



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2020 6:00 PM

**PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7232 EAST MAIN STREET, REYNOLDSBURG, OH 43068**

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Cullinan (Remote), Zollars (Remote), Hicks (Remote), Furst (Remote), Benner (Remote)
ABSENT:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – August 6, 2020

Approved

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

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Stands Approved

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers Sworn in by Mr. Zollars

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Zollars: We will keep all comments to three minutes. Any applicants interested in the 1170 Lancaster agenda please step up to the podium.

Mr. Burns: I live at 1131 Lancaster Ave. I'm a realtor and I've lived at this property for eight years. I've spend three quarters of my life in Reynoldsburg. For one, I love what I've been seeing in Reynoldsburg. The biggest concern I have, for one, nobody knew about this on my street, so I'm not sure how the word got out. That's one concern. Obviously, traffic is another with the congestion from Main Street to Lancaster just about every rush hour. The other is the possibility of mixing rental and ownership. I think we are all old enough to remember The Continent and what worked and didn't work there, with mixing them. I guess my biggest concern is me representing a buyer for instance, or someone investing in Reynoldsburg, why would they want to choose a \$290,000 condo and then be surrounded by rental apartments. I know they are going to be higher. My other concern is if this has to develop in Reynoldsburg here, why can't they all be purchases instead of any rentals? We have plenty of rentals already. I just think that would also build animosity in the subdivision of people that own versus people that don't. The traffic is the biggest thing, why can't we just come up with something where there is more ownership? I mean, for goodness sakes, Reynoldsburg is number two on Realtor.com most requested. I mean this was as of last week. There are 20 homes on the market currently active for 43068. So the demand is obviously there. I know there is demand for rentals as well. My last concern is there's

a petition out there that was started today and it has 239 people that have signed it saying they do not want this. This is all within 24 hours and it's still going. So I love the idea of maybe a dog park and combined condominiums, or whatever. The other concern I have is even if we are going to have rentals at a high dollar amount our children; kids now are not able to save the kind of money because of college expenses and rent. Why would we have something so freaking high that they can't save money for a down payment? Why couldn't we make these all owner occupant to please everybody, at least everybody here? To where there's a program or incentive to acquire a down payment. In summary, really think about the traffic, I'm right across from it, I see it every day. Like I said, I love what I'm seeing across the board, and this could be a great thing, but I think mixing them is not a great thing.

Mr. Stoots: I live at 1070 Waggoner Rd. From the Development Department page on the city website under your mission or description says, we work to energize and maintain a thriving community where all citizens prosper and realize their potential by committing to the following: Guiding the changes and development that will enhance our community.

Do you really think that building three story apartments surrounded by one story homes enhances the community? With the exception of one parcel in between, this development practically borders on one of the most historic neighborhoods in Reynoldsburg. Highland Terrace was developed originally 113 years ago. I have a dated map with me of the development and when it was platted in case anybody needs that. My grandfather build a two-story house at the corner of Bryden and Jackson 93 years ago, next door to Ralph Connell, for \$8,200, got a picture of that too. 91 years ago, my mother was born in that house. There are no three story homes anywhere in the area. If you want to build to enhance our community, and keep surrounding home owners in mind, then stick to two story buildings as the highest level. Also, put all townhouses in there or attached single family. Owner occupied preferably. Had the surrounding neighbors known about the plans for this they would have filled these chambers. They didn't fill these chambers because they knew nothing about it, none of us did. Nobody was notified about the zoning changes because of the loophole found in our city code. The development department zoned that land to please developers without disclosing plans publicly. And Council passed it. I don't believe they knew about the plans either. This was a sneaky move that builds distrust between the citizens of this town and city government. At this point, all we can do is fight for the design. Don't build higher than two stories. Keep the neighborhood consistent. Earn some of that trust back from the people you represent while you are enhancing our community. Especially when it borders so close to a historic neighborhood. Thank you.

Mr. Luzader: 1116 Gibson Rd. Mrs. Stoots touched on a few things that I want to bring to your attention. The biggest concern that I have in the height of the buildings. Approximately 95% of the homes in that area are one story. I don't know of anyone that would like to look out their front window and see a 40 foot tall building that they got to look at. There are no three story apartments in the city. If we really want to put three stories out there, it's a perfect location down at the corner of 256 and Livingston that would also be a gateway coming into the city. The other statement I would like to make is in your actual zoning code under residential medium zone says the purpose of the residential medium zone is to compliment single family residential. I don't think this compliments the existing area over there. A couple other concerns I have. Have we done a facilities demand for this development? Do we know how much water it's going to use? How much sewer it's going to take up? Have we done a traffic study to know how it's going to

impact the traffic? One other concern is fire safety. There's only one driveway in and one driveway out. If there's an accident right at that driveway, and I know the odds of that happening are slim, but if it does, how does a fire truck get to the back of that development? Or emergency squad to assist someone? These are just some of the concerns that I think need to be addressed. Thank you.

Mr. Norris: I live at 1139 Gibson Rd. and this complex literally sits eight feet off my property. The only reason I found out that this was going to be a thing was because the property directly behind mine was contacted several months in the past and was told that their property was going to be neighbors with them. That's how we got this word out. We put City Council in charge to make sure our homes; which I've been living there for 23 years and I've raised two children in that neighborhood. The reason we chose it was because it was quiet, it was a safe place for them to live and that's why we came to Reynoldsburg. Now I find out that the property that I've almost paid off on a 30 year loan is going to be backyard material for a three story condo/apartment complex. The only reason we found that out was because the neighbors were talking. How does that even happen? We didn't even get a say so on this. So what's going to happen is; we're going to come in and talk here, you are going to hear our grievances, you're going to go home, they are going to build their complexes and I'm going to have to deal with it. And sooner or later one of those three houses directly next to me is going to sell and that's how you are going to get your exit from that place. So I'm going to have an exit onto Gibson Road, which is already congested because of the school which is less than a block. I don't think any of this was taken into consideration. I don't think the people that have invested their lives in the community were taken into consideration. I do believe the developer is going to make a lot of money and we're going to have to deal with the consequences. That's all I got to say, but remember you got people like me that were thinking about moving into Reynoldsburg and if this is what it's going to be, they are going to find another community where it's just as quiet as it was when I moved in and that's where their tax money is going to go. Thank you.

Mrs. Neinast: I live at 1155 Gibson Rd. My house is directly in the middle of the field that you guys are planning on building on. I just found out about this happening about a week ago. I don't know if that was my fault that I should have been looking at other areas to know this was going on. I don't think the transparency on it was great. Since I have found out I have tried to get more information and I've learned how it could benefit the city. I'm not completely shutting down the idea, but agree with the people that spoke before me that the building that are planned are too large for the property. No matter what color you paint them they are not going to fit into the aesthetics. I have the impression that I have no power as to what's going to happen right now. It's not my property, but if I have any say, we need to have more town homes or the lower one or two stories in that property. Also, my other thought was that we need to setup something to have something setup for a privacy fence for those neighbors baking up to it and not just trees because it is going to take a good five to ten years for those trees to be big enough to provide any shelter to the people living there. If we can be reimbursed for privacy fences before building starts because I have a two and four year old and that just won't be safe. The other part of that is, I was concerned about the schools and making sure the schools are going to get funding to be able to handle the incoming students and also the traffic. We have kids walking to school and there's already people speeding in that neighborhood and we are going to kick up the number of people flying through the neighborhood at school times and I want it to be safe for our kids. I'm ok if it

benefits the community, I'm ok if it fits in with the aesthetics, but we need to be thinking about everyone that's involved. My family are on the line where, do we move out of Reynoldsburg or do we stay in Reynoldsburg? We're a young family. I have been very impressed with what has happened in Reynoldsburg since Mayor Begeny has taken over. I have been very happy and I just want to keep that going so I think we need to look at the long term of the town and not a private company. Thank you.

Mr. Boerman: I live at 1122 Lancaster, which is actually the big white house with almost three acres right beside the field. So this is going to be built eight feet off my property as well. I only found out about this though Reynoldsburg Get Involved Facebook page. I served 22 years in the Army and I brought my family to Reynoldsburg. I bought that property because it was quiet and safe. I have two children, a seven week old son and a five year old daughter. I'm told that there's going to be natural vegetation that divides that eight feet between me and this monstrosity. So I'm going to look out of every window on the side of my house and I'm going to look into the back of the building. I've had multiple calls, folks trying to buy my property. I'm sure it had something to do with this, I should have put two and two together a long time ago. They are still calling me, matter of fact, they want to talk tomorrow. I'm actually going to hold out and just be a thorn. The fact that we are talking about now is that we aren't allowed to do a privacy fence of eight foot, at least that's what I was told, and I'm not saying that's the final say. That would make me feel a whole lot better as well to have a big privacy fence between me and this. They are not all owner occupied, you know, there's what 56 apartments and 32 town homes. Think about the people, think about the people that call Reynoldsburg home and pay our taxes and just want a safe town to raise our kids. I'm not saying a bunch of criminals are going to move into these apartments, I don't want that to be taken from what I'm saying. I just think this doesn't fit, it doesn't fit at all. A lot of people have said it so I'm not going to say it again. I appreciate you hearing me out but please think about some of the safety issues.

