



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2021 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner
ABSENT: Cullinan

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes Stand Approved

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – May 6, 2021

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Stands Approved

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Mr. Zollars.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Zollars: We're going to do this two ways. One, we're going to start with email first, emails pertaining to Eastwood will be read first, and then we'll follow up with emails from the Oliver.

Mr. Bowsher: We received zero emails from Eastwood was

Mr. Zollars: Any emails pertaining to the Oliver?

Ms. Wheeler: Yes, I have four. The first email is from Tom and Amy Fee, 7367 Bryden Road.

It looks like once the Oliver Project was initially approved we had a bait & switch situation. The original project was to build 56 apartments and 32 town homes. It looks like since the purchase of the North lot (a single-family residence) everything has changed. Now the plan is to have 126 apartments & 24 townhouse. The planning commission sneaked around and had the lot, just north of the church, changed to Residential Medium to allow a project like this to happen. What about the single-family lot? Are you intending to change this as well? From the site plan, it looks like they intend to demolish the current house and replace it with multiple family dwellings.

The huge increase in population density will create a big problem for traffic in the Main & Lancaster area. Sometimes it's difficult to turn onto Lancaster Avenue from the side streets. The increase in population would also cause a problem with parking. It's

completely reasonable to think that each unit would have at least 2 adults each with a car. That would require 300 parking spaces. The plan is for 201 parking spaces. The surrounding neighborhood will fill up with cars parked in front of houses. This happens in many population-dense neighborhoods like around OSU where apartments are mixed with single-family houses. The increase to 150 units will create a stinking mess to the neighbors on Gibson and Bryden Roads. I assume that the dumpsters would be located between the development and the existing properties. Finally, there are currently 687 signatures opposing the development of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Ms. Wheeler: The second email. Mr. Todd Burns, I have an address of 7670 Slate Ridge Boulevard.

Emily and council members,

First, I am all about new ideas, development, and improving the city and surrounding areas if, and only if it makes sense financially, and benefits the area without drastic compromise to traffic, schools, etc.

When was a traffic study done? Within last 15-16 months? If so it would not be accurate...businesses were shut down, any many worked from home. Adding hundreds of apartments with more traffic makes it seem impossible for residents on this street that struggle to exit their own driveway...It is constant all day long so I can not fathom the traffic increase. Is there another plan and entrance/exit proposed? Next, I am perplexed on how a 3 story dwelling gets approved while surrounded by nothing similar? Also, the plans from the developer lacked a leasing office which forced him to purchase the next parcel to the north which is now under contract. Two story mixed use with owner occupied is reasonable but not sure the 3 stories fits this area at all.

Why didn't the city consider purchasing this lot for itself to seek out other potential projects, other experienced developers to achieve the highest and best use for this area like the PNC on Main street recently?

If the council members work for the city and live in the city (although zero are directly effected) please listen to your residents.

Who would handle the timelines and who follow follow through to see this project gets complete?

Please look at the property now. No one consistently mows this lot as it sits.

Did you look into the experience, financial integrity, and track record through of this developer? Who will hold him accountable?

In summary, there were hundreds of petitions against this project and counting last meeting. Does council care?

Every north and south bound arteries between Main and Broad have some apartments planned or being built causing major increase in traffic

We have so many apartments and zero owner occupied homes to purchase as I brought up last year.

I just hope the elected officials can see all points from residents. I know that no one will ever entirely agree whatever is done, but can't we try to understand if this is truly the best interest of the city.

So many residents are asking about the credibility and integrity of this developer. I hope the city can answer it.

Ms. Wheeler: The third email is from Danielle Sigmon, 7372 East Bryden Road. I am writing again with extreme disappointment that this 3 story monster is planning to be built in a neighborhood with barely any 2 story homes. This will tower over the existing homes that are cape cod and ranch style, invading privacy. Retention ponds are not going to solve the repetitive flooding that occurs in the Highland Terrace area. The property still shows owned by the church. The gentleman claims he purchased it last year, why does the auditor show no such information about the new owner? How can we entrust this person to run a successful complex when mowing the empty lot is such a task and has required a formal complaint to code enforcement. The bait and switch going on with this project is truly unsettling. Why has there been no update to the community about the mayor reviewing the project? Also the traffic study can't possibly be accurate due to many residents working from home due to covid. The project also shows a dump off into brookside on Gibson, that home is now owned by the gentleman who applied for the project. Where will students of this proposed project attend school, since we are expected to be at capacity in the next year?

Ms. Wheeler: The final email is from Sarah Read 7823 Jordan Crossing.

Good Evening Planning Commission Members, City Representatives and Mr. Oliver;

I'd like to speak about the proposed expansion for the project on Lancaster Avenue. The drawings for the project look nice; but there are a number of concerns that should be addressed before this expanded project is approved. I'm more that a little concerned with the lack of transparency involving the transfer of ownership on the property and the original application submittal. It is my understanding that the original application has already been approved; but perhaps we can take care as we consider the expansion request.

1) Have we given adequate consideration to the impact on the residents that live near the development? Are our City representatives and Mr. Oliver willing to not just hear; but discuss and address their concerns?

2) Does Mr. Oliver have the experience to develop a large multi-family project? My understanding is that he has been in "real estate" since 2018, and that began with a couple single-family homes. Now, in a time of steep price increases and building material scarcity, he's decided to "go big". The financial/business risk here is significant. Is the City prepared to spend tax-payer money to absorb developer risk as they have with the PNC and Happy Dragon parcels?

3) The developer, Mr. Oliver, plans to form a company to manage the apartments. Where will the experience come from to manage a project of this size? Reynoldsburg is not generally known for effectively managed large-scale apartment complexes. How does the City propose to mitigate this risk?

