



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, JULY 6, 2017 6:00 PM

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. McKenzie: I would like to call to order the July 6, 2017 meeting, the Reynoldsburg Planning Commission.

PRESENT: McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, King

ABSENT: Weldon

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

Dr. McKenzie: Are there any requests for changes to the minutes? Do I have a copy? A different copy of the minutes here?

Mr. Snowden: I have one over here for you to sign. If you want it, absolutely, let me bring it to you.

Mr. Cullinan: I was the only member that's present now with the exception of yourself that was here at that meeting. Correct?

Dr. McKenzie: That is correct.

Mr. Cullinan: I do not have anything.

Dr. McKenzie: Once again, ok. There is within, and it is to these minutes, you noticed that under the commission business, I don't see which one. Under number two ordinance to amend the code of ordinances the City of Reynoldsburg, so on, the chapter 1183 planning the re-development district chose that there are two aye's and one nay. And yet by the rules of commission declares a minimum of three people to pass everything, so that needs to be changed from an approval to a non-approval. I talked to April about this and she said that we would need to request that, but because of that three requirements, because Mr. Cullinan and I are the only people here tonight that were here during that meeting we really can't approve these tonight. So we have to put these (inaudible) too. Because it requires the minimum of three Aye's and Yea's to pass anything forward through the Planning Commission. Three votes on the whatever affirmative side.

Mr. Snowden: You are correct Dr. McKenzie; however, all that's going to do in that case is just simply send it back to city council with a recommendation for disapproval.

Dr. McKenzie: Like I said, I talked to April about this and so she said it had already been to city council that there was not actionable, but to have the minutes show the correct thing which was not that it had passed because our rules are that it can't be approved for a recommendation with less than three votes that we would just need to revise that. As I said we don't have enough people here to do that.

Mr. Snowden: It just simply is referred back to city council with a negative recommendation.

Dr. McKenzie: Well then they would need to on the third reading to do that super majority vote, which it will be done, because there will be no people voting against it anyway.

Mr. Snowden: Correct.

Dr. McKenzie: It's just a matter keeping our records straight.

Mr. Snowden: There's nothing in here that specifically says approved or denied.

Dr. McKenzie: As I said I talked to April about this we've decided this is the way we should do it. We can't prove anything, but I understand we do have sufficient people to approve the minutes from the May 4 meeting, so, we may move on and we'll put the June 1 on hold and then move on to the May 4 minutes.

Mr. Snowden: You can approve the June meeting, there's nothing preventing the June 1 meeting minutes from being approved.

Unknown: I would abstain because I wasn't here.

Mr. Snowden: You're welcome to do that, there's just nothing that prevents it from being approved.

Dr. McKenzie: So, anyway, for the May 4 meeting, so, any requests for changes for the May 4 meeting minutes from either Mr. Comeaux or Mr. Cullinan or myself? Hearing none or do you have any?

Unknown: No, no.

Dr. McKenzie: Hearing none it will stand approved then.

June Minutes held.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. McKenzie: Are there any requests for changes to tonight's agenda? Hearing none the agenda stands approved.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Dr. McKenzie: Is there anyone here that will be addressing the commission tonight? If you are would you please stand to be sworn in. Before we begin tonight's agenda will everyone addressing the commission please stand and raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the commission will be truthful, if so please answer I do. Thank you. Any public comment? Hearing none.

2. COMMISSION BUSINESS

1. 1749 : Amendment to Zoning Code - Section 1193.07 - Referred to Council for recommendation to approve the version revised July 6, 2017

Dr. McKenzie: First item is the ordinance to amend the code of ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio amending section 1193.07 Design Standards of Chapter 1193 Historic Overlay District.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman, other members of the commission. As you probably recall there was a merger of the two chapters relating to the historic district into chapter 1193 and that caused a few hiccups because there were certain regulations that were intended to only apply to the commercial districts, there were certain regulations that were intended to only apply to residential districts and the real reason that I'm amending this specifically is because it seems to indicate that wood is not a permitted material in the residential portion of the historic district. The situation was that the fence regulation here under item J of 1193.07 originally applied only to the commercial. I'm editing it here to reflect the fact for what materials will be permitted in residential and what will be permitted in commercial. I understand that there was a question related to vinyl materials within the residential district. Ultimately that decision of whether that is an approved material would be up to the board, but let me just clarify before the 1193 and the former 1194, which were the old chapters before they were combined, the only thing that governed materials within the historic district at all was the historic design guidelines from 1996. In that document, which is a document I would very much like to update in the near future it did state that for example, vinyl siding was not a preferred material, but Design Review Board could approve vinyl siding that gave the appearance of wood. In this case, the reason that I made that particular edit to this section was because I feel for residential we should try to be a little bit more flexible when you have something that gives the appearance of wood or has a similar design to wooden fences. If the board is really not comfortable with that I don't have a problem with the board just simply stating that it's not an approved material and we'll send that back to City Council and request City Council to amend or that commission making that recommendation, but the real reason that I'm editing this section is because the section seemed to restrict wood as a material in residential and that is not the intent of section when I edited it originally. So, with that I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Dr. McKenzie: Is there a staff report for this?