Mr. Ruth: I live at 1216 Lancaster, just on the other side of the church. I've lived there 37 years. I grew up in Reynoldsburg my whole life, so I've seen many changes in our beautiful, quiet little town. About 25 years ago the Dispatch did a wonderful article on their very own Mayberry and we were painted as a very picturesque, back porch community that was involved with each other. I've certainly seen that changed somewhat over the last 25 years. My primary concern is with the rainfall runoff. Just in the past year we've had two incidences where we've has heavy rainfall and it's not just Blacklick Creek backing up the runoff from the existing church parking lot, which has impacted several of my neighbors. There's been road flooding and basement flooding. I don't know that that's; doesn't seem to me one of the issues most people are talking about. Certainly traffic and having lived there; going back to when they widened Lancaster 25 years ago, we were told certain things then from City Council. We had a nice meeting where everybody came and everyone was told how it would impact them. Not everything that was said was true. They took quite a bit of my front yard out. I was told that wasn't going to be the case. I came home from work and low and behold a whole row of hedges in my front yard had been removed. So I'm not in favor of this project or any project that increases traffic and other issues that many other people have talked about. The style of the apartments that are going in. I'm certainly in agreement about the three story proposal, that should not be, that would not look at all right. I have concern again like the other people, I was not made aware of this until just a few days ago when Mr. Luzader spear head this, and thankfully so. Which I think City Hall should have been

letting us know a few months ago. I talked to Reverend Linder. He assured me that, if a lot of people don't want this, that he will seriously consider not selling the property. Thank you very much.

Ms. Nader: I don't live in the area of Lancaster Ave., I live over on Palmer. I feel for the residents over there that feel like this is being put upon them. This three story apartment homes and the high density in the middle. If apartment homes are going to be put there it seems like they should be one floor and it seems like there should be a lot less people moving in. My problem with some of the development in Reynoldsburg goes back to the development behind me, which in The Villages at Slate Ridge. The condos behind us on Palmer Road. They started to be built in 2006, they worked on them a few years, stopped construction until 2016. In 2016 they picked up again and finished. In that 10 years they left trash, unfinished projects, insulation laying around, and light poles that had wires coming out of the top, nobody did anything about it. I called the city repeatedly, they said, they are going to come back and fix it. They are going to keep building. 10 years later. I just hope that whatever developments that go on in this city are watched a lot more carefully than that one was. That's' ridiculous that we have trash laying around. These people were paying \$229,000, 14 years ago for condos behind me looking out on all this stuff. And me out of my backyard looking at all this. Where is the cities over sight in this? Whether it be Construction or what they did over on Palmer Road. We still have things that were cover up, drainage tiles and things. It seems like all this stuff is started and there's this punch list of things that need to be done and it's not done. So when I hear about more things going in, especially things that aren't in favor by the neighbors and that area will be directly impacted I get very angry because I can't help to think that everything is being done about half. There's never that finishing touch. Never anybody going back to the builder saying you made all this money doing this, come finish it. Come clean this up. Come be good neighbors, good stewards of what you have started. Please pay attention to the people of Lancaster Avenue and the neighbors along there.

Ms. Ruth: 7328 Bryden Road. I was born and raised in Reynoldsburg. I grew up in Brookside and to me Brookside was always that down home, small town village. I felt like I lived in a village where everyone looked after everyone. We had each other's back. I've lived in and around the east side most of my life. I just recently moved back two years ago from living in southern California. I came home because living in California is because it's a nice place to visit but a hell of a place to live. The reason my significant other and I purchased the house we did on Bryden is because I felt like I could have that small town, hometown feel. I felt secure, I felt safe and I just love the ambiance and quietness of it. Like everybody else that spoke tonight, nobody knew about this. So I come before you guys tonight thinking, what have I moved into? Have I moved into a city that doesn't care about the people who live in it? The people who own property. The people who pay taxes. The people who want to stay here are make it their home. Is this just all about money? Cause if it is, I might as well move back to California, because that's all it's about out there. So I'm asking, I'm pleading with you guys to consider everybody who has spoken here tonight. Everybody who is zooming in. Everybody who has sent in an email. Make us feel like we matter because right now, it doesn't seem like we matter. Thank you.

Ms. Wheeler: I have about five emails to read off here.

These emails may have not been read in full during the meeting, but the entire email that was sent in will be included in the minutes.

Email from Mr. and Mrs. Fee:

We were looking at the proposed apartment building complex at the church at 1170 Lancaster Avenue on Facebook, we wanted to make a few comments. A number of 3 story buildings sure does not blend into the existing historical neighborhood. Having a high rise building next to single-family homes will ruin the neighboring homes' privacy. The apartment dwellers would be able to look down on everyone's backyards impacting the quality of life nearby and reducing property values for the whole neighborhood. It looks like the total population of the proposed project will outnumber the population of the neighboring Highland Terrace area. The increased traffic will cause many problems especially due to the curve on the northbound side of Lancaster Ave.

Apartment communities do not make great neighbors as evidenced by the number of police runs at Postwoods. That community was marketed as a home for young professionals. That didn't turn out as planned! I understand that condominiums are planned to supplement the apartments or vice versa. I am concerned that the plan will change once the lot has been rezoned. There would be a late market study that finds that no one will purchase a \$290,000 condo in this area and then we are stuck with another Postwoods, Wind River, etc. Per CMHA Reynoldsburg has 3 times the Public Assistance of neighboring suburbs. It's no wonder that our homes are selling 30% below other suburbs.

Years ago, the same parcel was considered for multi-residential housing. At that time the Council/Zoning board deemed that type of use was not in the best interest of the community. I hope the same ruling applies now.

Email from Mr. Ono:

My name is George Ono, address 7328 E. Bryden Road Reynoldsburg, Ohio my topic of comment is to participate in the city's Planning Commission Special Meeting being held on August 27th, 2020 with regards to Planning Commission Application App. /Case# 2020-5357 for Description of Project: Proposed medium density residential development on vacant lot Parcel ID# 060-001078-00, property address 1170 Lancaster Avenue.

From 1959 I was raised in the Brook Side residential neighborhood which borders this property and graduated from Reynoldsburg High School in 1977. I purchased the property on E. Bryden based on its location of where I grew up and the fact this general area was shown on the Official Zoning Map of the City of Reynoldsburg as the ORD - Old Reynoldsburg Neighborhood District which is adjacent to the now proposed project.

These are my comments, concerns and questions for this Planning Commission Special Meeting.

For the record I have major concerns with the amount of additional traffic congestion, flow, including the ingress and egress on Lancaster Ave that will be caused by this proposed project.

Has a traffic study been performed and if so is the study available to the

residents for review?

For the record I have major concerns about the current and future property values of our neighborhood that could be caused by this proposed project. What is the proposed pricing structure for the purchasing or renting of these units? Is it considered a High, Medium, or Low income price range to qualify? For the record I am concerned about the additional noise levels that will be caused by the completion of this project. Has there been problems within the City and a rise or decline in noise complaints and Police dispatch after similar medium density residential development projects have been completed of this size?

For the record Section 1109.09 APPLICATIONS A. states All requests for a decision or approval under this Code begins with the property owner or agent thereof filing an application with the Planning and Zoning Administrator on form provided from time to time.

It should be noted that on the Planning Commission Application App. /Case# 2020-5357, Section II, Property Owner of Record is stated as Michael Oliver. The Parcel ID# and Property Address recorded by the Franklin County Auditor states the Property Owner of Record as GRACE APOSTOLIC THE REFUGE OF REYNOLDSBURG. Has the Planning Commission confirmed who the rightful owner of the property is or is this common practice to submit an application to see if a proposed project can be approved prior to entering into a sales purchase agreement with the real property owner and having the Applicant Signature certifying that they are the owner of the property?

For the record I have major concerns with this proposed project removing 8 of the existing fully grown Trees in excess of 60 years of age which contributes to all of Purposes and Intent under these Common Zoning Regulations as defined under;

SECTION 1105.07 Landscaping And Buffering

- A. Purpose and Intent, states under ii - Encourage the preservation of existing tress and natural features.

- A. Purpose and Intent, states under v. Protect the public health, safety and welfare by minimizing the impact of all forms of physical and visual pollution, controlling soil erosion, screening unsightly areas, preserving the integrity of neighborhoods and enhancing pedestrian and vehicular traffic and safety. -

For the record will the 8 new replacement Trees proposed or Tree credits fulfill the true Purpose and Intent of the Common Regulation in the opinion of City officials?

For the record per SECTION 1105.01 I. Reserved Parking Lot - The Zoning requirement is for 72 parking spaces and only 68 are shown. Have fewer spaces than is required by Table 1105.01A, been reviewed or approved per this regulation?

Finally for the record as a concerned citizen I ask the Planning Commission to deny the Proposed Project based on consideration of the concerns, comments, statements, and questions made today by myself and the other citizens who have provided responses with limited notification for this special meeting. I

would also request that the City provide a written response to the questions I have asked.

Email from Mr. and Mrs. Hollenbaugh:

I am writing to you today regarding the multi-family housing project that is proposed to be built at 1170 Lancaster Avenue.

My husband and I have owned our house, located at 7332-7338 E. Bryden Rd, for 38 1/2 years. The Grace Apostolic Church is right in our backyard, along with empty lot that I am being told is sold. We have never had any issues with our Grace Apostolic Church neighbors. Years ago, there was a cherry tree that was half on our property and half on theirs. They decided that they wanted to cut it down because it kept losing limbs. We agreed to help them with the cost of the tree removal. When they cut the tree down, we knew there would be an added expense to haul the wood away. So, we told them we would take the wood from the tree and all the tree removers had to do was leave the trunk in long pieces and drop them in our back yard. Years later, we custom built beautiful new kitchen cabinets from that old cherry tree. We have always found the church to be good neighbors even though there is traffic and added noise on the days they have services. It has never bother us. We were both shocked to even learn that the empty lot by the church has been sold and to learn about the proposed development is very much a huge concern of ours.

The new property owners want to build several multi-family housing units on a very small piece of property. The property is in what I would consider "Olde Reynoldsburg". Again, I have some major concerns about this proposed project that I would like to have addressed. I know there is a special meeting on this project scheduled for Thursday night (8/27/20) and I plan on attending that meeting virtually.