4) Mr. Oliver's development website features a single testimonial quote from Pastor Robert Linder, Zoning Board member and pastor of the church that sold the property to the developer. The quote speaks to Mr. Oliver's commitment to Reynoldsburg. But what I see is a project to profit the Developer and the Grace Apostolic Church, potentially with detriment to the surrounding community. Nothing wrong with profit motivation; but we should be clear-eyed as to the project's intentions and potential negative impact (traffic, enjoyment, property values. etc.) to the nearby residents.

Reducing the density, increasing the proportion of owner-occupied properties, phasing in the development, and making an effort to ensure the project blends with the surrounding area would go along way towards making this a development we can all be proud of. And help mitigate the risk. It's not too late to do these things with the expansion.

Mr. Zollars: So thank you. Now we're going to slips. We have one pertaining to the Oliver and the other one will be Glen Duggar will come up in the discussion in a minute.

OK, thank you. Bret Luzader, if you would, please. You have three minutes plus or minus to talk.

Mr. Luzader: Thank you, Chairman Zollars, members of the commission. I have a number of concerns with the proposal for The Oliver that are also echoed by our city engineer. But first, I have a concern about the application itself. It says they are proposing to develop on a vacant lot. The last time I looked, there is a single family home, a pole building, a garage and numerous other structures. As far as the engineers concerned. And some of mine are the same. We don't have a facilities demand study worksheet to show that if the proposed six inch water line main is adequate supply for the project plus flow for fire hydrants. If we have to put fire suppression systems in these apartments and whatever. We really don't know if there's enough water to supply these. There appears to be dark spots within the interior of the project. Are these going to be lighted by lights that are on the buildings themselves? If they are, they need to be displayed on their lighting plan, which they aren't. According to the staff report, they do not meet their parking requirement. There are also concerns about the storm water plan. Are the storm water tiles that are being connected to adequate to handle the flow? There's an outlet tunnel from the east retention basin going through private property. I think an easement must be obtained prior to approval or an alternative plan needs to be in place and submitted to this board. These are just a few of my concerns, not just mine, but of our city engineer, as I stated before, that should be addressed before this application moves forward. And with that, until these are addressed, I would ask that you table this until these issues are addressed. Thank you.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you, Mr. Luzader. OK, that ends the email and slips part of the meeting. Any comments pertaining to anything that we've heard to this point? OK, all right, then, we have no unfinished business, we're going to new business. Emily if you could get us started with application number one, please.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Application #2021-5215; National Road SW; Applicant Joe Ciminello; Major Site Plan (Eastwood)

Ms. Wheeler: Thank you, Mr. Zollars, first application is for major site plan number 2021-5215.

Below is the staff review of the above referenced application.

1. Project Summary

- a. The property is located on the North side of East Main Street west of Summit Road (parcel ID #010-017466). The property was recently annexed in to the City from Etna Township under three different zoning classifications. The proposal calls for subdividing the parcel (see Preliminary Plat application #2021-5214) into 5 lots with a planned commercial component on Lots 1-3 (zoned East Main Street District) and a residential component on Lots 4 and 5 (zoned Residential Medium).
- b. The applicant, Joe Ciminello, is requesting Planning Commission approval of a Major

Site Plan for the construction of a new residential development on approximately 35 acres (Lots 4 and 5). The project will consist of 159 single-story apartment units with attached garages (Lot 5) and 264 apartment units with detached garages and amenities (Lot 4). The site is currently vacant.

2. Zoning Review (Section 1103.19)

- a. The property is within the Residential Medium (RM) Zone. The proposed use ('Dwelling - Attached Single-Family' and 'Dwelling - Multi-Unit Building Complex') is listed as a permitted use in RM.
- b. The proposed development complies with the RM Zone in terms of building height (41'9" apartment building height), lot coverage, and setback requirements. The RM Zone sets a max density of 24 units per acre. The proposal calls for 17.6 units an acre for Lot 4 (264 total units on 15.01 acres) and 7.8 units an acre for Lot 5 (159 total units on 20.36 acres).
- c. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed site layout. The suggested building typology for 'Dwelling - Attached Single-Family' encourages rear garage access as well as private open space for each unit. The townhomes keep garage access on the interior with front facades fronting the right-of-way. Additionally, the City's Comprehensive Plan encourages pedestrian-friendly features for infill development such as walking paths and/or trail connectivity. The proposal calls for sidewalks and walking paths throughout the development, as well as an 8' bike path along Eastwood Drive.
- d. The applicant has met the parking requirement. The required parking for the townhomes is 1 enclosed and 1 unenclosed off-street parking space. Each townhome unit will have a 2-car garage, as well as driveway parking for 2 vehicles. Lot 5 provides 655 total parking spaces. Apartments require 1 parking space per unit plus 1 for every 5 units, or 317 total spaces for 264 units. The proposal calls for 410 surface parking spaces and 66 garage spaces on Lot 4. The parking requirement is met. With that if there are any questions for the developer I will turn it over to them.

Mr. Bowsher: Before we get to that, I'm just going to read something real quick so we can just put it on the record. Obviously, we have a staff report that's there. This is a new thing that we're doing now is sort of a precursor. So you'll start to see more of an engineering staff report and the planning and zoning staff report as well. I think it's very important. I also want everyone to kind of understand that when this comes out, what this is doing is this is a sort of a recommendation to the developer as well as to the development staff to make sure that we're following through with those. Basically, it brings to light some of the concerns and questions and things that will be answered and delved into the PGU process. But it's just putting it out there so we have it. Specifically, for the Eastwood. I was going to read sort of an email from Ryan Andrews, our city engineer. He says, as noted in the staff report, we've reviewed this project. There were a few items regarding water and sewer capacity that these comments are not items that, in my opinion, should hold up the project at this stage, but rather comments that could be addressed during the PGU stage. We just wanted to bring these up now so the developer and their engineers prepare to address them down the road. It is not uncommon for these types of comments to occur at the Planning Commission stage and to be resolved during the construction plans stage. I know the developers engineers in possession of the sanitary capacity study that we prepared for this area on the city's behalf. So they are aware of the limitations in the system and I'm sure they are planning their development