Mr. Snowden: There's not a specific report for this.

Dr. McKenzie: Because I had two staff reports for the rezoning.

Mr. Snowden: No, I didn't do a specific staff report for this because it's only one section.

Dr. McKenzie: Well, since I've gotten two of these.

Mr. Snowden: Sorry, I.

Dr. McKenzie: (inaudible due to speaking over each other)

Mr. Snowden: No sir. No sir.

Dr. McKenzie: So, if I may, previously, what you have crossed out here is constructed ornamental metal tubes or solid metal bars and there was something else that would have allowed a greater variety of materials for the fencing in the historic district.

Mr. Snowden: So, this section Dr. McKenzie, other members of the commission, this section originally was from the portion that applied only to commercial and when it got integrated into the chapter that applied to both commercial and residential it seemed to state that the only fence material within the entire district regardless of whether the base zoning was residential or the base zoning was commercial was ornamental metal tubes and bars or masonry. At minimum I would like wood to be a permitted material for residential only. I don't want to see wood fences in the commercial district because they are not durable enough to withstand the rigors of being on a commercial lot. What I'm stating here is the following materials are permitted district wide. Ornamental iron or metal, stone or brick and within the area designated with a base zoning of residential wood or vinyl, which gives the appearance of wood are also permitted materials. If folks are not comfortable with the vinyl portion, I don't have a problem with that. I'm just trying to make sure that we're not restricting wood as a material in the residential. There's nothing inappropriate about wood being a material within the residential portion of the historic district. It's a historic material. It's typical to the 19th century when the area was originally laid out.

Dr. McKenzie: So, I'm still just trying to get at we had before, so previously, before you combined these two, what was the set of materials for the historic district fences in the neighborhood overlay?

Mr. Snowden: There wasn't anything specific about the materials.

Dr. McKenzie: There was nothing.

Mr. Snowden: There is, again as I stated, the very out of date 1996 design guidelines, which kind of says well kind.

Dr. McKenzie - Design guidelines are archived where?

Mr. Snowden: They are on file in the planning office, online, and available to the public. The way the document was written it's not particularly helpful and it doesn't address fences

specifically. It only addresses building, siding, and so forth.

Mr. Comeaux: I like the addition of having wood or vinyl that gives the appearance of painted wood within the residential area. My concern is a drafting concern. When you say, fences may be constructed of wood or vinyl, that gives the appearance of painted wood, is it clear from that in addition to the wood or vinyl that one could in the residential area also make a fence of iron, metal, stone, or brick?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, because if you look at the first sentence, it just says fences within the historic overlay, which means the entire district regardless of base.

Mr. Comeaux: That's a fine reminder to me for being that precise. But anyway.

Mr. Snowden: That's a great comment. Yes, I don't feel that that's restricting that further.

Dr. McKenzie: And so, fences in the front of the properties in the historic neighborhood overlay, is that different than from the rest of the city?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, the remainder of the city the max height for fences is 3 feet in the front and they're designed to be decorative. The reason that I'm standing 4 foot...

Dr. McKenzie: (inaudible due to speaking over each other) extends more than so many feet.

Mr. Snowden: 50 linear feet, exactly. The idea here, and at 50 linear feet I specifically wrote that that's in the main general regulation section 1171.06 if memory serves me correctly and the reason that I said 50 linear feet is because that is approximately the length of fencing of a very small lot would be 50 feet and it was appropriate in the, it is no longer appropriate today and I don't think that folks really want to see a lot of front fences because they become hazardous, they become eye sores and so forth, but in the time when the historic district was laid out it was not atypical to have fences within a front yard or fence in a front yard. So, that's why I left it at 4 foot being the height throughout the district.

Dr. McKenzie: I was at the public hearing. I was the one that's asking the questions.

Mr. Snowden: Sure.