These concerns are equally important and are in no importance of order. Here are my concerns:

1.) A 92 unit multi-family development being built on that property is outrageous. The new property owners are trying to squeeze all these people into what I consider a very small area. The buildings look like they will be nice, but they absolutely will not "fit" the style of this old neighborhood. When I drive north on Lancaster Avenue from Main Street, you are surrounded by old one and/or two-story homes with mature trees. Now they want to put these brand new, 3 story, modern looking buildings in an area that is clearly well established. If this multi-family housing development is approved, that property is going to look extremely out of place. If you travel even further north on Lancaster, all the houses in the Brookside neighborhood are single story homes. These buildings are going to look like skyscrapers compared to all the other homes surrounding this piece of property. I also feel it is going to be extremely difficult to control the occupancy of these units. We know that it is not uncommon that multiple families try to occupy one unit causing overcrowding. I would also like to know if this development is going to accept vouchers for government subsidized housing or is this going to be considered low-income housing?

2.) Parking - according to the information that I have, there aren't even enough parking spaces for 92 cars. Most families have at least one car if not two. Where are they planning on parking all these extra cars?? Are they planning on using the church parking lot for "overflow" parking? Is this something that the church and the new property owners have agreed upon? If, so, that means that we will have to listen to noise from vehicles and people all the

time. Not to mention the amount of trash that will collect along our fence line!

3.) Traffic on Lancaster Avenue - We can hardly get out onto Lancaster Avenue without having to wait forever. How is the city going to handle all the extra traffic that this development is going to bring to Lancaster Avenue?? It's bad enough that we have impatient drivers that don't want to go 25 MPH in that area. I can't tell you the number of times I've had someone pass me in the center turn lane because I'm obeying the speed limit. Lancaster Avenue can't handle any more traffic than it has already. Again, adding this type of housing is going to increase traffic in the area making it so much worse than it already is. I can see multiple accidents occurring in this area. Are you planning on putting up any kind of traffic light? Are you planning on widening the road at all?? I can't even see how that would be possible. Some of my neighbors won't have a front yard! I am also concerned about the added traffic on my own street. Shoot, we can't even get our street repaved! We were told many years ago that our street would be repaved when they finished doing a water line project. Guess what, we're still waiting. All the city does is patch the potholes that keep coming back and get larger and larger as time goes by! I know our little stretch of road in Reynoldsburg isn't important to the city, but it is to us. We've asked about it before and are always told "No, your street isn't on our list to repave"

4.) Our schools - this is going to create even more overcrowding in our schools. French Run Elementary can't handle any more kids. I know it's not a City of Reynoldsburg problem but a Reynoldsburg City School District problem, but we can do something about it by not building this 92 unit multi-family complex!

5.) How is this development going to add to our city's income tax revenue or even the school district?? The tenants don't pay property taxes. Is the developer getting some kind of tax relief by building here?

6.) Noise pollution - what are the developers plans to keep the noise down?? Again, 92 units with full occupancy is going to bring added noise to our area! We already have added noise from the traffic that travels on East Main Street and Lancaster Avenue. Now we're going to have noise from cars and people coming and going all hours of the day and night. I guess we are not going to be able to enjoy opening our windows to get some fresh air anymore! Plus, when we want to spend time in our backyard, we will no doubt hear the added noise from this development.

7.) Lighting is going to be an issue. We are going to be the ones that are going to have to look out our back door and see these 3 story buildings that are no doubt going to be well lit. We will no longer be able to enjoy an evening out on our deck without seeing all the lights from these 3 story buildings.

8.) Proposed dog park - what are the developers going to do about controlling the noise from barking dogs and the smell from dog owners not cleaning up after their own dogs. Who is going to control this and take care of this? If we need to file a complaint who do we contact? The city or the property owner? I am a dog owner myself and I know how much waste my dog produces as we clean up after her all the time. If dogs are allowed in this development, I can see their owners walking through our neighborhood to exercise their dogs. I can also see dog waste being a problem in my front yard! Don't get me wrong, I love dogs but we know that there are some dog owners that aren't very responsible.

9.) Are there any future plans to tear down the church and build additional units? If so, will the neighbors be notified about this. Or are we going to be blindsided again! I feel like we are being blindsided now with the proposed development.

10.) Are these rental units or are they units that people are going to purchase? If they are rental units, who is going to manage the property? And again, how are you going to truly control the occupancy of each unit so they are not occupied by multiple families in one unit?

11.) There are two "wetland" areas proposed in this development. I am concerned about the increase in mosquitos with these wetlands. There is no standing water on the property now. I am certain that creating a "wetland" is going to harbor more mosquitos and other insects.

12.) Greenspace - What is the plan for landscaping on this development? Are they planning on putting in large trees to define the development? Are they going to build some kind of tall fence so that we don't have to see these buildings??

13.) Privacy - What are the developers plans for adding privacy for the existing neighbors. With a 3 story unit, it will be very easy for those tenants on the third floor to scope out their neighbor's yards or watch every move we make. Again, another concern of mine. We have been very fortunate over the last 38 1/2 yrs to have minimal crime happen in our neighborhood. I am quite certain that crime will increase with this type of development. When you add people, cars and belongings, crime is going to increase.

14.) Property maintenance - What is going to be done to keep trash down to a minimum?

15.) During development, if this gets passed, where are all the construction vehicles going to go? Are they going to use the church parking lot as a "staging area"? Again, right in my back yard! We are going to have to put up with the increased mess and noise associated with the construction. What's in it for us?? Nothing I'm sure. I'm sure we will be asked to just tolerate it. If this the case, then who are we to go to to resolve issues when the arise?

I am not at all in favor of this 92 unit multi-family development going in literally right in my backyard. I don't mind change within the city but this change does not even seem appropriate for the area. I will be extremely disappointed in my city leaders if this development gets approved. I realize that this is not in YOUR backyard, but it is in MY backyard! It would be nice if the city would just use common sense here. Common sense tells me that this type of development is way out of line for this small piece of property.

I look forward to hearing a response to my concerns. I hope they are genuine responses. I hope you are all taking the time to listen to the "People of the City". You represent us. Now is not the time to disappoint the "People of the City".

Thank you for your time. I look forward to attending the special meeting on Thursday evening. Have a good day!

Email from Ms. Sigman:

I as a resident of Highland Terrace am not opposed to development of the parcel as long as it blends more seamlessly with the surrounding homes, pointing out that the surrounding homes are ranches, and story and a half cape cod style houses.

If the land is developed what will be done to prevent Blacklick Creek and French Run Creek from flooding. Due to the neighboring developments these creeks flood regularly, mentioning this past March when several homes in Highland Terrace and on Lancaster Ave, had substantial amount of water in the homes.

Email from Mr. Smith:

I would like to offer my opinion on the proposed development of a multi unit apartment

complex near Bryden road. I fully support this development and look forward to it's development. I am a homeowner in Saffron Hill area which is near this development. I do agree with the traffic concerns on Lancaster and would like to see a proposal for remediation of the potential upcoming problem with traffic in that area. However, I believe (based on the rendering) that this development will give the area a more modern facelift that it needs. Too many people confuse the difference between old and historic. This particular area is aging and needs more modernization projects. Our roads are also falling apart in this area which is evident on Hillridge road. I am hoping that the new units will bring in additional taxable income that will help in providing funds for basic infrastructure repairs and community revitalization. I hear a lot of people complaining about almost every project that Reynoldsburg announces. Most of these complaints I have read are focused on two main themes. The first being that all change is bad. That's human nature to hate change, but we must make progress. The second theme is maintaining the status quo and hindering expansion and revitalization in the area because it will bring more diversification and cultural change. If we want Dublin and New Albany schools and property values we must change and revitalize our city. We need the taxes, modernization, and beautification that these projects will bring.

Mr. Zollars: Those wishing to speak on application 2020-5347, 8617 Taylor Road please come to the podium.

Ms. Siders: I'm a resident of Kingsley Drive off of Taylor Road. I'm here tonight as part of the Taylor Woods housing development. I am one of the residents of Kingsley Drive and I'm concerned for Kingsley, Taylor Woods Place, many streets out there that looks like from the plot that I've seen that are going to be impacted by this apartment. I think there's like 128 apartments going in there. I've spoken to several of my neighbors about this apartment development going in behind our homes. Our extremely private back yards are now going to be destroyed by two-story apartments. The lots that we have all chosen to build on because of the private yards were chosen up to 27 years ago. In November it will be 27 years for us. We now will be looking at the backs of these building instead of the trees and the fields that we have enjoyed for the last 27 years. We find that totally unacceptable. The fact that I'm just finding out about it is also unacceptable. We should have been asked, the homeowners should have been given some kind of information about this. We request that if these building are to be built that we at least get a wall or a fence in addition to trees, mounds, plantings, something high enough that will assist in the blocking of our view of the backs of these buildings and the people. And those people from looking into our homes and backyards. We hope that the additions of this to the plans that our property values will not be drastically impacted, because I fear that will be the case to build apartments in the middle of a housing community. Another worry is the possible issue we may have when all of the land is disturbed. We already have drainage issues in all our backyards and we've had to deal with that, so it really concerns us. I would also like to know, has an environmental impact study been done concerning the wildlife? We have deer families, deer nesting, further back in the woods we have a bat population. Of course there are any other number of squirrels and raccoons, all the things you see out in the woods because right now that's what we have are woods. I'm just here tonight asking for us to take these things into account before being built and we have no recourse but to live with them. Lose our property values and privacy in our backyards. Thank you and I just hope that all these points will be considered.