accordingly. I can also attest to that. Mr. Ciminello, the applicant who's here tonight, who will talk on behalf. We've been working with him and his team since mid last year, maybe even earlier, taking a look at this, working through the six month process for the annexation. Finally coming to get, you know, two of the first several lots that will eventually be built out through this master plan community. So we're very happy and excited. Obviously, the indexation went through three different zoning classifications with this development. We're continuing to work through the PGU process, understanding that these are on the outskirts of our east side boundary. So we're consistently working through them. Ryan, our city engineer, feels very confident that we can overcome a lot of these obstacles. I want to put that on the record because this is a non-issue for our planning commission this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Zollars: OK, the applicants here, I understand. Would you like to walk us through something? Give us some information we don't have. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Ciminello: Joe Ciminello, 567 Lazelle Road, Westerville, Ohio. Thank you, Chairman Zollars Planning Commission. Want to give special thanks to Emily, for helping us through the application process and in both Andrew and the mayor on welcoming us as developers to Grove City to Reynoldsburg. So, were excited for the project. I know. This is lot four and five. Lot one, two and three are really going to set the tone for a gateway to Reynoldsburg coming from the East. And I think if you look at the last rendering that we included, even though, you know, it's not part of what's before you this evening. It was the excitement that we're going to be able to create along six hundred plus foot of frontage streetscape that will welcome everybody to Reynoldsburg and Eastwood, would be that start. So when you continue in our development, what's before you this evening are two multifamily sites. A diverse product, single story ranch attached two car garage, as Emily pointed out. So gearing more towards empty nesters, young professionals. Then we have the three story walk up multifamily as well for younger and sometimes older. When you look at the renderings what you see here is lots one, two and three. What's before you this evening is all behind that. But what we're approving tonight, working with the city, Andrew Development director, economic development. We'll be able to use the development to help pay for this infrastructure and the entrance features that will be put in on Main Street. So it's all part of a master plan, as Andrew mentioned. So that that's a drive with the ranch on the right and the three story building on the left. We included in our annexation, another 80 acres behind where this one ends and hoped to bring a major site plan to you in the next few months. That so, yeah, I'm right behind the blue, which is our residential medium, which will be single family, individual occupied homes with some four family that you see there that will front on a park. So all part of a master plan. We're kind of bringing you the middle of it tonight. I'm here to answer any questions.

Mr. Benner: Thank you, Mr. Ciminello. Your correct renderings are awesome and look very nice. I think we are looking forward to the development. I have a few

questions on the engineer's report. Not disregarding what Andrew spoke of earlier, that these could be taken care of later, but there is a notice on number five that you should consider providing additional sidewalk that's in lot four to provide better connectivity between buildings. The drawing that we have and unfortunately, these screens are big enough for an old guy, but they're not there. I don't think that's something that in the PGU you later on could be it could be brought up. But I would like to see this as a condition that there is some more sidewalk connectivity on lot number four.

Mr. Ciminello: I apologize, I don't have that, so they're speaking internal to the development of the apartments?

Mr. Benner: Correct.

Mr. Ciminello: I do think you have, you know, the stop and final engineering. We still need all our engineering plans approved.

Mr. Benner: That is correct.

Mr. Ciminello: I don't know. You are open to that condition. We're working with developers besides myself that will develop the individual site. So I hate to commit to saying there'll be more sidewalks unless we say how many more. Between every building or?

Mr. Benner: I understand your reticence, I hope you understand mine.

Mr. Ciminello: Yeah, I think.

Mr. Benner: You know, you can't guarantee me, but I can't be guaranteed it's going to happen either. And I think there needs to be more connectivity. I'm not probably smart enough to tell you exactly where they should be or how many there should be. But it is part of our master plan that you have a lot of interconnectivity and it just seems as if there's a lot of walking along the parking lots in that area.

Mr. Bowsher: I think if I could add, I guess, you know, maybe what we're seeing right here, obviously this is colored rendering. But I think maybe what Ryan was trying to point out in the staff report is you see some of these sidewalks where they're obviously fronting some of the parking, but it's like they didn't carry out the pen stroke all the way around. And really it just needs to be fully enclosed. And that just could be just, you know, overlook, you know. I think, let's take a look just for example, because it's on the screen buildings eight and nine. Right. And then seven. So you see the sidewalk, it goes all the way around, but then it stops up at the top and it's not there. So there's a disconnect from obviously somebody being able to walk into the side of Building nine from that parking lot because that's typically where somebody would park at. So I think what we're saying, Joe, is if we can just continue that forward and that just could be an oversight of finishing sort of those sidewalks

out so people can walk and not have to walk through the grass to get to the parking lots on the sides.

Mr. Hicks: And this is Mr. Hicks, I'll just point out, you know, I'm not the attorney in the room, but the ADA law will require, you know, an accessible route for all the first floor units to all the public amenities. So, I'm sure that as they go through the plot grade and utility plan, the sidewalks are going to have to get a little bit more robust. I don't know if there's some language that we could agree to conditionally that would make sure that staff has all the tools that they would need to make sure that some additional sidewalks are done where they're appropriate.

Mr. Furst: Mr. Hicks, do you think if we made it in that sort of language that the condition that there be sidewalk connectivity from the parking areas into each building if it does not exist and that all of it meet all the ADA requirements, I mean, that would obviously occur, of course, but just as a transparent item. Do you think some language like that might be acceptable?

Mr. Hicks: I've been trying to nail it down. You know, maybe it's the frontage of where the building fronts along the parking areas, you know, there seems to be what seems to be the missing piece on this where I'm seeing sort of missing teeth. Right. Of areas where it kind of feels like there should be a sidewalk, but there isn't. I don't know if we want to get too far down in the details because obviously the developer is going to hire a civil engineer that's going to be laying out all those sidewalks and grading plan and everything else and things can get moved around based upon existing conditions. So. Yeah, I'm sure there's some language. I don't know if Mr. Benner wants to try to propose something.

