply, from the standpoint and direction from City Council, we reduced our density from 240 down to 192 units. In doing so, we brought the net density down to 7.9 units per acre, below the previous just under 10 units per acre that we previously had in our application. In doing so we removed three buildings that would be on the west/south and west/north of the site. Two being on the west/north side of the site and one being on the west/south side of the site. We felt those were the best buildings to remove to continue to increase the distance between ourselves and the neighbors directly impacted to the West of us. In doing so we of course reduced payment and we also reduced garages from 84 down to 60 garages. So that was a reduction again from 240 units down to 192 units and I'm here to answer any questions to the board at this time.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or comments?

Mr. Hicks: In our last meeting last time (Inaudible). Last time we recommended approval .. (Inaudible).

Mr. Thomas: Yes just clarification. We will submit on to City Council under the condition to doing the additional turn lane at the intersection at Taylor and Main, but we would like to contribute financially to the parks system in lieu of building the park, if that's acceptable to the board tonight.

Mr. Zollars: Any other board comments or questions? Any public comments or questions?

Mrs. Young: On September 5th I asked in an email to each of the members of Planning Commission, except for Mr. Cullinan, who has some ties to the developer that we ask for this review to be delayed by one month. We asked Mr. Bowsher on numerous occasions before August the 28th, if there was going to be public hearing notices sent out. We were assured that there would be. On August the 31st we received an email from Mr. Bowsher that said that he would not be sending out public hearing notices per code. Our question tonight before the Planning Commission is that the City's Charter is very clear about sending out public hearing notices and I hope you did get an opportunity to read the email we sent. The City and Metro Development demonstrated that they agreed with the charter with the understanding. They sent public hearing notices out before each Planning Commission meeting. We ask for you to delay this meeting at least until October and send those notices out. Back to March the 8th. And I'm referencing code 183.05 our exhibit that we attached to the application is in an inadequate constructive notice, which is the public hearing notice in that original public hearing notice. Eighty five hundred Taylor Chase, Licking county taxation address parcel which is part of the code, which is the major portion of the acreage and the proposed zoning district change is not listed in the public hearing Notice. Also in reference to 118305. 9370 Taylor Road and eighty five hundred Taylor case drive licking county taxation address parcels. The two major portions of the acreage in the proposed zoning district change is not listed in Metro Developments letter to invite the public for comment. Again we attach that to the application for the public record. In Our exhibit 5, again from March the eighth and reference to zoning code 118305b traffic and reference to the city of Reynoldsburg development handbook prepared by the city, dated March 24th 2017, number three zoning

district change reads what information you will need to initiate zoning process. Number 10 traffic impact study. I referenced back to city council meeting from February the 12th president Joseph and Mr. Baker in that statement asked for a traffic impact study to be done. The Planning Commission under zoning 118305.B can't ask for additional assistance in their review. Our understanding in reading the code is the purpose of the Planned Neighborhood Development is permitted and approved new development. The suspension of traditional zoning provisions should enhance existing developments and promote compatibility to protect public which is the school district, and private investment which is the result of value of all land. On a personal note on Taylor road the last three weeks there has been three accidents in front of my home. Licking County fire which is West Licking County, the state Highway Patrol and Reynoldsburg has responded to those accidents. It's a congested area is substandard according to your or excuse me, the documents have been provided for access. We believe that this development will continue to create more congestion in that area. We simply ask that the Planning Commission the City Council abide by the city code and deny this application based on density, and compatibility lack of traffic study, and inadequate constructive notice. The other thing I'd like to note is this is a third time before the Planning Commission and Mr. Hicks did pointed out that this applicant did not include their plans for the park area which was delayed again in June. They did not include in this presentation the right turn access, excuse me the right turn off of Taylor access. Again I ask you to have a vote and to delay this review for one month.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you for your comments. Lady in white jacket you had something in mind to say please come up and state your name and address if you would.