Dr. McKenzie: I was not specifically going after the vinyl question. It wasn't in the opening it up to including stone or brick and what I was trying to get at was what's the difference between a wall and a brick fence or a stone fence? And I would say in actuality most people; by the people who are producing these items would say that there is no difference. So, if you look at people who could come out and build you a brick fence or a stone fence it is going to be a wall and having walls in the front yard of 4 feet of height in the historic district, even the neighborhood, I would say, is there any historical evidence of walls in the historic neighborhood area of Reynoldsburg? Not that I know of. I've never seen any photographic evidence or even heard of that and that, what I was trying to get at that night is this seems to be changing that it's in a way of like Disneyland version of the historic district. So, say

wealthier community along the east coast or something we have had stone walls to buy you property, but that's not a historic feature of Reynoldsburg and that's really why I was trying to get at that night in addition to the vinyl fencing because once again vinyl fencing it's not necessarily going to be vinyl constructed picket fencing which you could have completely opaque fencing made of vinyl, such as a vinyl wall. It was this difference between a wall and a fence that I was trying to get at that night. Because it's not clearly defined in our social usage of the terms. So, I'm worried by this that you're going to not get fences made out of metal tubes or bars with brick or stone pylons you're going to get walls or you may get walls made out of vinyl that are going to be completely opaque not like slats where you can see through them and stuff. Often times the historic distinction, picket fences vs solid (inaudible due to speaking over each other)

Mr. Snowden: Well, we can do that now. You could do that now.

Dr. McKenzie: Do what?

Mr. Snowden: You can do solid fences in the historic district now and until this section was applied to the historic neighborhood sub area you could do up to 6 foot privacy. This restricted it to 4. So, a lot of the folks down there have 6 foot privacy fences right now and now 4.

Dr. McKenzie: In their backyard?

Mr. Snowden: Correct. I would say and let's not make it more complicated than it needs to be. If folks think that the, that we'd like to have the same front yard fencing that regulations that we have for the rest of the city. Then we should just edit the last sentence to say, the maximum height for rear fences shall be 4 feet.

Dr. McKenzie: The question is the future comprehensive plan. What do they want from the historic district? So, yes, people have put up privacy fences in the backyard. Do you wish to continue that although, now we would be restricting it with 4 feet in height.

Mr. Snowden: We are currently restricting it. It's currently restricted at 4 feet.

Dr. McKenzie: Ok, currently, but we've got people there who in past have 6 foot fences and the question is do we also want them to 4 foot high equivalency of a privacy barrier be it stone or brick or vinyl in front yards as well. That's really what the, you know, the point of my question is.

Mr. Snowden: Ok.

Dr. McKenzie: What do we want? I mean generally historic districts are driven by appearance and my question really is does this not change what we might want in a Reynoldsburg historic district. I don't know that we've ever answered the question of what we want in the historic district of Reynoldsburg. Mr. Comeaux you've been on the commission longer than I have. Had that question ever come up and been answered before?

Mr. Comeaux: No not on this commission. There was some group that looked at some overlay stuff in the mid 2000's, but you're right that we don't have a let's sit down and think about what we want this to look like. It was kind of a broader materials and vibe type of thing.

Mr. Snowden: So, there needs to be a new design guideline document done for the whole historic district. I agree with that. What I need to do immediately, in order to prevent folks from not being able to build wood fences in their rear residential yards I need to make some sort of edit here that deals with the, that allows wood. If you guys don't want vinyl we'll edit the vinyl section. If we don't want to do anything with the front then the regulations throughout the rest of the city would apply, which would mean that 3 foot was the max height and the fences must be 50% open. I would just say I think the shortest distance here is, I understand were not going to decide tonight what the historic districts going to look like I'm just trying to be able to issue a permit for fencing for residential only.

Dr. McKenzie: (inaudible, speaking quietly/not close to microphone)

Mr. Snowden: I agree completely. So, if that's how you guys feel and I don't disagree with that I think a good improvement to what I wrote edit the last sentence to say "the maximum height for rear fences shall be 4 feet." Because then the front fence regulations for the remainder of the city would apply.

Dr. McKenzie: And so, 50%...

Mr. Snowden: For the rest of the city, for everywhere else in the city front fences are 50% open, max height 3 foot. I would view this the way I wrote it saying that all those regulations shall apply except that in the historic district front fences can be up to 4 feet. They still have to be 50% open and they still have to be a decorative design.

Dr. McKenzie: You would say that, that applies...

Mr. Snowden: It still would apply. Because it's the more restrictive typically. If you guys want to stick with the 3 feet in the front then just let's edit sentence and then the same regulations will apply city wide for front fences and residential. So, in that case you would just want to approve it on condition that staff submits an amendment to City Council editing that sentence.

Dr. McKenzie: I'm sorry, but this still, what you're saying, the way this reads, is still not reading right.

Mr. Snowden: What part of it is not reading right to you?