Mr. Benner: I would like a condition that that the sidewalk situation be addressed. If you would you be amenable to a based on ADA requirements? Mr. Ciminello, that additional sidewalks be added to the project.

Mr. Ciminello: Yes, I mean, we are going to have to comply with ADA regardless. I think what Andrew's pointing out and some others and maybe where the engineer was heading was I do see the sidewalks don't extend all the way across the building frontage.

Mr. Benner: Correct.

Mr. Ciminello: And my guess is that it's probably compliant ADA wise. So I think, you know, we condition that we would try to address or we would address where the buildings front to have sidewalk along the parking lots in those spots. And that's where Mr. Hicks was heading.

Mr. Furst: I think that's reasonable. Would that be reasonable to you?

Mr. Ciminello: Yes, that's a reasonable.

Mr. Benner: That's all I have right now.

Mr. Hicks: I did have one additional question. The elevations provided on the clubhouse building, I think were in the packet. I think that just driving around not Reynoldsburg, but just the east side of the metro area is seeing similar clubhouses built in other communities in regards to the esthetic appearance. I think part of what we're trying to do here is make sure we establish a separate identity for Reynoldsburg and to try to differentiate ourselves from maybe other areas of city of Columbus. It's been annexing out this way. I think well, this is the clubhouse for the single story units that we're looking at now. I think the clubhouse for the other multifamily. Yeah, it would be that elevation number four right there. Mr. Ciminello, is there anything that you, as the developer could do to spruce that elevation up a little bit and help differentiate it maybe from some of the other similar projects that are going around the city of Columbus area?

Mr. Ciminello: I did hear that concern of Mr. Hicks when we spoke, and we do have a rendering that took the copula off. But after looking at that. And speaking with Mr. Bowsher, when you look at our elevation and the entrance monument, they're more of a mission style architecture and we tried to use that to complement the architecture, the heavy brick and stone massing of the AG Center across the street, because that's nice frontage there as well. So I think we could actually shorten that copula a little bit to make it more similar to our entrance columns and maybe have some larger overhangs on that cupola, maybe end up with some brackets on the building. So we would commit to do that from final design as well. Probably shortened that up and maybe widen the overhang.

Mr. Hicks: Yeah, I think that would be excellent tweak to the elevation to help match and tie into the rest of your master development. So I think that's going in the right direction.

Mr. Zollars: Got a question. Can we see the entrance again? And is there a rendering with the clubhouse on it?

Mr. Bowsher: I don't think so. But we can pull up the other rendering again. Will show the concept? No, that was it, just backup. You had it. Wherever you clicked before, yes, there, and then I'll just scroll up.

Mr. Ciminello: So you can see in front of the car on the left, the column width. There will be larger ones with that feature out on Main Street, and then each individual neighborhood will have those columns. So if we made the cupola more mirror, that instead of the typical one that's shown is more colonial.

Mr. Zollars: As a point of reference the cardinal health building in Dublin is a similar look.

Mr. Ciminello: Right.

Mr. Bowsher: So this right here is the inspiration. So this is across the street right here, the Department of Agriculture. So they've taken sort of this architecture, modernized it a bit, and they've put it through the development. And add to just for your sake, Mr. Ciminello, this is actually not going to be the only clubhouse that will be built in the future phase. There's actually going to be a very large several million dollar clubhouse with pool that'll be associated with that for the entire neighborhood and development, which will come later. So you've obviously got two multifamily development, but then also an additional one that'll be there for everyone. If you've driven through the Pinnacle Development on Buckeye Parkway, have a very large same similar community center. It's more of a farmhouse feel. This will be more mission, sort of brick feel.

Mr. Zollars: Any other questions from the commissioners?

Mr. Furst: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ciminello, I have a minor question request perhaps regarding your landscape plan. So I see in the landscape plan that you specify deciduous tree of this size, shrub of this size, etc.. One of the things that we've tried to do in previous applications is increase the diversity of plant life there such that if we had another emerald ash borer incident, that there would be sufficient diversity there, that you wouldn't have to remove every street tree and everything like that. You would you be open to a condition, since you don't specify species and things like that in a very granular detail, a condition such that, you know, you would have sufficient diversity to prevent something like that happening?

Mr. Ciminello: Yes, that's been typical in other communities we've worked in the past, half dozen years or so.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Hicks, I had a couple of proposed conditions, just if we could talk about those real quick. The first one would be on the lot number four the clubhouse and cupola that the applicant, when they submit for building permits, that they would add additional architecture to mimic the streetscape and columns within the master development. And similar to the design of the Department of Agriculture building across the US 40. That sound kind of like what we're talking about here? And then in regards to the sidewalk, second condition would be that the developer shall add additional sidewalks internally on lot number four in compliance with the ADA, completing sidewalks across the entire frontage of each residential building, fronting parking and driveway areas. That sounds sort of in the ballpark of what we're working on? OK.

Mr. Ciminello: Good to hear.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion. I would like to move that we approve the Eastwood major site plan under the following two conditions. First condition would be that the clubhouse and cupola on lot number four the architecture

would be modified to mimic the streetscape and columns within the master development in order to match the Department of Agriculture building across the street on US 40. Second condition would be that the developer add additional sidewalks in the plot grade and utility plan internally on lot number four, in compliance with the ADA, completing sidewalk access across the entire frontage of each residential building, fronting the parking and driveway areas.

Mr. Zollars: OK, very good. We have a first we have a, what are the rules? We have a second and then we can go into to question.

Mr. Bowsher: Yes.

Mr. Zollars: So we'll take a look at that. Do we have a second to Mr. Hicks's motion?

Mr. Furst: I second the motion.

Mr. Zollars: Love that. OK, any questions? Mr. Benner?