Ms. Grimes: Members and others. My name is Linda F. Grimes and I live at 1370 Reserve Drive here in Reynoldsburg. The area in question sits pretty much right behind my home. First of all uumm, I tried to jot down a few little things so I don't get sidetracked. The meeting notification I would have never known this meeting was even going to be conducted, if someone a couple of days ago had not informed me that this meeting was to be held. I thought we were going to get prior notice like we have always, and that didn't happen this time. I went to a couple people's homes to inform them that this meeting was to be conducted today. I don't know if they're here today and I don't know if they were able to tell anyone else but usually there are a number of candidates we could which could be this time, because they didn't know it existed. My issues are the same with regard to density, traffic, drainage. I have a concern about the amount of parking that they have proposed. I know that the unit now went from 240 to 192. But some of those units have 2 bedrooms. So people could share rent and if there were two people in each bedroom in each one of those individuals had a car. You're talking about four cars for each one of those, two bedroom units. In addition the ones that would contain one bedroom each individual that lived there and I'm saying two adult each one of them could have a car. And because the parking has been reduced to parking garages. That means available parking spaces would also be reduced. So my question then would be in the proposal, where would the overflow go? Now currently at the end of my street Reserve Drive. There's a little cul de sac area and there is a metal sort of a railing right there. It would provide direct access from this proposed project into Reserve Drive. Ever since they opened up the reserve Drive area to two other neighborhoods traffic is horrifying. I used to be able to Rollerblade up and down the street. I can't do that anymore. Too much

traffic and it continues at a high rate of speed. Throughout the day and into the early morning because I'm up watching cooking shows and Disney. So I am awake and I hear things zooming down the street. Now they have had in the past a few units to gauge and measure traffic, but unless your totally stupid you're not going to approach 1 driving 50 miles an hour like you would do normally if it wasn't there. So again my concern is traffic that could happen and the opening up of that area. I don't know what the current amount of people with regard to density is how many people are supposed to be. What's the limit on like five per acre 6 per acre? What is the limit on that currently? I just want to know because I want to know is that seven point nine continues to it exceed it?

Mr. Bowsher: Technically if it was to be built out at AR2 there's not a density limit set forth. It is a limit per how many units per building, which would be four units per building doesn't state how big the building needs to be how small the building is to be how many buildings are allowed to be it just simply states if AR2 to is to be built it would be four units per building per the zoning code.

Ms. Grimes: And then limit list the number of people that could be living inside?

Mr. Bowsher: The Ohio revised code limits how many people can and can actually live in their property. Maintenance Code basically states that currently, I can't quote the exact number, but it limits it because the Ohio Board of Health you know states you know. It becomes out of control of too many people are living there. So there's more mechanisms outside of the city that states what can and cannot and how many people can live in one unit or how many bedrooms and such.

Ms. Grimes: I could see that would be the intent. However. A number of things can happen in between there. So pretty much my concerns remain the same. What we're talking about is something that's going to impact that area. For time to come after I'm moved on my greater reward in addition. I don't know, in the beginning maybe there might be more oversight. As time goes on that does go down as well. So what the intentions were when it was built and what it turns into could be something that is entirely different. I just think that is still too many people, too many buildings, inadequate parking, and the impact that it will have on traffic will be horrifying. If they open that area up at the end of Reserve Drive so that it will then serve as a pass through because I can anticipate that coming just because of their. Those are my objections to this project. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you. Please stand up on state you name and address.

Mr. Young: Aaron Young 9167 Taylor Rd. SW thank you. Coming back here today escorted this back and forth. I do want to commend the developers for their patience going back and forth, just like we have to be patient, they had tried to address some things that we had on our side of the property they had added into their plan, from our view looking north what it would look like in the plane. Thanks for taking the time to do that. Speaking of the density the concerns with the density were still above what PND calls for and I'm no longer speaking to the developers I'm speaking to you, the commission. As what I want to know is we shall not exceed this is the law. This is statutory law. This is written law. We shall not exceed five

units per acre in the district this number and the proposed column has always been over five units per acre and the complete total district. Yet. We're going back and forth between you guys and council. There's another number in 1183.04B which says; in any part of this district shall not exceed ten units, in any acre park in the district, not as a whole, but any acre section. What I want to ask commission is have you guys ever looked at that number? What does that number come out to? Because on this proposal column it only lists what it is verses the five. Have you guys looked at it versus the ten? Individually, I'm asking individually, has anyone ever looked at what this number comes out to versus the ten? Each council member has anyone ever looked at it? As anyone ever done the math? You haven't Zollars?