Dr. McKenzie: Well, it's going from what Mr. Comeaux said about the way these sentences are, the change between the historic overlay and the historic neighborhood overlay subarea. It, so, by the reading of that, so we go first it starts off the historic overlay district we talked

about materials being ornamental, iron, metal, stone or brick, then fences may be constructed of wood or vinyl that gives the appearance of painted wood within the historic neighborhood overlay subarea and then you go on to talk about the historic neighborhood overlay subarea. Correct? The rest of that, after the point where it says fences may not exceed a height of 4 feet.

Mr. Snowden: No, no, it's for everything. It applies to the entire district.

Dr. McKenzie: But you could not have stone or brick fences in the historic neighborhood overlay subarea?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, you could, because it's part of the historic overlay district.

Dr. McKenzie: And that's the problem I don't, that's what I don't want to see.

Mr. King: It's only wood or vinyl is only residential is the intent, right?

Dr. McKenzie: I would like to see in the historic neighborhood overlay subarea that we only allow wood or vinyl with the 50% open, so we don't get wood or vinyl walls and I would not like to see stone or brick walls in the historic neighborhood subarea.

Mr. Snowden: Nobody has a, I mean Mark, the thing you need to realize is, you're making this way more complex than what it needs to be. The fact is, there's nobody down there with enough money to build something like that. That's why we don't see it throughout the entire city because it's really, really expensive. If you want me to edit this, I don't have a problem sitting here and editing it, and coming back but I need this immediately. Ok. I submitted this back in May and I need this corrected. So, if you want me to sit here and edit out something else I don't have a problem doing it.

Mr. King: I actually don't see a problem with it. When we look at the stone or brick in the front, if I remember correctly, there is a site going down Main Street directly in front of the ice cream place, I forget what it is, but they have a stone wall in front of there. I can't remember if it's 3 feet or if it's 2 feet, but that would be a place in the historic district that does have a stone wall in the front and I believe it's across two buildings. So, stone is something that has been here at least long enough that it's on Main Street within the historical district already, so I wouldn't see an issue with leaving stone or brick in there as it is, the way it's currently being presented to us. You just asked for an example of where that was. I'm bringing up an example.

Dr. McKenzie: I'm talking about the neighborhood overlay, you're talking about the commercial overlay.

Mr. King: But, when you start talking about a historical district or historical overlay if it's historic.

Dr. McKenzie: We separate ours between the commercial and...

Mr. King: I think that's where some of the confusion is coming in is just the verbiage of historic. If it's historic, either it is or it isn't. It's going to be historic or it's going to be modern. At some point you can keep slicing and dicing it, but then you're going to have sections that are very small that can do something and then another section right next to it or in this case possibly directly behind it that cannot.

Mr. Havener: What if we would put, if you read this, your read through it and it says, district shall be constructed of the following materials ornamental, iron, or metal, wood or vinyl with stone or brick pilasters or columns. Would that clarify, is that getting it to the point where everyone would be more comfortable? You're basically calling out all of the materials that the fence could be made of and then you're adding stone or brick, with stone or brick pilasters or columns.

Unknown: I will say I'm fine either way.

Mr. Havener: Either way, what you need is clarification so we can move ahead.

Mr. Snowden: I just think we're looking for a problem here. We're looking to try to find what's the most extreme thing and that could ever, ever happen.

Mr. Comeaux: If someone puts up a fence, they have to come to you?

Mr. Snowden: Yes, they have to get a permit.

Mr. Comeaux: And you're saying that if we struck the part about 4 feet front fences, that if they came to you they would be compelled to, in terms of a front fence, to have 50% see through.

Mr. Snowden: They're compelled to have that now. I'm just making a different requirement for the 4 foot, but it would go back to the 3 foot. It's still, regardless of what you say about the, with regard to front fences, regardless of the height the regulation dealing with the requiring the 50% open applies throughout the district.

Mr. Comeaux: I would think that would seem to (inaudible) concerns about having, because you wouldn't approve a 4 foot brick fence in that instance.

Mr. Snowden: Not in a front yard. It would have to be open. It always have to go through our approval for the code. They can't just do it.

Unknown: So no one's put in a cinder block wall.

Mr. Comeaux: (inaudible) my neighborhoods pretty much done. I'm fine with the understanding and the person who prove or the office that would approve such a permit is sitting here, what they're saying is on a front fence it has to be 50, you have to be able to see through 50% of it.

Mr. Snowden: Regardless of what we say here front fences must be 50% open.

Mr. Comeaux: I'm less concerned about, there is a guy in my neighborhood that's pretty much built it's not (inaudible) feet tall along the perimeter his yard, he's built a 3 foot.