Mr. Benner: I do have a few questions and I'm not sure about the language on the sidewalk. One about the trees that Mr. Furst brought up, the trees have to be approved by the city. Who does that?

Mr. Bowsher: For clarification, we don't approve each individual tree, we do have a list of approved trees that they can plant, which are all native species, deep growing roots. Obviously, we don't want sidewalk sort of bursting up.

Mr. Benner: So excuse me. So if they adhere to a list, it doesn't matter to us what trees they put?

Mr. Bowsher: So we would review this in detail during their detailed landscaping plan, during the PGU process for those trees.

Mr. Benner: OK, and do we consult the two arbor's that we do have here with us?

Mr. Bowsher: We do, because the one has to review it, so.

Mr. Benner: OK. All right then. As far as the trees are concerned, I'm finished. Thank you. On the sidewalk. Can you do your motion again, please? Or read it to me or tell me.

Mr. Hicks: I think the important parts that we identify a lot, number four on that side, that all the sidewalks need to be in compliance with the ADA, which is kind of a given. But I think that that also just explains our intent, what we're trying to make sure we have the connectivity here. And that they're completing the sidewalk on the frontage of each of those residential buildings against a parking field or a driveway.

So, for example, number five, building number five there. The sidewalk goes all the way across the building frontage on one side, but not on the other side. So you could take that all the way across and there could be an additional crossing to get across the sidewalk there. Similar building number two, that seems appropriate on building number two. But I think we have to put this in the staff's hands when they review the plot grade utility plan. That just needs to be more sidewalks on here. So which is not untypical. I mean, I've had projects where, you know, a lot of these municipalities, they can intelligently work with the with the applicant to make sure that they're being put in appropriate locations.

Mr. Zollars: OK, we have a first and second. Let's call the roll, please.

Mr. Bowsher: Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes. Mr. Hicks. Yes. Mr. Zollars. Yes.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner
ABSENT:	Cullinan

2. Application #2021-5214; National Road SW; Applicant Joe Ciminello; Preliminary Plat (Eastwood)

Ms. Wheeler: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The second application this evening is for preliminary plat. This is also for the Eastwood development. This is application 2021-5214. This is to subdivide the parcel into initially the five lots as shown. With that, if there are any questions you can ask.

Mr. Zollars: Mr. Ciminello, would you like to start the conversation with anything or. Anything you want to state?

Mr. Ciminello: This is just the engineer and we need to subdivide the parcels and it's the first step, the preliminary plat. Final plot might be adjusted for any engineering concerns, but this is just the first step that's required approval from your body.

Mr. Bowsher: And as the M/I had as well, it'll come back to this body for the final plats as well.

Mr. Zollars: Any questions or statements from the commissioners? OK, entertainment first and second motion.

Mr. Furst: I move that we approve this as submitted.

Mr. Benner: I will second Mr. Furst's motion.

Mr. Zollars: OK, we have the first and second. Emily, could you read call roll, please?

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

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner
ABSENT:	Cullinan

3. Application #2021-5083; 1122 & 1170 Lancaster Avenue; Applicant Laurie Gunzelman; Amendment of Development Plan (The Oliver)

Ms. Wheeler:

RE: 1122 & 1170 Lancaster Avenue - Development Plan Amendment #2021-5083 Staff Report
Planning Commission:

Below is the staff review of the above referenced application.

1. Project Summary

- The property is located on two parcels at 1122 & 1170 Lancaster Avenue (parcel ID nos. 060-008442 & 060-009334). The property is within the Residential Medium (RM) Zone.
- The applicant, Laurie Gunzelman, is requesting Planning Commission approval of an amendment to an approved Major Site Plan allowing for the construction of a new residential development on a 7.6-acre site. The project will consist of 24 townhome units with attached garages and 126 apartment units, as well as a pavilion and dog park. There is an existing single-family home on the site.
- The development received Major Site Plan approval at the November 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. No variances are being sought.

2. Zoning Review (Section 1103.19)

- The property is within the Residential Medium (RM) Zone. The proposed use ('Dwelling - Attached Single-Family' and 'Dwelling - Multi-Unit Building Complex') is listed as a permitted use in RM.
- The proposed development complies with the RM Zone in terms of building height, lot coverage, and setback requirements. The RM Zone sets a max density of 24 units per acre. The proposal calls for 19.7 units an acre (150 total units on 7.6 acres).
- Staff is supportive of the updated site layout with 2-story townhomes on the exterior and 3-story apartment buildings concentrated in the development's interior. The suggested building typology for 'Dwelling - Attached Single-Family' encourages rear garage access as well as private open space for each unit, though these are illustrative rather than regulatory features. Additionally, the City's Comprehensive Plan encourages pedestrian-friendly features for infill development such as walking paths and/or trail connectivity.
- The development meets the off-street parking requirement. Required parking for the townhomes is 1 enclosed and 1 unenclosed off-street parking space. Each townhome unit will have a 1-car garage, as well as driveway parking (excluding 8 units along the rear of the property with parking across the private drive). Apartments require 1 parking space per unit plus 1 for every 5 units, or 152 total spaces for 126 units.
- Access to the site and all units will be from dual drives along Lancaster Avenue. The northern access road will be a right-in, right-out-only, while the southern access road will be two-way. A traffic access study was conducted by EMH&T (see City Engineer's report) which concluded the proposed development is adequately served by existing road infrastructure. Pervious pavers are being proposed for townhome driveways as well as the central north-south drive through the development.
- The landscape concept plan meets zoning code requirements. Screening between residentially-zoned properties is not required, however the proposed development calls for landscaped

screening along the perimeters of the lot. Additionally, the proposal calls for preservation of existing trees along the rear of the property and inclusion of street trees along Lancaster Avenue.

g. To address surface water drainage, the proposal also calls for two storm water detention basins along the Southern edge of the property. Please see Engineer's report for further analysis.

h. Neighborhood entry signs are permitted in RM. Separate zoning sign permits will need to be submitted for all site signage.