Mr. Zollars: No I have not.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. just too kind of answer your question. So, the applications plan development and to boil it down in the city attorney may have a better way of explaining this. Any type of a plan developments essentially a contract between the city and the developer and everything's on the table for negotiation.

Mr. Young: I agree.

Mr. Hicks: So the fact that what their application is does not necessarily meet those requirements within the code. Honestly it doesn't matter I think it's something that matters a great deal and should be considered by all the council people but it doesn't necessarily disqualify the application or make it invalid. It's just one of many things that's negotiating and it's gone into are certainly my consideration for the project. So it is a question yes I'd review that.

Mr. Young: Okay good. Did you come up with a number for that? First of all before well I want to let you answer that. Did you come up with a number when you looked at that? What was the density number you came up with per what is left over development wise, because we have our open space which is the non-developed space?

Mr. Hicks: Well the entire property is subject to the rezoning so you calculate density based upon the acreage of the entire property you don't just pick out the areas that are there developing or not developing as part of the submittal.

Mr. Young: And that's where we come up with seven point nine correct?

Mr. Hicks: Correct.

Mr. Young: Okay What about our other number that we have in the law and the law by the way is also a contract between council and the citizens of Reynoldsburg.

Mr. Hicks: Understand.

Mr. Young: And myself and Etna Township because I'm part of this application process.

Mr. Hicks: So the second question you're asking its 10 units on any one particular acre doesn't spell out how you draw out that acre. It's just over two buildings and you're certainly not complying with that. So.

Mr. Young: That's correct.

Mr. Hicks: That could be applied to just about anybody's development though depending on how you're drawn to it. Bottom line is that the planned development. So if we don't like it we voted no. And if you think it's acceptable you voted yes.

Mr. Young: I totally agree it's not defined. The only thing we have is the other number five which is the total district. I would ask to bring up exhibit D-2. I'm sorry. D as in Dog. D-2.

Mr. Bowsher: They have it in front of them. If you want it we have go ahead. We have it with us right now.

Mr. Hicks: This one with the open space?

Mr. Young: It's also included in the photo on the agenda. I don't know know if we can get a landscape on that by any chance. This is OK we can we can read like this.

Mr. Bizjak: I mean we have it in front of us. You know you feel like you want to go we off we are all looking at it.

Mr. Young: This is good right here. We can see what we need to see. I'm going to take it Mr. Hicks you did consider that 10 number. You may be the only one that tried to consider that number. And again we don't have any math to put against it. It's not defined, but if we do if we look at this exhibit D-2. When it when it speaks to density as being the total versus the total units you know we have our seven point nine. Now speaking of the other number. Number 10 anywhere in the district. When we look at this exhibit we have our total acreage. Now we have total open spaces, which do not have dwellings or units on this. What we're left over with after we take away the open space. If anybody was trying to do the math. If you do the math where you end up with you've got 10.37 acres left over. Granted within that you still have some open space so we're we're being pretty liberal there. So when we're talking about a building on a piece of land taking away the open space. We have ten point three seven acres. If anybody was interested in doing the math. If you take.... What do we got? 192 units and divide that by that remaining space which is not part of the open space. We're being liberal because there are still spaces in between the buildings. Where you've got right there is 18.5 Dwelling units on those remaining acres per those remaining Acre's. If anybody was interested in doing the math. That's well above the 10 requirement. Ok? One of the reasons I point that out is because Ms. Grimes, I believe asked the question about what are these density numbers supposed to be. My wife pointed out. As 1183.01 B. That last sentence says it's not the purpose of the planned development provisions to permit reduction in traditional lot sizes with mitigating amenities or quality design which justifies such reduction to benefit. To the benefit of the residents and the community as a whole. Its PND is not meant to reduce lot sizes or in other words increase density beyond traditional lot sizes. Now you can budget.