Mr. Snowden: Yes, I'm very familiar with Mr. Ratliff.

Mr. Comeaux: Oh, ok, I'm sorry, I wasn't trying to call names, I didn't know who, his name, but, anyhow, but it sounds like, your concern it struck me as was you're going to go through this neighborhood and you're not going to see the dogs playing in the yard, you're not going to see the flower beds, or whatever else they have around their house and it's going to be cordoned off and my understanding is from them that wouldn't be permitted even with the language we have in front of us.

Mr. Snowden: So, if you want to stick with the 3 that's permitting the rest of the city fine, if you want to modify and go to the 4 then that's what's in front of you. It's really, that's the issue it seems like.

Mr. Comeaux: I would end the sentence where you had suggested we end it so that they would only be allowed to have a 3, because at 3 feet it's basically a decorative fence.

Mr. Snowden: Correct.

Mr. Comeaux: Keeping in small dogs perhaps, keeping out small rabbits, but the big rabbits can get through.

Mr. Snowden: It's really up to you gentlemen. I'm not married to anything on this. I'm just trying to do something that makes sense and when I went to edit the section regarding the wood and the neighborhood subarea I was compelled because of how badly the overall section was written, which was not something that I wrote originally, it was just moved around. By the time I reviewed that I just decided look, I've got to rewrite this entire thing. One thing to remember is that a wall, a true wall, if it extends over 4 feet in any district, requires a building permit.

Dr. McKenzie: If it's higher than...

Mr. Snowden: If it's over 4 feet with...

Dr. McKenzie: Width wise?

Mr. Snowden: No, no, vertically. Higher than, with earth behind it, that is what the definition of a wall is from the standpoint of building and zoning. Even if you built a masonry, it would be a masonry fence if it did not have earth or some sort of structure on the other side, if it was completely free standing.

Mr. Comeaux: So, not to jump around, but the 4 foot to 3 foot, are there examples of 4 foot fences within the historic district that would try to probably tie into?

Mr. Snowden: Probably not. In fact I don't even recall specifically why I put that in, so maybe with that (inaudible due to speaking over each other) take it out.

Mr. Comeaux: But, there's not 50% of the houses already there with 4 foot, which is, keep it simpler.

Mr. Havener: Yes, take it out and make it 3.

Mr. Comeaux: I suspect the concern is folks wanting to build a fence for their backyard and they're having trouble figuring if they can do it with what materials and such.

Mr. Snowden: Exactly.

Mr. Comeaux: In light of that I would, when we get to that point, I would say...

Mr. Snowden: So, it sounds like and I'm going to go back here to my document where I have it written. It sounds like, I'm not going to do anything. I'm just giving you an example. That version is an improved version.

Mr. Comeaux: Because it would rely on the...

Mr. Snowden: The general regulations for front fences. (inaudible due to speaking over each other)

Mr. Comeaux: So, it's essentially just going from a 6 foot rear fence to a 4 foot.

Mr. Snowden: Exactly, but you could still do a board on board or privacy style fence for what it's worth. (inaudible due to speaking over each other) Again, for rear. And I've seen examples for both from the period, maybe not in our historic district, but there's also been 100 years of additional stuff. There's people back there with chain link because they built that in the 50's.

Dr. McKenzie: (inaudible due to speaking over each other)

Mr. Snowden: That's exactly right.

Mr. Comeaux: There's a difference, backyard and the front yard, and how you're perceiving that from the street and functioning for the people.

Unknown: The idea of a 4 foot privacy fence is...

Mr. Snowden: Pretty crazy.

Dr. McKenzie: It would not be.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, if I could call your attention to the vinyl issue. Could I edit this sentence here to improve or minimize confusion so that people can get behind what I'm saying? Again, I'm trying to be flexible, but if folks really don't want to see vinyl that looks like wood then let's just take it out now.

Unknown: I would throw in composite. That's a ambience with you guys, we're literally looking at doing a fence and it's going to be coming through soon and so as we say vinyl composite is really what we're looking at. It's more progressive, so just in addition of composite is something that I would say if we added that in there.

Mr. Snowden: Would the general term be plastic composite? That's what it is, is it not? Vinyl is a type of plastic, is it not?

Unknown: So, vinyl is a type of plastic. Composite is a combination of wood and plastic. It's just a combination, but that seems to be....

Mr. Cullinan: Going off of that, if you think of like a Trex like you'd have for a deck or something your still having that called out as painted, so you can buy a composite piece of wood, like a Trex that gives the appearance of a wood coloring. Is it a painted wood?

Mr. Snowden: I don't want to state a brand name, but was is a general term that I could use?