3. Staff Recommendation

a. The Commission shall consider whether the proposed Major Site Plan is consistent with the standards contained in the City's zoning ordinance and Comprehensive Master Plan.

Screening between residential zone properties is not required, but the proposed development does call for landscape screening along the perimeters of the lot. Additionally, preservation of the existing street trees. With that, I believe the applicant is here if they would like to address the board.

Mr. Bowsher: I appreciate that. Just a couple of clarifying things I want to just discuss with obviously the traffic study being number one. So what we had our engineer do was take calculations from 2019, which was the busiest year that we had on record here in the city. Obviously, we did not want to do, you know, during the pandemic numbers. So we used MORPC traffic study counts from 2018, 2019, utilize those. All that was based off of the one hundred and fifty units that were being proposed here this evening, regardless of the various of heights throughout we went through the unit specifically. The property was bought in 2020. I think there was a comment that was made that it did not transfer December 29, 2020 to Principal Property Solutions LLC. I know that they're going to get into the differences between the previous submission and this submission, but the density has not been increased in a significant amount. Actually, it's just a zero point zero two to the density. I just wanted to sort of get an update of how we got here. This was an approved development plan. Originally, the lot to the north is under contract being purchased by The Oliver. They came back to us knowing that they had some constraints with their storm water. They needed to fix some of those within their engineering and they were not going to be able to do that on their current site. So regardless, it was going to be changed. Within doing so adding costs, they decided to take a look at the other adjacent properties. They originally had submitted for our April meeting. We had asked for them to pull that so we could continue to negotiate and work with them on a more palatable project, which they have submitted here this evening. Also there was a comment that was made about this parcel being rezoned under, you know, suspicion. This parcel to the north that's being proposed, in addition to the one that was already approved was RM zoning classification, as was the rest of the development, all at the same time, had no bearing on the Oliver project. So I just wanted to put those to bed and some clarification marks. I turn that back over to you, Chairman.

Mr. Zollars: All right. Thanks for that information, Mr. Bowsher. OK, we have a committee in front of us as you are speaking. If you could please identify who you are for the record, that would be helpful.

Mr. Duggar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Glen Duggar. I'm an attorney. 37 West Broad Street. I represent Michael Oliver, who's the director of personal development, who is the contract producer, actually, the owner of a portion of this property. Also here with Laura Gunzelman. Lori is the one who actually has to do the heavy lifting, who's the architect, the planner, and has really put this plan together. I'd like to thank staff, Ms. Wheeler, first of all, because I think that her summary of what's going on here in terms of this being a seven point six acre application, it was previously four point five. We made it three point two acres larger. The number of apartments, townhomes, etc. is one hundred percent completely accurate, with which I agree completely. The second part of that is also like to thank Mr. Bowsher, because when we did bring this back earlier this year, we sat down with his staff, and the administration, to try and work through how to make this thing work. And his guidance, the administration's leadership on this was really, really helpful to get us to where we are today. So what I'd really like to do, I think, is cover that in a little bit greater detail on the person do that is Lori, because she did the plan work on the original 4.5 acres. It's now 7.6. It's a little bit bigger. The density is the same. But we basically have a slightly larger project in on at least 60 percent of the same property. So I guess Lori can walk you through what the old plan was, what the new plan was, what the new old architecture was with the new architecture. We think that the new plan, the new architecture is more responsive to some of the issues and concerns that the administration has. And then I'll kind of maybe wrap up at the end of the day, if that's OK. Thanks.

Ms. Gunzelman: Thank you very much. It's not necessary. Thank you very much for hearing us this evening and presenting the proposed revised, amended site drawing. We really appreciate everyone's efforts on this one. We understood that there was a lot of concern about transitioning this project from the one story neighborhood to the east. And we really took that to heart and worked hard to accommodate a lot of those concerns by proposing instead a two story single family for sale product that would be adjacent to the single family residential neighborhood to the east and north. Due to the constraints of the site and how the grades work, we need to detain all of the water to the south. And that was one of the aspects of why we needed to meet with the city and redesign a lot of it. Thank you very much for pulling that up. As you can see, we still have townhouses on the Lancaster Avenue side. Three triplex. Three homes on the Lancaster Avenue and two areas, we have porches also that we identified to the Lancaster Avenue at the request of and advise of the development office. We also incorporated and maintained our dog park it's in a slightly different location to the north and we still have a park pavilion to the north as well. The other areas that we improved, we believe, is we created another access point to the north on Lancaster Avenue. We realize this is a larger development and that street access is going to be important to that. We have 24 townhouses and 126 apartments. Our parking, we completely are able to park on site. The single family or the, I'm sorry, the townhouse product has an enclosed parking garage attached and a surface lot in the front of those. We still have a walking path completely around. We still want to encourage walking in this development. We are at 19.7 units per acre, so we are about 17 percent below our total what we could have. We are also