You can smudge it you can move it around a little bit as a PND and you can work with the developers. In the end what our law says under density of dwelling units the maximum density of dwelling units for both the overall planned neighborhood development district and for each of its areas shall be as approved in the development plan. So you're right you can approve it. You can smudge the numbers you can work around traditional zoning you can you can do that. What I want to know is if you prove it. How's it going to be legal? Because it says shall be as approved in the development plan except that the density of the dwellings and the District shall not exceed five units per acre in the district. And shall not exceed ten units per acre in any part of the district. If anybody was interested in doing the math. I think a reasonable person could come up with eighteen point five somewhere in that leftover track of 10.5 Acres. 10.37 acres. Apologize for that. I'm going to take it as you considered it Mr. Hicks? I'm glad if you're the only one it's not so good for us as a community. At the end of what I just read. You know you can work around, but in the end what, I just said what I read. In the law. Consideration shall be given, shall be given, this is law. Consideration shall be given to the compatibility of proposed dwelling density and the characteristics of the proposed lots. The structures with the existing and projected surrounding dwelling density lots and structures. You shall do this. Mr. Hicks considered it. Sorry guys it's just we keep coming back here. Got to get through it. You don't mind is it okay to bring up exhibit D-1.4? Could you scroll up here a little bit? Back down. Just getting the whole thing. If we can turn the lights out because the participating community can see this at all. Reason people are here. I talked about this being a wall one day appreciate you guys getting this together. I mean you look at that top view. You know I'm not, I don't. I can see the projection that comes from my house. I mean these folks driving down the road you see that wall there, you see the density of this? I would ask the audience and the council members if you're familiar with that area. Does this look anything like the density in this area?

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Young, this is not the City Council this is the Planning Commission.

Mr. Young: Apologies. Thanks. Yeah you're right. That's a rhetorical question. I think this image kind of speaks for itself and it's you know it's it's not bad it's a nice development. It's very nice. I mean I can see this in many places. For or the PND the request to rezone for PND. I don't see how this is lawful even if this gets approved housing illegal development because the PND. It's clearly stating what its purpose intent is and it has numbers against it. This is law and I understand there's contracts between cities and developers, but law is also contract between citizen citizens.

Mr. Hicks: If you don't mind Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Zollars: Go ahead Mr. Hicks.

Mr. Hicks: I just appreciate you bringing all this in front of us. I think it's a really healthy discussion not just about this application but about our zoning code in general. And I think that this application in many ways has highlighted a lot of areas that our code could be improved or code and our process. Process has been way too long, has taken way too long to get to this point that we're at. Just pointing out some of your your your items there in regards to meeting the exact letter of the code. There are ways that we bypass things like that, they

are called variances. I think that there's been a healthy discussion I know among staff. I've discussed with people about whether a planned development applies for variances or not which would go before BZBA, I believe. And that's something that and how that's handled in other municipalities is handled in different ways as well. I think it was the determination early on in this project that because it's a planned development it does not require to apply for variances or anything that varies from the code. However as part of our process I think what we should be considering is as staff provides reviews applications for Plan developments and then provide staff reports to both planning commission and council. What would be helpful for council members and planning commission members would be if staff sort of graded the application versus the things like density like what you're pointing out in the code, and just simply stated whether it meets that requirement or not. In my opinion that doesn't necessarily disqualify it from being able to be approved, but at least it's a transparent way of the people that are voting and making decisions on things could see these things that you're bringing out tonight. We would have known about that in June rather than where we're at today. So I just wanted to point out a couple comments I really appreciated you going really in-depth on on the issue.