Mr. Cullinan: It's a composite. I was just trying to say that, that brings up that you can buy them and they don't appear as a painted wood or stained.

Mr. Snowden: Now, gentlemen, do I need to say, where I've said, fences within the historic overlay district ... ornamental. Fences may be constructed. Do I need to say, in addition to those materials fences may be constructed of wood or composite that gives the appearance of painted wood within the neighborhood overlay to specify.

Mr. Comeaux: What I was going to, I've been looking at, if you see the clause that begins with within the historic overlay subarea?

Mr. Snowden: You want that at the beginning?

Mr. Comeaux: I want that at the beginning. If you put that at the beginning then it's saying, within the subarea fences can be. Capitalize within, change the f in fences to lowercase.

Mr. Snowden: Does it need to be, may also be.

Mr. Cullinan: Yes, I think that's good, may also be

Mr. Comeaux: Just to take it out. And that gets to my concern before. I prefer that.

Mr. Snowden: Do we like that clause?

Dr. McKenzie: If you want to allow vinyl fencing you cannot assume composite is going to include pure vinyl fencing or it would not be a composite if it is a pure PVC vinyl fence, which is the typical. When you go out to the hardware store and you get vinyl fencing it's usually not a composite it is pure (inaudible due to speaking over each other).

Mr. Snowden: A composite or similar material.

Mr. Comeaux: Or you could say wood, vinyl, or

Dr. McKenzie: Or composite.

Mr. Comeaux: I would leave vinyl in there.

Mr. Havener: Or composite material. Add material after composite. It gives the appearance of wood, not painted. Let's just say, of wood. Because like Tyler was saying it could be, it could give the appearance of stained door painted, or you could put finished wood.

Mr. Cullinan: Are we ok with that too?

Dr. McKenzie: To get away from that problem, composite material (inaudible) give the appearance of a wood grain that way it gets away with how the, what's applied over that wood grain.

Mr. Snowden: It's not a bad one, but now I'm prescribing a process.

Dr. McKenzie: I know.

Mr. Snowden: It's not easy stuff what we're doing here guys. It's not easy stuff. Have we made a progress here. Are we more comfortable with what's in front of us now than we were with the original?

Dr. McKenzie: Being clear with all the other regulations would be more restrictive than here has gone a long way to make me more comfortable with this one.

Mr. Snowden: Good.

Dr. McKenzie: Because at the public hearing I was not clear whether you were actually going to be allowed solid, opaque fencing in the front yard. Ok. Anymore discussion? Are we generally, just to push things along and force closure here are we comfortable with the wording of this change now?

Mr. Snowden: Dr. McKenzie, sir, what I'm going to do is save this as a new version and what the recommendation, folks are comfortable with this version going back to City Council you'd want to make a move to improve the version of the code change dated today. Because

it's going to be dated today. Then I will attach that to the application when we send that back to Mr. Luzader's committee and we can discuss, and I can make the case along with anyone who would like to attend city council and we explain the reasoning of the commission and help clarify. I think city council is going to be supportive of what's being said here.

Dr. McKenzie: Are there other discussions? I tried to jot things down, so we would be forwarding this to Council for recommendation to approve the version revised July 6, 2017. I'll make the motion. Do I have a second?

Mr. King: I second.

Dr. McKenzie: Seconded by Mr. King. Any further debate? Mr. Snowden would you please call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cullinan "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Comeaux "Yes", Dr. McKenzie "Yes".

Dr. McKenzie: Recommendation is approved.

Mr. Snowden: I will send that gentlemen. Thank you for our attention on that. Appreciate that.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 9/11/2017 7:45 PM
MOVER:	Mark McKenzie, Chairman, Planning Commission	
SECONDER:	Ivan King	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, King	
ABSENT:	Welday	

2. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED – 0 Taylor Road SW, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from CC Community Commerce District to R-4 Single and Two-Family Residence District, Applicant, Charles W. Warner, Jr.

Mr. Snowden:

0 Taylor Road SW - Charles. W. Warner, Jr. - Zoning District Change (Rezoning)

Application: #177611 - Zoning District Change
 Location: Property is located on the east side of Taylor Road, just south of the intersection with E. Broad Street (OH 16).
 Request: Request for review of a zoning district change (rezoning).
 Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District
 Current Use: Vacant Land
 Proposed Use: Residential
 Applicant: Charles W. Warner, Jr.

The applicant is requesting that the Commission review and make a recommend approval of a zoning district change to the City Council.