Ms. Rock: I live at 8654 Kingsley Drive. I am, as well as Linda, one of the many residents in the existing neighborhood which will be impacted by this development of the apartments. One thing that must be remembered is that the development is not creating a new development such as Centex or M/I might do, but rather coming into an already existing neighborhood, existing community. As such as the residents of the existing area must be considered and respected not only as homeowners, but also as tax payers and citizens of Reynoldsburg. We must be ensured that the development of this complex at least retains existing property values if it doesn't add to them. If property values decrease then it's a loss for all involved. Home owners through property values and city through decrease tax revenue. The long term affect must be more than the short term gain. It behooves the developer and is most certainly the responsibility of the city to partner with the existing home owners rather than entrench on the community without regard to those already living there. One thing I am concerned with is the trash compactor location, which is near our homes. It could invite infestation of rodents and bugs. It would be more respectful of the existing property owners to move it on the Ravines side and away from the existing homes. During the development there must be a seamless and easy process for us existing home owners to file complaints and to resolve any issues, especially those which may be due to damage to existing properties due to construction. Again, the city has a responsibility to the existing property owners and should not drop and run once ground breaking exists. This must be a three party partnership; the developer, the city, and the existing home owners. Development could easily cause shifting of ground formations, which could cause damage to our homes. As already has been said, there's a lot of underground spring water in our area. It must be assured that development does not cause drainage and soil issues, especially with the uprooting of thousands of trees, and does not push that type of water into our yards or underground towards us. Therefore, causing more issues to our properties. I would also request a wall be put up before ground breaking so the residents most nearly affected are not having to deal with excessive dust, dirt and noise, which will affect our lives and the environment in which we live. We will have workers and surveyors encroach on our properties without warning or permission. I request that the existing owners be given hard copies of not only the plans but a project timeline and any changes therein. This isn't a wide open development, but one which is narrow. Again, the existing homeowners and neighborhood, therefore must be respected and seen as partners and neighbors. The development and the city need to respect the neighborhood and work with us to ensure continued beauty and peace. Thank you.

Ms. Wheeler: I have a few emails to read off here.

****These emails may have not been read in full during the meeting, but the entire email that was sent in will be included in the minutes.****

Email from Mr. Feeney:

This is Patrick Feeney I live at 1076 Taylor Woods Pl. My family and I have lived in Reynoldsburg for 26 years. And I'm opposed to this project. I have reviewed the plans that were on line and have some comments plus I have a proposal. I am a property owner that has a common property line with this proposed rental complex. This common property line is 190' long which I believe is one of the longest. Here are a few of my concerns in no particular order:

1. There will be 7 AC units that will face my property which is the most out of ever property that is adjacent to this project. With a fence around theses AC units or not, this will be noisy.
2. I have a 30' set back in the front and a 50' set back in the rear on my property. The apartment buildings will be 29' from our common property line? This should be a minimum of 50' just like mine.
3. I did not find if this project was going to build a fence around their property. With these buildings being 29' from my back yard I believe that it's going to be very hard telling their renters where my back yard starts and where their back yard stops. Year after year every time a new renter rents one of the seven units that are adjacent to my property I will have to have this very uncomfortable conversation. They need to build a 8' privacy fence around this project.
4. On the recorded plat for the 'Taylor Woods Section 1' there is a "RESERVE "A" that shows as part of our subdivision. It is not shown on these plans.
5. It appears that the AC units or maybe a patios are being built on the sewer easement. What I'm proposing is Reynoldsburg invest in Reynoldsburg. I'm would like to propose that the City of Reynoldsburg purchase this land for a new park. We could use the engineering plans that are done (which we would pay for) and negotiate the price for the land. I'm proposing that we develop a park that kids can swing on a swing or clime on a jungle gym or safely ride their bikes around a path. The only park east of Kennedy Park is Pine Quarry Park and this park does not have any of these things. It's a great park but not the neighborhood park I'm proposing. There is continues green space between this property on Taylor Rd and Pine Quarry Park. I know Reynoldsburg already owns some of the parcels and this would be a perfect opportunity to develop a walking/jogging/biking path between these properties (parks).

Email from Mr. Miller:

My name is Vince Miller and reside at 8751 Linick Dr in Reynoldsburg. I would like to comment on the zoning proposal. Why does the city keep building more multi use properties "apartments" instead of single family homes? I'm sure there are developers out there who would build single family homes on this site. There is currently another site building apartments on Taylor Rd just down the street from this location. This proposal is very close to Taylor Rd Elementary and the additional traffic from this many units creates a safety risk for students. This will also negatively affect property values in the Taylor Woods subdivision. I am against this proposal.

Email from Mrs. and Mr. Klecan:

We are residents with adjacent property to 8617 Taylor Rd SW. Our concerns and questions are as follows:
Is a perimeter fence a requirement for the development? The ravine lots

adjacent to the development are naturally wooded and contain a number of risks to trespassers; fast running storm drainage, poison ivy, thorn rose bushes and wild animals. As an adjacent property owner we should not have to increase our liability should an occupant from the developed property venture onto our property and get injured. Additionally, it is not fair to allow members from 120 homes to access our property from the development. We do not want people using our property as a park or dumping on our property. We believe that due to the risks involved the City should require a perimeter fence where the development borders adjacent properties. A line of trees is not a suitable alternative.

The property has an existing fence that has fallen into disrepair on our property and neighbors properties. The fence is a wire fence which should be removed and replaced by the existing property owner or developer.

The creek runs through our property and year over year flooding and water flow rate have become progressively worse. The creek overflows it's banks regularly (see pictures attached). Plans show 2 detention ponds that will add to existing concerns. Have appropriate studies been conducted to minimize the impact of the development on storm water drainage via the creek? Note, French Run creek adds to the collective drainage flooding city hall parking lot and adjacent buildings. This concern impacts Reynoldsburg as a community.

The plan shows a large quantity of existing trees that will be saved. Grading is a concern for these trees and for our trees near our adjacent property line. Concern is existing trees will not tolerate grade changes. Please ensure developer takes appropriate steps to maintain existing grade and not damage the ravines natural areas.

How will all of the additional traffic on Taylor Rd be handled? Taylor Rd is already to congested, especially when school starts and stops. The development is very close to Taylor Road Elementary. Two new developments on Taylor between Main and Broad will further add to the problem. Taylor Road was just repaved and no new lanes or improvements were incorporated. Have appropriate traffic studies been completed? Do these studies account for both new developments? Do the traffic studies account for non Covid (non remote learning) Taylor Elementary congestion? Some of the existing documentation published is not readable. What is the indoor square footage range of the new dwellings?

How is the development going to be marketed; rental or individually owned condos?

Paperwork shows the existing property as vacant. The existing home has had a tenant for over 4 years. Not sure it makes a difference but the existing single family home on the property it is not vacant.

Personally we believe Reynoldsburg would be better served by not allowing this development. The planned housing is not consistent with the surrounding single family home community. Established neighborhoods do not benefit from squeezing an apartment complex in the middle of a single family home

development. Multi-point access to the development on what are now courts with roads already in disrepair does not bode well with present day owners. This community would be best served by a development of single family units with a higher cost of ownership, lower per acre population density, and less traffic. Please enter this email into public record. If these topics will be covered in the Zoom meeting on Thursday, August 27 or a future scheduled meeting, please send us an invite.

Email sent in by Mr. Cox:

As an adjacent property owner of the above stated property, I have a two primary concerns regarding the intended plans for the upcoming future development of the Ravines at Taylor. First, my property has a creek which takes runoff water from Taylor Woods. If you look at the attached photos you will see that my property gets flooded whenever we have an inch or two of rainfall. This used to occur about once every two or three years. However, in the past five years, as more properties have been developed on the backside of Taylor Woods, the flooding occurs at least twice a year, sometimes more. The powerful, rushing water has shaken loose one of my bridge's footers, not to mention bringing all sorts of debris and unwanted garbage into my yard, which could also become a serious health issue. According to the posted plans, this new development includes two new detention basins, which appear to dump excess water down the hillside, into the creek that is already at capacity when it rains an inch or two. My property already takes enough water runoff for the city of Reynoldsburg. This appears to be a serious problem which needs to be addressed prior to the building of this development. I would appreciate someone explaining how this additional water, being added to an already over used creek, can be avoided. Second, currently there are two families who live on the property at 8617 Taylor Road SW. The plans for the Ravines at Taylor, will change the property to approximately 79 town home units. This will bring more people, pets, and debris to the backside of all adjoining properties. Even though the backside of my property is woods, I really don't want the additional traffic or clutter on my property. No home owner would. Posting "No Trespassing" or "Private Property" signs will not stop these unwanted "guests". Therefore, I would like the developer to build a 6-8 foot privacy fence on the perimeter of the

new development, especially for the wooded properties extending from Taylor Road east towards the back of the new development that will be called the Ravines at Taylor. I realize that the wheels of progress are already in motion for this project. However, my concerns are real in that they will have a huge impact on the existing homeowners in the immediate area. I would like to think that we deserve a little consideration in this matter. The time to address these two issues is BEFORE you permit the developer to start the project.

Mr. Hicks: Were there pictures included in that of the flooding?

Ms. Wheeler: They were attachments to the email. I can try to pull those up if you give me a few moments here.

Mr. Zollars: Where are you going with this question? Just for the sake of time.

Mr. Hicks: I was just hoping to understand where this property was that's having flooding problems and if we could see flooding up next to the house. I was just curious and hoping it was already printed off to view.

Mr. Bowsher: Additionally. Mr. Hicks, we'll get into that in a little bit. Emily had forwarded that email to us, the city engineer and myself and we'll get into that once we get into the application.

Mr. Hicks: I'm sure it will be addressed but I want to make sure those pictures are part of the record.

Mr. Zollars: Mayor next?

Mr. Mayor Begeny: Members of the Planning Commission, Good evening, While I am addressing you tonight, this is also for the residents of the City of Reynoldsburg, and those who hope to live in Reynoldsburg in the future. These last few weeks have seen a lot of discussion about the role of City Government in Development. To save time I will condense the process.

In January of 2018 the previous Reynoldsburg City council passed a Comprehensive Master Plan detailing a shared vision for the future of Reynoldsburg at a cost of \$120K. As you can see with exhibit 1, this is a "Future Land Use" map that was a product of the Comprehensive Master Plan.

The next step was to allocate over \$150K in funds to Calfee to create a comprehensive zoning plan based in large part on the Comprehensive Master Plan. For 11 months the previous council was kept informed of the progress of the zoning plans, including a Public Hearing in October of 2019 where the Comprehensive Master Plan and the proposed zoning map at the time. The previous council and the Planning Commission made their suggestions and recommended changes to numerous areas. Seeing that the plan was not ready for a vote, the previous Council left it to the incoming Council to finish the work they started.