Mr. Young: I appreciate that Mr. Hicks. Yeah I mean I don't just point this stuff out tonight. I mean I think since we started we've been speaking to the density. We're just we're just really kind of getting down to what is the law here. And I agree with you that PND, that you know you can't have variances the whole reason for PND it is the variance itself from traditional lot sizes. It also spells out what its intended purpose is and when it gets down to the approval of it the end game the approval of it specifically is saying you can be lenient. You have to consider this and that. But in the end you've got 10 or five per district and no more than 10 anywhere on an acre in the district.

Mr. Zollars: Yes. Sorry we're you done?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Mr. Zollars: Sorry. Mr. Bowsher, go ahead.

Mr. Bowsher: Just a quick just touch on or just you know you were talking about you know the fit and the density you know in the neighborhood. I would just like to point out that of the 11 other rental apartment communities within the area, basically anywhere in Reynoldsburg nothing is below 10 units an acre. In fact, the apartment complex just north of this proposed area where the Creno's pizza is. It is at 18 over 18 units an Acre.

Mr. Young: It's zoned PND?

It's AR-2. Which makes he makes it nonconforming at the time because now we have changed our code and limited ourselves on that. Basically back to what Mr. Hicks was saying is that it is outdated and there needs to be extreme changes made to it. Also within the PND code it also allows Planning Commission and City Council to vary the requirements to make those changes within these forums.

Mr. Young: So yeah those are not PND and those require variances in the whole concept for the PND. The whole reason is it's basically a variance itself. However there's written in the law, it does regard density and it says you know it shall be approved because there is not a density requirement in the law versus traditional lots. It is just saying you can vary with that area.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you. Appreciate the information. Thank you. Can we get the lights back on please? Any additional? Yes sir. Please come up and state your name and address if you would.

Mr. Crawford: My name is Justin Crawford. I'm an HOA member at the Reserve Reynoldsburg crossing. So it's actually the neighborhood that is a budding to the Planned Neighborhood Development rezoning that's we're talking about tonight. Thank you for letting me speak. I've been a part of this since the first meeting that was sent out for community members to come and actually talk with Joe and his team about the development to see the plans. I've been to almost every single one of the meetings and have seen this grow from you know a bigger community and as neighbors, community members, board members, council members have come together we have you know basically tailored this to what everybody has wanted over and over and over and over. Concessions have been made. Each and every time that we've met each and every time that we've talked in each and every e-mail that's been sent. So where we're at today I'm kind of surprised that Metro Development is still willing to come in and put 26 million dollars into the... You know, into building this beautiful high quality housing for young professionals, and for empty nesters. So one of the things I want to ask and I believe Mr. Bowsher we talked about this awhile back the master plan that is in process. It was my understanding that a part of that master plan maybe some of the early reviews looked like it was saying that that in the city of Reynoldsburg that they wanted more single housing or rental communities. I don't remember exactly what the wording on it was maybe for young professionals and for elderly. So was that a correct statement?

Mr. Bowsher: Yeah that was a correct statement within our survey we came across and there was a huge push for for a high end apartment living as well as senior housing in our survey for our comprehensive plan. We drove into a couple of different areas and obviously we don't have the time the money or the commitment to literally dive into every small parcel. Where we did want to focus in on was good infill development and redevelopment of parcels and where we could we would like to make it denser. Per MORPC's recommendation to make things denser along mass corridors to actually slow down transportation cost, wear and tear on roads costs, because things are more walkable and things are more accessible. I could get in and talk about it for hours, but that was the gist of what we were trying to do with the Comprehensive Plan. We have several areas that are empty and we wanted to plan more, I guess environmentally friendly, and transportation wide developments within the city.

Mr. Crawford: So I don't think it takes a professional at analyzing that. It seems like this property kind of fits along with those guidelines. So you're talking about main corridors. Then we get into traffic and Taylor road. They've agreed to put the turn lane in five years ahead of when the city's plan to. I drive down Taylor every single day. I work for TS-Tech.