reduced the height so that transition from the single family two story goes from the single family to; we've reduced that to twenty five feet. So that is substantially less than what our three story townhouse product is. This is the product here that you're seeing on the screen. We still have the walk up, we still have garages adjacent and we still have outdoor balcony space on those front elevations. There's some renderings as well. The apartments did not change at all. So there's not a lot to talk about that. This is, again, along Lancaster Avenue. You'll see on the upper number one detail east facing the front porches that we've incorporated on those facades so that there's a porch facing Lancaster Avenue. This is the apartment elevation excuse me, that hasn't changed at all from our previous submission. Again, the materials that we're using are exactly the same, but we are using them obviously a little bit differently on the two story townhouse. Next, please. So this is a revised elevation's for the two story townhouse along Lancaster Avenue. We're still adopting the water retention basins, but also along the south. So we'll have a tree line access along that south drive. Next, please. This is the Lancaster Avenue elevation's showing the front porch and we incorporated additional street trees along this Lancaster Avenue. Next, please. This is a better rendering of the two story townhouse product with the drives. You'll notice we have permeable pavers parking in front of those single attached garages to incorporate an additional parking space for those for sale products. And again, the sidewalk that accesses along to the drive there. Next, please. This is the again, the apartments, not a lot of changes here. We just thought it'd be a good idea to kind of maybe identify a little bit better with this retention would look like. There were some comments last time and we thought maybe an image might help. The intent is really to have like a stone and vegetation basin that would be accessed and easily to walk around. So this is a bit of a detail of what that would look like. Next, please. Those are some landscaping details. This is the lighting site lighting plan, we increased the number of both pole lights and then street lights. These lights also were adopted from the Reynoldsburg plan. So they will match Reynoldsburg urban district. Next, please. Then we get into more of the engineering showing their site plan with parking. It Shows, the adjacent site properties as well. That shows more of the storm and utility plan connections. Thank you. The intent of the detention basins, again, also would be that they would be more free formed that will be worked out in site engineering after we do all of our calculations. And that's pretty much our proposal, I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Zollars: OK, I've got some questions, but I'll go up to my peers over here. Any questions?

Mr. Furst: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Gunzelman, thank you for bringing this back. Just to speak quickly to your landscaping, I appreciate the attention to detail that you have in there. I think that should be a model for any city or any application. So thank you very much for that. I do have a couple minor questions here so that the pavers for the driveway's for the for sale product are those can be maintained is like an HOA type responsibility or the homeowner be responsible for those?

Ms. Gunzelman: that will be all under HOA.

Mr. Furst: OK.

Ms. Gunzelman: So similarly, you'll see on this site drawing, there's permeable pavers that run on that mean what I call it, the boulevard. So it's the same product. So all of that landscaping will be maintained by that HOA.

Mr. Furst: The great thank you for that clarification. Now, regarding the south entrance there that goes into the church parking lot, I assume there won't be a problem getting an easement, given that you did purchase the adjacent property from the correct?

Ms. Gunzelman: Correct. Very similar to our previous proposal. There's an easement with the church to access that property. We also are connecting a storm through their property as well to the south as part of our removal of storm water. So all of those easements are either negotiated or in place.

Mr. Furst: OK, great. Thank you for that point of clarification. And one last thing. There was a public comment about the lighting in the center of the development here. I think the point of contention was around the apartments. Is there going to be lighting on the building that would kind of cover some of those spaces or is or maybe they're just misread the lighting plan. Are the public spaces all adequately lit with the lighting?

Ms. Gunzelman: Yes, the public spaces are adequately lit. We also have lighting in all of the canopies and or overhangs. So everything is adequately lit, which is also required by building codes.

Mr. Zollars: Let me add to that point, Mr. Furst. I believe Mr. Luzader said something to that. The top, which would be the North run. I don't see any lights on this drawing.

Ms. Gunzelman: The north?

Mr. Zollars: The north driveway.

Ms. Gunzelman: Do you see the larger gray areas, the larger gray blobs? Those are lights.

Mr. Furst: Yeah, it's kind of hard to see on this drawing.

Mr. Zollars: There are lights?

Ms. Gunzelman: Yes. There are lights all along the drive around. And then there's along the boulevard. Yeah. Those large gray ones.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you.

Ms. Gunzelman: Yeah.

Mr. Furst: And then, Mr. Chair, I will give the floor back here in a moment, but I do have a question for Ms. Wheeler. There was a comment made that this this application does not meet the parking requirements in our code. I did not read that in your staff report. I read that it was adequately parked. Could you clarify, please?

Ms. Wheeler: Yes, I believe there was a change in where they previously two car garage?

Ms. Gunzelman: Yes, correct.

Ms. Wheeler: Yeah, but we our code requires regardless one enclosed and one on enclosed for the townhomes. So we still meet that requirement.

Mr. Furst: OK, thank you. I give the floor.

Mr. Furst: Thanks Mr. Furst. Mr. Hicks, you have anything. OK, I'll go ahead if you want. I've got one question. The EMH&T and I don't know how you access that, Emily, but on that it referenced, back to a fence or guardrail on number 18. Yeah, there you go, that's it. Where are we talking about that on the drawings and what are you how would we address it?

Ms. Gunzelman: I'm assuming that you're talking about the northern edge of the water retention.

Mr. Zollars: Yeah.

Ms. Gunzelman: Yes, based on the proposal, they're recommending that a fence or a guardrail be incorporated. Our preference would be to be more fence like so that it looks more in keeping with the neighborhood. Obviously, we want to make sure that the residents are protected in that case.

Mr. Zollars: OK, thank you.

Ms. Wheeler: I would like to point out that if we do, you know, add that is a condition that we, you know, allow us staff to work with them to make something that's tasteful, that fits in. Sometimes these fences, I believe actually we talked about it, Mr. Furst, that, you know, sometimes especially in Columbus, they pretty untasteful around this. And, you know, we have Boswells just like this around the corner, the corner of Lancaster Main Memorial Plaza. If we put a fence around that, it would be pretty unsightly and just not really that natural. And these are not going to be filled with water at all times. These are dry basins. Only during rain events will they fill up. So I just want to be cognizant of that, that we're not adding additional maintenance

and things that we'll have to take a look at later or have something that just looks unsightly, that's just unwarranted.

Mr. Furst: Mr. Benner, if I may briefly impose upon your speaking time, but that it is my preference. I don't particularly see a need for a railing or a fence here, as Mr. Bowsher pointed out, we do have bio swales exactly like this, except in size, immediately around the corner, even from this building here. And, you know, I don't see that they pose a particular hazard as far as drowning or anything. These aren't the typical, you know, pond like structures that you might see in other developments, in which case then I would be in favor of some sort of protective barrier. So that's all I want to say.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you, Mr. Benner.