In the first few months of 2020, Council had a “work session” to get up to speed on where the zoning plan was before any action was taken. Even planning commission had continued suggestions for revision. Most of the attention was towards the proposed Waggoner Road Apartments the Council listened to the community and denied the change. Other areas were brought up, including the area off Lancaster Ave, specifically mentioned at the Thursday February 13th meeting where changes to this area were proposed by a resident, and those changes were also accepted in the final zoning code. This makes sense as to not take the majority of work done under the previous Council and waste the tax payer’s money by reject that work. This brings us to today.

The city established a zoning plan, developed under two different councils over 18 months, to streamline the process for the development. This process is a key discussion point with new developers of commercial and residential properties, and they are thrilled with the opportunity our city presents them. There are checks and balances and a thorough review process that will continue to improve as we move forward, with several revisions planned to be introduced to

council in September. Our hope is that bringing in various levels of residential development will strengthen our case that businesses like Cameron Mitchell, Jeni's Ice Cream, and entertainment options would be profitable to them. All of that being said, this is about private landowners selling their land to a developer. The city works with the developer to make sure their development matches our code and our comprehensive plan, and if the zoning code needs to change, we welcome it, we just need to know what changes are needed.

The large majority of Reynoldsburg lives up to the city of respect, but occasionally, typically on social media, that respect ends at the keyboard. Statements that apartments bring in crime, lower property values, attract the "wrong sort of people" are common. Given the history of Reynoldsburg it is easy to see why some people feel that way. Years of neglect towards existing apartment complexes have only added to these views. Every day our code enforcers are out holding apartment complexes accountable for their properties. One week ago tonight a complex appealed their violation, screening around dumpsters. Their defense of why they had not followed the code had two points, one: City codes had not been enforced so it was unreasonable to expect compliance now, and the second was using the Fair Housing Act saying the code improvements would increase rent on the mostly low income tenants they served at this location. While I found their defense laughable and insulting, we did come to an agreement to the dispute. We held them accountable. This is not the last time we will bring those who don't feel the rules apply to them. We will hold all apartments/condos/townhomes accountable.

What I want is for everyone's idea of the American Dream to be available to them here in Reynoldsburg. Thank you for your time.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Application #2020-5357; 1170 Lancaster Avenue; Applicant Laurie Gunzelman; Major Site Plan - the Oliver

Ms. Gunzelman: I'm with Gunzelman Architecture Interiors and I'll be representing The Oliver project and will presenting it to you this evening. First off I would like to thank the city of Reynoldsburg, its residents and the members of the Planning Commission for the opportunity to present this project this evening. It's been a long time in the planning process and we are really excited about it. So the proposed project that we are working on it's a new medium density residential development with both townhouse and apartment units in the site. It's a four and a half acre site north of the church on Lancaster Avenue. The townhouse units, there's 32 total units, both two and three bedroom units. The first level is an attached garage and the first level of living space actually occurs on the second level and the bedrooms are on the third level in each of the townhouse units. The apartments, which are actually located in the center of the development has 56 total units. They are divided into 18 unit type buildings with open stairways. We have green space in the middle of those apartment dwellings. If we want to go to that next slide maybe you can see some of that information I'm talking about. So there's green space on the inside, which we have green space and balconies that look down into those courtyards. We are also creating a bit of a boulevard that happens from north to south with a park pavilion happening on the very end. The intent is that we would add a lot of trees and greenery so these would be walk able spaces. A lot of developments that happen don't have a lot of areas to walk, this is meant to have sidewalks and meant to be enjoyed by not only the community that we are developing but by neighboring communities as well. This is not meant to be isolated. We are really creating a vision or people to be able to walk through and feel conformable walking by someone's home. I think the other comments that have occurred is the parking. We do have two parking spaces per each townhouse unit and we have one plus for the apartments. The apartments are both two bedroom two bath, as well as two bedroom one bath and one bedroom one bath. So there's a nice mix of different types of units that would be for rental. The townhouse development is for the, for sale product. It is being sold at market rate. I believe there is some comments about this being subsidized house, it is not, and it will be at fair market value. The elevations that we are proposing for the community is really taking cues from the architecture that is happening the city of Columbus. We're using materials that are durable and easy to maintain. There will be black windows and we'll have board and batten siding and brick. We'll also have some other cement board type product. Most of the elements that we are using are actually a nice blend of materials. The development also has a few amenities, it has a dog park, that's really meant to be a community space. We understand that there are neighbors around the property that would benefit from something like that. We have also looked at FEMA maps and have looked at the areas of flooding and we are in the area of minimal flood hazard for this particular area. We have also looked at the opportunity to create connections both north and south to various areas. As far as a traffic study and other things that may have been mentioned, of course we are doing our due diligence and having traffic studies performed as well as all the other types of code and regulatory requirements that a development of this nature requires. I did talk to the developer and he is really invested in working with the community, He wants this to be integrated in with the neighbors. He does not want people to feel as this is going to be something that is an isolated community. He works with an

experienced team and is respectful of the comments that were presented this evening. He endeavors to work with the city and creating an environment that is walk able, that is meant to be projected as a nice quiet neighborhood and he wants to be a good neighbor. Understand that he will endeavor to work with you to make sure that happens. This is some of the renderings that we have. There's another rendering that shows the apartment block. This is the apartments and again we plan to incorporate a lot of trees in the development as well as shrubbery and greenery to soften the built structures. This is actually what would be viewed from Lancaster.

Mr. Zollars: What I would like to do since I can't see anyone is maybe go down alphabetical order and if you have comments, let get those all out. Mr. Benner, do you want to add something?

Mr. Bowsher: Pat real quick. I was writing down some really good questions that some of the individuals have brought up and working with this applicant and the developer. I just wanted to touch on those so we didn't have to re discuss multiple ones that maybe the commissioners might bring up as well, so maybe we can hammer those out. I want to make it clear that the application before you tonight in a major site plan approval, it is not a rezoning. I know that got brought up a few times, it's not being rezoned. How the Waggoner Road and Taylor Road developments were previously, this is a major site plan, the zoning was already approved. There is a side exit to the south. I know Laurie didn't mention that. That is to the south exit and it actually goes to the other exit. I know someone had actually brought up emergency access. That is there for emergency access. There was meant ion about eight foot setbacks. We have an aggregate for the City of Reynoldsburg in our zoning code, so when talking to the developer earlier, one of the conditions for that tonight for the sides to be ten feet, which they have already agreed to. So we will need to make that condition because what is being shown tonight is eight foot side yard setbacks. I think it was also said that is was an eight foot rear. That's actually a 30 foot setback to the rear and this picture here gives a pretty good landscape of the surrounding landscaping. In our zoning code we do require professional landscaping to buffer that. I know fences got brought up tonight and I'll leave that to the Planning Commission to decide with the developer on how they would like to approach that, or if they feel lushier landscaping can be done. Additionally, I want to make it clear that the property as it stands right now does not pay taxes as a religions representation owns the piece currently, so there's no taxes being generated currently. So anything would be a net plus for the school district who would receive about 60% of the property taxes on this development. That would be paid by the property management and owner of the apartments in the center, as well as the individual town home owners that surround. The biggest thing that I wanted to talk about that got brought up was the water impact, which I'll also talk about for the next application. The two wetlands in the front, the purpose of those are the water retention purposes that are needed and required for this site. We'll go into a much further site, civil design with our city engineer. They will have to go through City of Columbus jurisdiction to get water, sewer. They'll pay it, obviously, through Reynoldsburg, but it becomes; there's a calculations that they have to meet to end up building in the end. Additionally, those wetlands could have just been ponds. The developer has opted to make them greenspace active space. And with this development, you're probably seeing a lot of flooding because it's an empty field. Therefore, you get a lot of sheeting. We've been dealing with this a lot across

the city and we've had one of the wettest record years on record. I think it's the second ever. So there's a lot of water that's out there. Additionally, there's a 132 parking spaces in the development with a total of 88 units. The zoning code actually allowed this development to go up to about one hundred and twelve total units. So they're much lower than that. And then they have one hundred and thirty two parking spaces. That does not include the sixty four spaces within the garage, in addition to that. So I just wanted to put that information out. I know that there may have been some questions. Additionally, I know that it got brought up about lot coverage. We have a 60 percent lot coverage for developments they're at 66 percent. Their allowance to the sixty six percent per code was because they are allowing that dog park to be active for the neighborhood at large to come on there, as well as the additional wetland and green space. Then added on top of that, they're not using just impervious pavement. The middle aisle and some of the entrance actually impervious, meaning they'll be utilizing some form of paver, which allows the water to penetrate and seep in naturally. Therefore, they get a credit for that part of the zoning code. So I just wanted to brush on some of the really good questions that were brought up tonight so people can have some factual answers to those.

Mr. Hicks Just to clarify, Andrew real quick. The hatching all that plan is pervious, not impervious pavement, right. Water will run through the areas that are hatched.

Mr. Bowsher: Correct. I said that opposite, and I did not mean to.

Mr. Zollars OK. Well, since we started with sort of an alphabetical order with Mr. Bowsher. Mr. Benner, you want to pick it up from there and you have any questions or comments for anyone?

Mr. Benner I do miss Gunzelman, thank you very much for your presentation. On the application it indicates that Mr. Oliver, is the owner of the property. Is that accurate?

Ms. Gunzelman I know he is in current; working with the lot split to achieve the ownership of that property.

Mr. Benner So the answer would be no, he does not.

Ms. Gunzelman He does not own it at this time.

Mr. Benner And may I ask just for my own personal. Why is Mr. Oliver not here?

Ms. Gunzelman He had an unexpected family emergency that he had to attend to.

Mr. Benner Very good. Thank you very much. Are you part of the Principal Home LLC? I believe that's who is, is that his company that's going to be doing this development?