Were a Tier 1 to Honda. Right up the road on broad. I come down Taylor every day. The roads kind of chewed up and what we talked about in the last planning meeting or me was the Commission, Planning, Council, or whatever it was they said something like five years. Five years from now they plan on fixing the road, repaving, and then maybe talk about putting in a turn lane. They're talking about putting in a turn lane now. That's going to help out everybody that's you know a bit concerned about traffic. There's been some concerns about well maybe people are going to avoid the traffic and come around through Kingsley and then on a Reserve Drive and come flying down there. There's already kids that come flying down there. Well you know, put in speed bumps and you know tell the cops to go over there. You know we're not going to stop people from speeding. You know people naturally want to go a different direction. Well then you know that's something we're going to have to deal with. Nobody can predict that, nobody can say that people are going to do that. Couple of just kind of short things. TS tech hires 1400 individuals that are located, the majority of them within a 30 mile radius. Of those 1400, and I talked with our HR today, 700 of them or are about half of them are single independent young professionals. Many of them are my colleagues. I have, we have a strong biking community. We ride for Pelotonia, which is a big ride in Columbus for charity. When I was explaining to them I said these apartment complex. I was showing them pictures and you know, there was a lot of excitement and buzz about it. They are a little bit on the expensive side with a single being \$900 and a two bedroom being \$1400. Is that still the same scope of the? I mean that is expensive. The two bedroom is the same as my mortgage on a 3100 sq. ft. home. Long story short. If that's what the City Council or the master plan is kind of looking for, and I've got a bunch of people I work with that are looking for places, and they are looking for that same development you just mentioned that was 18 units per acre that's just North of the Creno's Pizza. They all kind of go in there, but those units are older. These newer units are going to go in and they are going to be nice. It's going to be a nice thing for the City. I'll tell you the city is not glamorous, so as far as the Planning Commission goes I would think that your number one objection would be to move more nice things into the city to get people to want to come here. There's other communities like this that young professionals go to. We need to attract some of those young professionals that are going to put back into the city. Those people that are going to go out and go to the bars, to go to local restaurants, and go to ... I mean places like Prost are not going to be populated by you know.. necessarily... well I don't want to speculate older or younger crowd. It seems like a really nice place. So, as a person that lives right behind it. I have gone from not wanting the development to seeing that there is a lot of benefits. These guys have gone out of their way to redesign their property 8, 9, 10 times. Including adding fences, ponds, adding an additional 30 foot setback, and it's all just to comply with what everybody wants. The fact that we are still wanting more out of this same company, doesn't make any sense to me. It seems like we are just being bullies and I think that we should start making decisions based on what is factual. If 10.43 acres is by law, then don't let them do it. If it's a variance and we can sign off and everybody agrees, then we do it. Hopefully... I trust that between Planning Commission and Council that they will make the right decision. I trust in the City. I guess I wish you guys luck trying to deal with everybody's input of personal objectives as well as contextual and factual information. Best of luck.

Mr. Zollars: Thanks for your comments, we appreciate it. Anyone else? Ok. With that I would entertain a motion followed by a second.

Mrs. Young: I just want to put this so it is actually in the record. The audio record and the written minutes. This is the 2017 Licking County TIRC, which is the board representing Licking County, Etna Township, and Reynoldsburg who are looking at the TIF. In 2017 July the 20th. Item number five. This is public record and I would like to add it to this application. Number five TIF. Number two Mr. Harris. This is Taylor Rd. South of Main St. ... What? This is originally setup for condominiums... That could be a true statement, but they are talking about South on Main st. But now it is going to be rental property on the East side as you go between Palmer rd. and Main st. There are some units built. Some of the reasons for having the TIF were to widen the road, water, and sewer. There was federal grant money that was gotten to do part of that. There are other things on the list that include storm water issues that may be needed to be taken care of. There's \$14,000 in it, that's 2017.

Mr. Zollars: Excuse me. What does this have to do with this community?

Mrs. Young: The big... Well you know Mr. Zollars, I'm going to be honest with you.

Mr. Zollars: I just want you to keep everyone focused.