The .35AC site consists of single parcel that is currently vacant. To the north, the property is developed with an existing gasoline station, which is a special exception use in the CC zoning district. The lot is adjacent to the site of the corporate campus of The Limited to the west across Taylor Road. That complex is zoned RI Restricted Industry. To the south and east, the property abuts several lots in the R-20 zoning district of the City of Pataskala.

The site was originally zoned commercial following annexation to the City in order to facilitate development of commercial businesses on the corner of E. Broad Street and Taylor Road. The main portion of that original parcel was developed with a gasoline station. Staff has received multiple inquiries regarding commercial uses of the lot. Given the 100FT width of the existing lot, and the regulations Section 1175.08 that require a 50FT setback for any commercial building or parking lot from a residential lot, the ability to construct a commercial building on the existing lot is extremely restricted. The applicant approached the Planning & Zoning Administrator to explore another use or another district, and made the determination that the R-4 zoning district is the most similar district to the adjacent R-20 zoning district in Pataskala. Staff made this determination based mainly on the minimum lot coverage requirements and on the provisions of the City of Pataskala Zoning Code that would permit a two-family dwelling.

The applicant has not submitted a specific building design for the purposes of this rezoning. Although this would be necessary for a large development with multiple lots in the zoning district, Staff has no concerns about this portion of the application. The applicant, with Staff assistance, has submitted an exhibit that indicates the required minimum setback on all frontages.

The City has water service available at this location. The adjacent parcel to the north is served by Southwest Licking Water and Sewer District under a special agreement. The City does not have sewer services available to serve this lot, so the applicant will probably be required to extend the sanitary sewer to tap into existing sewer at the rear of the lot, if present. Comments about this situation were solicited to the Department of Public Service, who had minimal concerns, considering that the subject area is only one residential lot. There is no reason to believe that the City has inadequate ability to supply water to a single or two-family dwelling on this lot.

The lot fronts Taylor Road which is designated as a major arterial street by the City's Thoroughfare Plan. The uses that are permitted in the R-4 district has significantly less impact than those permitted in the CC zoning district. The impact to traffic will be reduced by the rezoning. Any development of the lot will require compliance with the off-street parking regulations of Chapter 1179 of the Zoning Code. For a single-family dwelling, two enclosed spaces and two unenclosed spaces will be required.

The Commission should apply the standards for review of zoning district changes contained in Section 1151.04 of the Zoning Code and determine if the application meets those

standards. Staff recommends approval of the zoning district as submitted. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Dr. McKenzie: Do any of the members have any questions for Mr. Snowden or for the applicant representative? Would you like to address us? Do you like to have anything to add? Please give your name and address.

Aaron Underhill, Lawyer w/Underhill & Hodge Law Firm - I'm pinch hitting for David Hodge tonight. He had a conflict with another hearing. Mr. Snowden did a great job of teeing this up. This really, I don't have much to say. Just from what the markets telling us and from the practical standpoint of what you need to do setback wise under your code, we think that this makes this property much more likely to have a future development on it and we ask for your approval.

Dr. McKenzie: Thank you. So, if this is going to go to a residential zoning code it seems to be that the commercial property to the north is going to be way to close to a residential property, so does that get grandfathered in, so they don't have to hold the setbacks anymore?

Mr. Snowden: They already have variances because look how close that is to the residential use immediately to the east.

Dr. McKenzie: Well on the...

Mr. Snowden: But on the southern, yes, essentially....

Dr. McKenzie: I was looking at not only the back of the building, but also where the trash cans and stuff are its right on top of the property.

Mr. Snowden: We are basically creating a non-conformance by changing the zoning district, but ultimately they're going to be, as long as they maintain it. Now if somebody came in scraped the site completely pulled Circle K off and said hey I'm going to build a new building here from the ground up then they are going to have to meet that requirement and it would be up to the commission and myself to enforce that requirement for the, during the major site plan process, yes, and that 50 foot can be relaxed to 25 feet by an introduction of landscape berm and some other things, but this already had a variance for that requirement from back when it was developed.

Dr. McKenzie: But that would be to the south?

Mr. Snowden: For the properties to the east. It's a good observation. We are creating a non-conformance with the code.

Dr. McKenzie: And once again, I was just looking at what the intent of the code is. So, you are going to have those trash receptacles right on top of the residential property. That's why we have those setback requirements in the code.

Mr. Snowden: Correct.

Dr. McKenzie: So, not only are we doing a technical violation, but we are also a violation with intent (inaudible due to technical sound interference)

Mr. Snowden: Correct.

Dr. McKenzie: And I was just curious about that.

Mr. Snowden: Also, the code with regard to screening also deals with who's there first. There's a colegal concept about coming to a nuisance, so in this case since the commercial use is the more intense use is there first they don't have to provide the screening. If they were going in later they are having to provide the screening, but Dr. McKenzie I don't disagree with your assessment. It's a good observation.