Ms. Gunzelman Yes, that's his company. I don't have no ownership in his company. I see you're just authorized to speak for him tonight. I'm his agent, of the owner.

Mr. Benner Do you know how long; does he have any other experience in multi-family development?

Ms. Gunzelman To my knowledge, this is the first of this type. He does do multifamily and residential improvements and development, but this is the first of this type of project.

Mr. Benner OK. Well, the Web site, I could only find where there was some house flips that were done. Who will manage the apartments?

Ms. Gunzelman I don't have that information. Sorry.

Mr. Benner Wow. OK. And you said, how will you arrive at your market rate for these for the sales for the townhome units?

Ms. Gunzelman At this time? What we've been talking about is we will be looking at comp sales in the area to understand how the market is doing and set those prices at that time. And it wouldn't just likely occur somewhere within probably 75 percent, construction documents.

Mr. Benner OK. And this is, purchasing land and developing this a very expensive proposition. Do we have any idea as far as timeline when this might start, finish?

Ms. Gunzelman We have a projected schedule based on approvals, and a lot of this will depend on civil because civil takes a lot longer and engineering takes a lot longer than building obviously does. We also have to go through an Ohio EPA approval process. We have projected out that we believe that we'll be starting, hoping to break ground sometime late March, early April.

Mr. Benner Thank you.

Mr. Zollars Thank you, Mr. Cullinan.

Mr. Cullinan I think the concerns I had about development were brought up by the residents going forward about the three story, two story, maybe one story in the surrounding areas. But I mean no further comments, other than what Mr. Benner brought up along with the residents.

Mr. Zollars OK. Mr. Furst, do you have anything?

Mr. Furst Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for a public record, I live right down the road from this development; I live on Lancaster Avenue in Olde Reynoldsburg. When I moved into town, the home immediately across the street, there was a blighted property that also joins Mr. Hicks property had been blighted and abandoned for over a decade. My own home was in a state of disrepair and now it is worth, according to the latest property values I was able to ascertain, more than twice what I paid for it. I think this particular project adds immense value to not only the neighborhood, but also to our Reynoldsburg as a whole. I grew up outside of New Albany and I remember it before anything was there at all but cornfields. If

you move this project just a couple of miles up the road on Reynoldsburg- New Albany Road in New Albany, at the proposed pricing that has been shown, they would eat this up. Every unit would be occupied immediately. I think this is just a tremendous opportunity that we have for the city of Reynoldsburg, using very high quality materials. I think it's a very attractive design esthetically and I'm very appreciative of the applicant for bringing it forward.

Mr. Zollars Thanks, Mr. Furst. Mr. Hicks, you want make some comments or questions?

Mr. Hicks Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Mr. Furst mentioned, I live on Lancaster Avenue, south of Main Street. When, I'll kind of share the same kind of the same story. My wife and I bought our house on the south part main street. It was vacant and had been empty for 10 years and rundown abandoned. Lot overgrown with trees, and most of the houses around us were in poor condition. That was 2012. From that point until today, our neighborhood is significantly changed and improved. Old Reynoldsburg now has places to go and things to do, Prost and the new Vicks. It's the lifestyle and old Reynoldsburg has significantly changed. I'd like to make. Mr. Chairman, I promise I'll try to be brief. But this project, I think there are some valid concerns and I think there are some things with neighbors that we need to make sure that we are addressing. I'm always a stickler when it comes to property boundaries and the set back only being eight feet, but then, you know, potentially 10 feet here to the property, to the north, I think is of great concern. And the properties that backup to this property on the back. I think we need to make sure that we are properly addressing our residents and neighbors concerned. I think that this is the type of project that overall fits within what we were hoping to achieve. Going through this long process of planning and rezoning of the city, because I think that old Reynoldsburg will become denser. There will be more density. It will be more walkable. More housing closer to the center of our city is a good thing. Regards to the lifestyle and what's going to happen with that understanding that there will be additional traffic from this project, but additional traffic has to be mitigated and we can mitigate traffic through the tax revenue that it will be generated in order to update our infrastructure and our road system to accommodate that. Some of the specific things that I think that we as a board need to consider is the building height. I think that if this was two story townhomes with the two story gardens in the middle would be much easier to approve. I think having the two stories above the garage effectively making it a three story building, backing directly up to single family and single story single family down the street makes it somewhat challenging. So if there's a way that the developer can accommodate, same goals here, this project and taking the three stories down to two, I think that that would significantly reduce the amount of concern from the neighbors. Sort of a technical thing. The wetlands out front in regards to storm water. I think that we need more detail on how those are going to be planted and maintained. A wet basin is tried and true had been done many times before. I'm not saying that I would prefer a wet basin over a wetland basin, but I have done wetland basins before on other projects and other municipalities and I have had to be educated on them and that they do require very specific planting details and also different than what most people are used to rehearse to maintenance requirements, which are details that I think could be addressed in a plot grade and utility plan, which would come later in our process. But I want to make sure that something like that is addressed because it's going to be front and center on this project. I want to make sure that wouldn't become an eyesore because

it wouldn't be maintained properly. So that needs to be on a plan, how it's addressed and to end up doing wet basins with fountains in them, that's OK too. No problem with that. The vegetated buffer around the property. Obviously, there's a need for it on the northern property line, single family owner on that side. There's currently no vegetative buffer shown on the south side where there is parking lot. This is less of a concern about the church. I don't think that residents of the church are going to be concerned, but that when those cars are parking, the headlights are going to be pointed directly into all of these units. So I think that a vegetative buffer needs to be included on the south side. And I think that we need to, if the units are going to be three story. Something else needs to be done with the vegetative buffer on the north side, because those units will be visible from that property owner and their backyard or in your house or garage or anything. So, something needs to be changed there specifically. Another detail, the asphalt shingles, the section that you showed on asphalt shingles is like a square. It looks like sort of a 15 year is what they call it, asphalt shingle. I think that we would expect that and Reynoldsburg to be a dimensional shingle. Like what they call it shake style. Or if you're able to do a metal roof, which is what it sort of looks like on some of the renderings or some of the black and white drawings of the buildings. But that sort of 15 year shingle I don't think would be appropriate. It would need to be a higher quality shingle. I think that's probably more just sort of an oversight. But I want to make sure that that's pointed out and addressed. The last thing I'd like to address is sort of the wow factor when you look at the elevations of a project like this, and I can completely understand people that have lived in Reynoldsburg for a significant amount of time to see elevations like this close to their home and to be concerned. But that same wow factor also incorporates all of the change that we are seeing in Reynoldsburg. It just happens to all sort of come out to you in an elevation of a building. I think that buildings like this that are a modern farmhouse look certainly are within the times and every development and house in this community is all sort of a creature of when it was created. This is this is sort of the cutting edge of where we are on what's going to happen with development. Aesthetically I think it is pleasing. And I think this property is specifically not an old Reynoldsburg district. I advocated to make sure that that neighborhood, just the south of it, was included and old Reynoldsburg. And we're going through this process. I'm an advocate for old Reynoldsburg. I live in old Reynoldsburg. And I kind of joke that I want old Reynoldsburg to be more historically, to be kind of silly. I think this project being adjacent to it just to the north is a great transition from what we want to try to do in old Reynoldsburg. This is a hardy plank project. This is not a project made out of vinyl. This is a hardy plank project, which is much more expensive to develop, and it will definitely add value to our community. So to conclude my comments and questions, I think ultimately I'm supportive of the project. But the three story issue needs to be addressed. I think that it may be best if we table this for a month and ask the developer to see if they can figure out a way to address the height issue with the adjacent single story, single family homes that surround this project.

Mr. Zollars Thanks, Mr. Hicks. Couple of things. I do agree, I think this is a beautiful look. I think it's going to enhance downtown. It's going to do a lot of good things for the Reynoldsburg community. Coming down Lancaster. Would you guys would can we entertain maybe the thought of putting a duplex or separating those four units that stick out like a sore thumb, a put two on one side and two on the other, maybe an entrance in there so they can incorporate the larger homes coming down from Main Street towards this community that

way it will separate it out. Maybe not give a first impression.

Mr. Furst So real quick here, Mr. Zollars and Mr. Hicks. I think we are a little limited in the requests that we can make of the developer here, given that the majority of this plan is already in spec, according to our code here. So let's kind of piecemeal it out here and see what exactly what changes we want to make. But, I think we are a little limited in what we can request.

Mr. Zollars Well, I mean to get it approved. They'll have to get it approved. I heard what you said, but that would be something that just some thoughts there, maybe separate those four and to have two on one side two on the other. What is the ceiling heights in there?

Ms. Gunzelman Ceiling heights are ten, nine and nine for the townhouse units. Then on the... I'm sorry, it's nine, ten and nine. The ten foot is the main living level and the apartments are nine feet.

Mr. Zollars Well, maybe that would be that would accomplish a little bit to get to the reduction in height. Maybe the pitch in the room would further the possibly impact the height. Just thoughts.

Ms. Gunzelman Well, the project design is within their thirty five foot height restriction already. It would just reduce the overall height at the height of the buildings.

Mr. Zollars Yes. As someone said, they heard someone in the discussions that this was a 48 foot building.

Ms. Gunzelman It is not.

Mr. Zollars I don't think so either. OK. And these are very large units. Twenty four hundred square feet is a large unit. I assume that's somewhere around 500 square feet in a garage which addresses parking. That's still nineteen hundred square feet. That's a very good sized place.

Ms. Gunzelman Three bedrooms. Yes, for the end units. Then the middle units are two bedrooms.

Mr. Zollars Yeah. So you still take five hundred off that that's still a decent sized living facility. So those are the questions. Hold on one second. I had one other comment. I guess I did write them all down. So Mr. Furst, you're saying that separating this four units is beyond our requests capabilities?

Mr. Furst I would defer perhaps to Mr. Bowsher or the city attorney. But I do know that significant changes to this probably would not be legal according to our powers and responsibilities, given that (inaudible).