Mrs. Young: I'm going to be honest Mr. Zollars. I asked Planning Commission member... hhhmm. Why did you change your vote from no, in the beginning, to yes? One of the Planning Commission members said you to me. You know I was presented with the TIF numbers and that sounded really good for the city. Now I have been questioning this TIF from the very beginning. I've asked you and City Council many times. Is this a 100% school TIF? I haven't got a definite answer and I don't think the city wants to answer that question. The reason why... hold on just a second... I will let you talk. The other thing that I'm bringing up, the report. The City from last year, they don't even have the correct property listed. Now this is TIF money. How much money is it Mr. Thomas? How much money is generated from the TIF? Couple million dollars? And the City did not even get the correct property in 2017. Now here is the next problem or question I have. You have to be good stewards for us. Ask these questions because on July 17th, 2018 those minutes were approved. They said yes. TIF number two is on the South side of Main St. I just want to say you need to be good stewards of our money. You need to be good stewards of our land. You need to be good stewards of our property values, thank you.

Mr. Zollars: Board, any questions or comments? Staff?

Mr. Bowsher: I just want to state that it is public record.. (Inaudible). Both are 100% non-school TIF's... (Inaudible). In the last Planning Commission meeting... (Inaudible). Yes there is some money that is there because they started on the Taylor Chase condominium project, so there is some that is there. Ultimately there is some money from inflation, but it is a very small amount compared to what would happen. I also want to point out as the development team here. We don't solely make decisions based on TIF. We try to base it on what is best for the community moving forward. Inaudible... there is a multitude of factors that go into play with that.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you for those statements. Anything else from the board? I'd entertain a motion followed by a second.

Mr. Hicks: Chairman, I'd like to move to Council for approval. With the same two conditions. I'd like to move.. (Inaudible). Summary - He asked that we send to Council for approval with the conditions that we continue with the Left turn lane from Taylor onto Main, with reimbursement from the TIF. Also, he asked that the developer continue with the handicapped accessible park on the back part of the lot.

Ms. Grimes: Do I need to come up? Ok. When this moved forward before with those same two conditions and then it got kicked back here again. What was the point of it getting kicked back here again?

Unknown: City Council.. (Inaudible) Summary - They explained how City Council asked the developer to reduce the density.

Ms. Grimes: Ok, so that's?

Mr. Hicks: The two conditions that we placed on them are our recommendation for approval.. Inaudible.

Ms. Grimes: Ok, because I was at that last meeting and I'm hearing the same thing that caused it to be kicked back in the first place. There is a reduction in the number of units, but wasn't that number 190, not 192? Which I guess is moved, but two over the suggested. No, I mean the reduction to go down to 190.

Mr. Zollars: 192. I don't know about the previous meeting, but that's what it is now.

Ms. Grimes: No, I know that's what it is now. I know it is 192 now. The lady that's not here tonight.

Mr. Bizjak: I don't mean to cut you off here, but Council specifically, Councilwoman Bryan and Councilman Baker, who made the motion and seconded it, specifically sent it back to us with the expressed purpose that this be reduce it down to 192 units. So we are ordered by City Council to do this.

Ms. Grimes: No No, I understand that I just thought it was 190.

Mr. Bowsher: But it was based on what I believe Mr. Thomas came back and said can it be 192, based on how many units he could put in each building. So he came up to 194.

Ms. Grimes: I just wondered to clarify for me.

Mr. Bizjak: If I could say one more thing, and I don't mean to be rude and cut you off. The one thing that I do want to say is at the end of the day City Council holds the ultimate authority to determine whether this goes forward or whether this ends. All our votes mean at

the end of the day is that we recommend for approval or recommend for its rejection by Council. Council is the one that retains the authority.

Ms. Grimes: No No, and that's why I was asking the question before you got to that second part there. I just wanted to have that information.

Mr. Zollars: Ok, thank you. We have a first. We have a motion.

Mr. Bizjak: I second

Mr. Zollars: We have a first and second, please call the role.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [3 TO 0]	Next: 9/24/2018 7:32 PM
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSTAIN:	Cullinan	

E. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Zollars: We are adjourned, thank you for participating.

Chairman

Planning and Zoning Administrator