Dr. McKenzie: Any other questions? Hearing none. It's time to make a motion if anybody feels comfortable.

Mr. Cullinan: I make a motion that we approve this application as submitted.

Dr. McKenzie: Alright, Mr. Cullinan approves. Do I have a second?

Mr. King: I will second.

Dr. McKenzie: Mr. King seconds. Any further debates? Hearing none. Mr. Snowden would you please call the roll?

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cullinan "Yes", Mr. King "Yes", Mr. Comeaux "Yes", Dr. McKenzie "Abstain".

Dr. McKenzie: Motion is approved.

RESULT:	APPROVED BY BOARD [3 TO 0]	Next: 7/24/2017 8:00 PM
MOVER:	Mark McKenzie, Chairman, Planning Commission	
SECONDER:	Ivan King	
AYES:	Cullinan, Comeaux, King	
ABSTAIN:	McKenzie	
ABSENT:	Welday	

3. Development Discussion

Dr. McKenzie: Next is development discussion for comprehensive development plan. I had included just a little something (inaudible) discussion started. I just for example on the change to the coding for the historical historic neighborhood sub district. I would just like us to start thinking of these things as code changes are brought to us and also thinking about what we would want if we hire an engineering firm to produce a you know comprehensive plan for us. What are we going to want? And as I pointed out, the one source I that I was

doing and there's lots of them, but the one source I quoted there, it gave a 4 step plan getting started on there and the first step was being familiar with the existing.

Unknown: Existing code.

Dr. McKenzie: Well, you know what exists. And one of the things that Reynoldsburg has to deal that other communities in central Ohio that started developing after us are these post World War II housing developments. We have two, Huber Homes and Brookside. And I had asked Mr. Myers from the historic thing, if he could do some research to look at what happened, what the news was, what people's understanding how they were reacting to those developments going in, in the mid to late 1950's and so, it also gives us an idea what those were like then, but as I pointed out it's very hard to, it didn't print out very well, it didn't print out very clearly, but those right now in the national databases are being described as well poor at risk, you know, type of area sub areas and that could go a long way to why we are getting such a limited economic interest in the Main Street corridor because they are surrounded by what are by the risk state advisors others as poor areas, economically depressed areas in the city. Now, I can only tell you what others, well I've only known what other communities have done to address these types of problems. Have you ever heard of Levitt Town? That is the first of these in New York State. It was the first of these post World War II housing developments and they had, had the same types of, 10 years ahead of Huber and Brookside, and they've had the same types of problems that other cities had developed at those times what they have done, but I'd also like for you to also develop to do through whatever research you're doing ideas of what could be done and what those other communities have done have involved zoning code. Many of the Brookside Homes run 1000 sq. ft. I don't know what the average sq. footage living area of a Huber Home is.

Mr. Havener: You're probably looking at 1000 to 1300, maybe or it's about the same size I would say.

Dr. McKenzie: Right now the average living space even in an inner city apartment, you know people moving back to the inner city, is still over 1500 sq. ft. That's the average. So, these are homes that are well below what the modern average is for either a suburban development or a the old downtown city development and so what can a city do to make these developments, you know, future looking, as a more desirable properties? And that's something that I think that Reynoldsburg's comprehensive development plan has to address if it's going to be successful for Reynoldsburg. Because you can see just how much of the city is included in those two developments vs the wealthy developments out east.

Mr. Havener: Yes, these are all relative things that, you're right, we need to take a serious look at.

Dr. McKenzie: They make Reynoldsburg unique from other communities that are surrounding us. There are other communities that have those, but there are also suburban entities in Central Ohio that don't have quite as much of their land area involved in developments like we do with Huber and Brookside, and to some extent, Briarcliff as well.

Mr. Havener: Good points.

Dr. McKenzie: Does anyone else have anything they would like to add?

Mr. Havener: We'll definitely take all of these things into consideration and during our conversations with whoever the consultant is that we decide to hire.

Dr. McKenzie: I would just like to point out once again, the reason I've been pushing this, is by charter the comprehensive plan, the responsibility is the planning commission.

Mr. Havener: And I was just going to say whenever we do select the consultant that we use...

Dr. McKenzie: So, the discussions and stuff should really be going through and involving the planning commission because by charter it is the planning commission's responsibility to develop and to maintain the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Havener: Correct. We'll definitely be inclusive.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. McKenzie: Ok. Any other discussions? Alright. Hearing none. That will finish our business for tonight and I will adjourn us at 6:56.

Chairman


Planning and Zoning Administrator