Mr. Zollars Would anyone be anyone be able to answer that Andrew or Mr. Shook's fill in? I

don't know your name. I'm sorry.

Mr. Shaw Oh, yes. Michael Shaw, assistant city attorney, filling in for Mr. Shook. Mr. Furst is correct. The planning commission could suggest or request changes. However, they're very limited in their abilities to mandate them.

Mr. Zollars OK, that's fine, let's just take your questions and everyone's got questions and answers. So that's why I questioned. Plus, I think it would probably make things a little easier going forward and tie the old two story houses right into two plus or three. I like it. I think it's a beautiful look and I think it fits well in the city. The buffering, fencing, something along those lines. Things should be considered as well.

Mr. Bowsher: Pat, I did want to mention one thing to kind of bring it up in an earlier phase, they actually didn't have any units sort of fronted Lancaster. I think one of the design esthetics that Laurie brought, which she was talking about Lancaster or was she brought those units up to the front because, yes, they're three stories, but there's actually three story homes on Lancaster. All on the other side of the on the on the road on the west side. You may consider them as attic space, but that's almost what these are as well because of the hip of the roof. And they actually stair stepped them to make them in line with those existing homes so it would keep that existing character straight down Lancaster. That was a request by our department to have to see that. So it would tie in a little closer when you were driving down Lancaster. So I appreciated them adopting that.

Mr. Zollars I agree with you and that's exactly where I was going with that. I'm just saying, if we had two and two instead of four, it might be easier to swallow. Well, then I heard Mr. Hicks say he'd like to table it. Do you have another question or comment?

Mr. Hicks Yeah, I mean, just a few details and Ms. Gunzelman. And you are the architect of current buildings, correct? You know, some of the things that we were discussing here, the current pitch of the roof is obviously intentionally fairly steep. A lot of times communities ask for steep pitch roofs. I get that. Would there be a way to sort of combine a reduction in the steepness of the pitch, not make it a 312 pitch, almost a flat roof. I'm not asking that, but some reduction in steepness of the grooves and a reduction possibly at ceiling heights or altered ceilings and things like that in order to try to get the buildings down a little bit or some way of scaling the buildings from two story to three story in a way that has a little bit more awareness on the scale of the buildings that surround this project. To the north, you have a single story or maybe a split level. I'm sorry, a single family home and in the back you have single story ranch style homes. Are there ways that you can sort of rearrange site in order to accomplish that or make slight modifications to your design of your buildings in order to just kind of reduce their height? I've seen other projects where they put two story type buildings in certain areas and then three story buildings and the facts of that sort of scales up. Just asking. In your professional opinion, this particular site and your product that you design for your client, if there is any ideas that you would have built, maybe help address some of the community's concerns.

Ms. Gunzelman Well, thank you for the opportunity to comment on that. If you look at this,

even at this 3D perspective, you can kind of see on that front entry piece how that second story on the very end, how it steps back. Obviously, that presents itself as a smaller scale. So there are opportunities to be able to do certain types of architectural changes to create those types of setbacks that actually make the building look smaller when you're standing next to it. No one ever really sees a building, flat on like this elevations present themselves. They look at them from a perspective such as this taken across the street or something. So obviously, you know adjusting roof pitches and things like that is something that we can do. You know, the steeper pitched roof is actually a more expensive build. So the client is actually creating a much more expensive type product to create a certain esthetic. But there's all these things that we can do to reduce ceiling heights and roof pitches.

Mr. Zollars Mr. Hicks, you said something about I heard you say the word table. You want to conclude this discussion for the time being via some sort emotion or table action?

Mr. Hicks Well, I mean, reading the code and I appreciate the assistant city attorney here being tonight. I think within the code we are required to make sure that these projects for a major site plan like what this is, meet the requirements of the code or the intent of the code. And being that this is a new zoning code that we have all worked very hard on. I want to make sure that we are not starting off the wrong foot with our residents and our neighbors. I think that I would love to give the opportunity for the developer to make some adjustments to this project in order to incorporate some of the issues that have been brought up tonight. Specifically in regard to height or streetscape from Lancaster of what it would look like. I think that tabling this to our next month's meeting could result in us all having a much better project. So stating all that, I'd like to hear by move that we table this application until our next. Well, our next scheduled meeting is next week. Not to be all technical about this. I'd like to move to table this until our October meeting, which would be October.

Mr. Shaw Mr. Hicks, if I could interject briefly, the Planning Commission can table a decision. You just have to make a decision within 60 days of the actual application. So you could table this discussion for now.

Mr. Hicks So would the scheduled meeting on October 8th.

Mr. Zollars OK. It's that a motion? Can you phrase it as a motion, please?

Mr. Benner Mr. Chairman, can I add something, please? It would seem to me that with the 60 day limit, if we go out to October, we may put undue burden on the developer. Although I would very much like Mr. Hicks, appreciate if the developer himself were able to attend and answer some of these questions. Ms. Gunzelman has been very kind. She's well aware that she's within our zoning code and we're making requests. But she did initiate her comments saying that the developer was invested in the community and looking forward to working with the community. I think if we can delay this, even if we have to have a special meeting for a period of time so that he can come and hear the changes that we would all maybe like to see, and have time to look at that, to decide about that and stay within the 60 days. I would agree that we should table. I'm just not sure we should wait until October to come back.

Mr. Zollars That's well, the next meetings in, what, 10 days? Whenever the next meeting is, it's right around the corner. Because this is a 27th already and we only have 60 days.

Mr. Bowsher: So whether we want to have the regular scheduled meeting as originally planned back in January for next Thursday, we do have a BZBA meeting that has an application. It's actually the second one on our sheet for tonight. So if you're electing two that would give them seven days as a turnaround. If not, I believe that we would need to call a special meeting later in September.

Mr. Hicks I don't think it's practical to ask the professionals, like Ms. Gunzelman, to make any significant change within seven days. But again, I don't want to delay anything. Any decision that we want to make in regards to this application all the way back to October. So I would respectfully like to ask if we could call a special meeting, 17th. I mean, what works for the rest of planning commission?

Mr. Benner Ms. Gunzelman, what works for you?

Ms. Gunzelman I'm glad you asked. Seven days would be a little challenging. I'm thankful that you didn't vote for that. We can meet something on 17, 9-17.

Mr. Furst And for the record, I'm available on that date as well, and I would prefer that we call a special meeting instead of delay to October.

Mr. Hicks Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion. I would like to move that we table this application to a specially schedule planning commission meeting on September 17th.

Mr. Benner I'll second.

Mr. Zollars We had a first and second. Emily, can you call the roll on that please?

Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Cullinan. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes. Mr. Hicks. Yes. Mr. Zollars. Yes

1:00:01

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 9/17/2020 6:30 PM
AYES:	Cullinan, Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner	

2. Application #2020-5347; 8617 Taylor Road SW; Applicant Christopher Bruzzese (Berardi + Partners, Inc.); Major Site Plan - Ravines at Taylor

Mr. Zollars: One more. Let's get number two started so we can keep moving, please.

Ms. Wheeler: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll give you an overview of this case, a little echo in the room. This application is number 2020-5347, for a major site plan at 8617 Taylor Road Southwest property is within the suburban residential zone. The

applicant, Chris Bruzzese of Berardi and Partners Inc., is requesting Planning Commission approval of a major site plan for the construction of a new residential development consisting of 128 town home units with a central clubhouse. This does include a mix of 98, two bedroom and 30 three bedroom units. There is an existing single family home on what is a 15.2 acre site. This development will go before the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals on September 3rd for conditional use approval. I do believe the applicants are on if they want to share more about the development. I will pull up the site plan.

Mr. Bruzzese: While Emily is doing that, let me introduce myself, I'm Chris Bruzzese with Berardi Partners. I have Larry Blackstreet with me, the project director, and Tom Warner is also present civil engineer with Advanced Civil Design. Thank you, Emily, for that introduction. Thank you. Members of the Planning Commission for your time tonight. As Emily indicated, we're proposing 128 attach single family units, all of two story structures. We have a mix of eight unit buildings and two twelve unit buildings to reach our unit count, together with a one story club house. You can see the site lay out there at the front. We have a courtyard arrangement with four buildings. Also, when you enter the property, the clubhouse is immediately in view. Other amenities that we are providing together with the clubhouse includes a swimming pool to the rear. The clubhouse also house a game room, a large common community space and administrative areas as well. Then as you go to the rear of the project, we have a double loaded corridor with buildings either side. As part of the development because of the eight unit building is being somewhat repetition as we're proposing two different exterior designs. And you don't need to go there yet Emily. I just want to mention there's going to be a mix of exterior designs as well as a range of colors and materials on the exterior of the buildings to give a project a visual variety. The site will be interconnected with sidewalks from the entrance all the way through to the rear. So it's going to be completely walkable and connected to the adjacent neighborhoods. As I mentioned, the structures are all two story. We have one story garage elements together with and ends of the buildings, which also step down, making it very much at scale with the adjacent residential houses. The proposed materials are a mix of brick and vinyl siding. The vinyl siding will have three different textures, with one half horizontal black siding together with vertical board and batten as well as a shaped shingle pattern. So between the mix of colors and textures and patterns, and these are not final, by the way. These are first look at our design. We've then process with Larry looking at other color schemes and mixes of patterns and textures. So we're still working on that. But as I mentioned, we have three different elevations together with four different color schemes. Again, provide variety. Some of the things that were brought up were concern about the site perimeter. We will provide landscape buffers around the perimeter to buffer the proposed development against the residential properties. Our setbacks are actually quite generous, ranging anywhere from 50 feet down. So I think the smallest setback we had was 29 feet. As far as engineering goes, if there are technical questions regarding that, Tom Warner here is available to answer those questions. We will meet all the city requirements for storm water detention and runoff, as well as any utility or site lighting issues that may exist. I think someone brought up whether we

did an environmental study. We do have environmental study in place and there are no issues that we're aware of at this time. So I think that's all I have to tell him. You want to open it up for discussion or questions.

Mr. Zollars: Commissioners, anyone want to get things started?

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, I do have I have one question. In our code. Well, first of all, that the decision in regards to density, I believe, won't actually be addressed by us. That's going to be addressed in regards to BZBA, how this project fits within the existing suburban residential zoning, but within the suburban residential zoning setbacks, rear setbacks, I believe, are determined at 30 feet for suburban residential zone. It's always goofy and somewhat odd in how setbacks. When you're talking about single family, it's normally pretty easy to understand, but at a multi-family project where they are, you know, sort of oriented in all different orientations with them a lot. I think one of my biggest concerns on this project is how this project gets along with the neighbors and the Southern and in some parts, the eastern property lines, and the proximity of those buildings. I don't see the setback number on there with that setback as to the property line. And then what buffering, vegetative, preferably plantings are included to help screen if those units are significantly closer to the rear set to the property line than what the adjacent single family is.

Mr. Bruzzese: So if you go to the previous drawing, I believe all of these set back dimensions are articulated along the south property line. And yes, regarding the landscape buffer, for that site, that landscape playing is obviously conceptual and not fully developed. We intend to meet any buffer requirements that the code requires along that property on. Forty seven. They're building four, 49 and building seven. It then goes to 53 below the line. As we move continued to the east you see the jog in the property line. We're down to 29 feet there. 27 at 12l and then 22 at the end of building 13 as you turn the corner back closer to 40 feet on the east property line. Yeah, Larry just made the point that there is considerable existing vegetation along the property line that we would never retain to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Hicks, you have any questions?

Mr. Hicks: No.

Mr. Zollars: A traffic study has been done. Am I reading this document correctly between 50 and 200 peak hour trips?

Mr. Warner: This is Tom Warner with Advanced Civil Design. A specific traffic impact study has not been provided for the property at this time.

Mr. Zollars: We got something here for use for a major site plans, and they're between 50 and 200 peak hours X'ed.

Mr. Bowsher: They did submit a traffic access study which was required for the conditional use to be reviewed by BZBA. While, I have the floor. I was hoping to address some of the concerns and questions that were sort of brought up, and then I do have one condition that needs to be made based off of an adjacent property owner. Emily, if you could move to the north of that detention pond, we will get that out of the way. There is a home that is to the north or to the side of that property. Its current easement allows its access to Taylor Road. The developer is currently working with that property owner through a contract to build a separate road to the north. And we won't get into the specifics of that civil matter. However, there does need to be a condition that is made that normal access pre and during the construction is at all times there. In addition, there needs to be a permanent access that is from that occupied home. Either via through the neighborhood itself, but I actually think it's going to be going up north into Canada court as that property owner also owns a small parcel to the north. So I want to make that very clear that there needs to be normal access during all phases of construction. In addition, there needs to be a permanent paved, whether that's asphalt, pavers or concrete. That is a matter between the developer and that homeowner, but that needs to be done, and that does need to be a condition that's placed into this because there is not a signed contract currently. So I just want to make sure I don't care who does that. But if we do approve this tonight, that does need to be put in there. Additionally, I wanted to talk about some of the water quality problems sort of over in that area, just as we kind of touched on a little bit through Lancaster. I had our city engineer take a look at these, as well as some of the pictures that I think I had actually sent back to Emily. That is some of the flooding concerns. This is to the east of the property line. Therein lies, sort of a kind of a rainwater collection point. I know the property owner to the north has had several problems with that and not even being able to utilize their own easement. One of the major concerns that we had as the city was making sure that we're not going to add to that problem. In fact, making sure that we're going to mitigate some of that. So I had Ryan Andrews our city engineer take a look. What we are going to insure is when we get into the plot grade utility of this development is that those detention ponds are made specific to hold water and not to release it, to cause further issues. And in fact, it will actually make all of the homes to the east and to the north much more friendly to the storm water collection because there will be holding it into a pond and not just lead to spread out within that field. So that will be resolved. There are plenty of laws that are already on the books to protect civilly other property owners and their property rights from disturbances to their property noise ordinances as well as water collection. That's an absolute civil matter from one property to another. So all those will need to be taken into consideration. Just like any other development that gets built along this, I wanted to bring that up because I know that there was a concern resident that had absolute valid concerns. And we will ensure everything that we can as the city through any sort of engineering process and through the construction process to maintain that to that level. We also require silt fences, which will be put around the property during construction to take down debris and things of those natures. Those are all covered later in different phases when we get to those. I think there was a trash compactor that got brought up, so maybe the developer can take a look at that. And then there

was a fence. They would need a variance just like anybody else. We need a variance of an eight foot fence. But I'd allow Planning Commission to make that call whether they would want a privacy fence to be over there or just some really great vegetation and screening later on. This will be next Thursday for BZBA for the conditional use. They will review that conditional use. This, again, as submitted is for the major site plan. One other thing that I wanted to talk about is to the East. Since we've got it on the screen, you can see that those are a different mix. That is a paver to the east side. And yes, that is a connection to that road that is to the east. But that is not a connection point. There will be breakaway bollards. Those are that entrance is only for emergency vehicles only. They'll be metal bollards put in. That will have a breakaway speed. So if a fire truck needs to get there through access, they will be able to. But that will not be open to the public for the homes to go through the development or from this development to go into the neighborhood behind. So there will be that buffer space. I know there were some concerns about that. Outside of that, that concludes everything that I needed to discuss.

Mr. Zollars: Commissioner's comments, questions.

Mr. Furst: Mr. Chairman, did you want to run the alphabet here again or you just want me to jump in?

Mr. Zollars: Just jump in.

Mr. Furst: Personally in regards to the neighbors and that the screening, given that we consistently hear that people enjoy the rural charm of Reynoldsburg, I would be more supportive of increasing the vegetative screening for the adjoining properties than requesting any sort of fence be erected. That's really my only comment.

Mr. Zollars: That's a good point. I agree.

Mr. Hicks: I agree. I think I think the vegetative stuff grows and becomes integrates in the community much better and fences become eyesores.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Benner, Mr. Cullinan, anything?

Mr. Cullinan: No comment.

Mr. Benner: Well, my only question at this point, Mr. Bowsher, the whole access point for the house that's on there, I'm not following that quite like maybe I should. If that's going to have to be a condition, I'd like to understand it better, where it's located now and how it's going to be located or what our condition should look like.

Mr. Bowsher: I understand, Mr. Benner, thank you. Miss Wheeler, can you bring up that map one more time? I will try to explain that. Can you see the house that is in the gray right there that has the pull to the east of it or yes, to the east of it? You do see that, Mr. Benner? That that home right there currently, as it stands, you can see

the driveway as it moves to the south. There's a little bridge that goes over the little creek that's back there. And it goes out in an actual follows that gravel drive out to Taylor Drive. So the development as it stands will be taking over that home. The homeowner owns the other home with the other pool. That's further to the west. All of that will be demo. That's private property. They're the ones that are selling this to the developer. My request and it does need to be added. This is not an option because there is an in-place legal easement. It needs to be added, it's not a question. What we need to do is, is we need to add a condition if we're going to approve this. We need to add a condition that there needs to be normal access during all phases of construction and permanent access either to the north or permanent access through the neighborhood. I believe this property owner and the developer are working on a contract. Now, the developer can talk to at length to that. The city cannot. It's a civil matter between those two. I want to make it very clear that we need to make sure that that homeowner remains and retains excuse me, retains the access that they currently have now. Whether that be via Taylor road or a driveway gets built to the north into Canada court, which I think is where they're leaning. So that's what the condition needs to be made.

Mr. Hicks: Can I requests for technical requests like this that think is absolutely necessary. Can we get the address of the house that needs to maintain access to Taylor Road so that we can be very specific and precise and any conditions that we include on this.

Mr. Bowsher: Mr. Hicks, I'm going to grab that for you real quick. I don't have it off hand. Just give me one second.

Mr. Zollars: Well, what you'll get that Andrew. Berardi, Gentlemen, what are the square frontages of these units? You know, roughly?

Mr. Bruzzese: Roughly the two bedroom units are 1400 -1450, excluding the garage, the three bedroom units are close to 1730.

Mr. Zollars: Not including the garage. OK.

Mr. Bowsher: Mr. Zollars. I know you guys asked a question. 8619 Taylor Drive. That that is the home that needs to make sure that they maintain normal easement and access to that home.

Mr. Zollars: Anyone care to make a motion on this subject?

Mr. Bowsher: I do want to clarify, we also do need to add another condition onto this as well. That condition is, is that if we do approve this tonight, the condition is made that BZBA approves of the conditional use. So that needs to be put on their.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion. I'd like to move to approve the subject application conditional upon the following conditions. Firstly, that the

applicant get approval from BZBA for variance. I'm sorry. That the applicant achieve a conditional use from the BZBA. That the applicant include additional buffering, landscape buffering along the southern and eastern border of the property as approved by staff, and that the project provide throughout the entire construction and development process continuous ingress and egress to the property at 8619 Taylor Road.

Mr. Zollars: And Mr. Hicks, permanently. Don't forget to include permanent.

Mr. Bruzzese: So just to clarify. If the owner chooses to provide access to the north, they will not be at Taylor Road it would be at Canada Court.

Mr. Bowsher: And that would suffice. We just need to make sure that they have constant access either to the north or to Taylor Road. That is the condition.

Mr. Bruzzese: It's good.

Mr. Hicks: I'd like to amend my conditions to include clarification provided by Mr. Bowsher. Just to be clear.

Mr. Furst: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you, Mr. Furst. OK. We have the first and second for approval, would you call the roll please?

Ms. Wheeler: Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Cullinan. Abstain. Mr. Furst. Yes. Mr. Hicks. Yes. Mr. Zollars. Yes.

RESULT:	APPROVED CONDITIONALLY [4 TO 0]
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner
ABSTAIN:	Cullinan

E. OTHER BUSINESS

None

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman

Planning and Zoning Administrator