Mr. Benner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, this is probably one of the longer applications that we've had and I mean, no offense, but probably one of the least popular that we've had. Well, let's just be honest we're all grown-ups here. Part of that is the project was sold as Mr. Oliver being a friend of Reynoldsburg with ties to the community and wanting to do the right thing, but there are a number of folks out there and I empathize and understand all of their concerns. I've lived here longer than many people here have been alive. And, you know, Brookside is an old, old, established neighborhood and a three story apartment building right in the middle of it is going to be difficult to take. I've advised most of those people that have done those complaints get involved with your city and don't wait until it smacks you in the face. Get involved early in the process when codes are being written, land is being zoned, etc.. I appreciate everything that you folks have done thus far. If I'm not out of line, who's calling the shots here, I know that the city met, I believe the administration, maybe some council members to try to, as you said, worked this out and make it a viable product. I was told, I believe, that this was the only way that you could viably make any money on this project, something along those lines. Is that an accurate statement of how you arrived at this particular plan with the additional apartments and cutting back on the townhomes?

Ms. Gunzelman: When I was first approached by Michael and we started to develop that first proposal. It was always his intent to increase this neighborhood into a larger area. I don't think he anticipated getting that parcel to the north as quickly as he did. And when we were presented with that opportunity, it just made sense for us to be able to acquire that and incorporate it into the current designs. Since we were already there, it made more sense to do it now. I will also say that we started this process well before covid and construction costs have almost doubled, if not tripled in many cases. And that, along with many of the other challenges on the site with water retention, it made more sense for us to be able to take this product and make it work from a pro forma standpoint. And, you know, developers don't go into this to lose money. They certainly if they did, we wouldn't have all of the beautiful housing developments that we have currently. So, yes, absolutely. It was very important that we were able to expand this project in a way that made sense from a financial

aspect. But having said that, we had a proposal that was even more expansive than this and we reduced it because after talking with the city, you know, the administration and Andrew's office, it was very clear that we were coming up with some challenges and we have never tried to shove anything down anybody's throat. So our goal is to be a neighbor, a good neighbor, an involved community member, and to hear the concerns and address those concerns. And we all sat back and when we presented this revised application, one of the things we said, I'm like, wow, I'm glad they made us do that, because this two story is really awesome. It's so much better than the three story. And so we're really excited about it. So I think, you know, it's one of those situations that I think it's a win win for everybody. And so back to your point. Yes, absolutely economics does drive a lot of what we did and a lot of the decision making.

Ms. Gunzelman: Is to be expected. I appreciate your answer. You almost made me forget the rest of my questions, which is very talented on your part. The drawings indicate that the buffer planting along the north and the east are not required, but our intended. Intended. Since you do have an attorney here, we all know that intended means absolutely nothing. Is there anything you can do to guarantee us that those plantings will occur?

Ms. Gunzelman: I don't do a lot of projects without I do other projects with a little stronger word than intended. My reputation obviously is on the project. And having worked with Michael through this process, everything he said he was going to do, he has done. He's not given me any reasons to be concerned. And one of the beautiful parts of this is that northern edge. That's sort of on the sort of the East I noticed they said they already have mature trees there. So like some of those, it's already planted, which I said, well, that's a bonus. But no.

Mr. Benner: Primarily I guess I'm talking about the parking lot with the church on the south.

Ms. Gunzelman: Absolutely. It's the vision of the project and we definitely are committed to having a landscape plan that is that addresses the Boulevard alley and allows us to have a walkable street. And that's the vision of the project.

Mr. Benner: OK, so I have an intention and I have a vision.

Mr. Furst: Mr. Benner, they are required to comply.

Mr. Benner: I'm sorry, Mr. Furst, what?

Mr. Furst: They are required to comply with what they submit here.

Mr. Benner: Well, the submission says they're intended, that doesn't mean anything to me.

Ms. Gunzelman: You do have a plan.

Mr. Duggar: So we shot a plan. The plan has landscape on it. Right. We also have to then additionally supply what's called a plot grade utility plan. What the simple, easy thing to do is I think the term was bait and switch. And that is obviously none of our intention here because we have to come back. Right. So we have to have the ability to say, Mr. Oliver, you have to do this right. So the way to do that is to say that our landscape plan, which we have shown you, would be fully and completely articulated as a part of the plot grade utility plan. If you want to make that a condition, great, I think it kind of is anyway.

Mr. Bowsher: It is.

Mr. Duggar: But, you know, if you need to specifically say that, that's fine with me, because I think we have to do that anyway.

Ms. Wheeler: I think I think where you're getting hung up on just if I could clarify when they said intended, they mean that they were intentionally doing that to block it, not that they had to. You know what I mean?

Mr. Duggar: That's a very lawyerly answer, Mr. Bowsher, I'm not sure I'd go there. But it's fine, but he's a hundred percent right. We like to speak in terms of very black and white, in terms of what has to be done and what doesn't have to be done. We have to do that landscaping plan there. OK, and you get to see it again as part of the plot grade utility plan. How's that?

Mr. Benner: That's perfect. And by the way, I did not use the term bait and switch.

Mr. Duggar: No, no, I know you did.

Mr. Benner: For the record.

Mr. Duggar: Sometimes developers get accused of that all the time. I'm really sensitive about it. And so I think that it's important for us to be very clear about what you're approving and what we're going to submit the next time around.

Mr. Benner: And I appreciate that. I'm far from finished, Mr. Chairman, unless you want to shut me up.

Mr. Zollars: No, go ahead.

Mr. Benner: On your paperwork or on the can you get to your drawing of the parking lot again? I don't know that you need not that one. Anyway, it says there are eight ADA spaces. That's not the one either Emily, I'm sorry. That one, I believe, can you blow that up?

Ms. Gunzelman: If you can go to the civil drawing it's easier to see. It's harder to see on this.

Mr. Benner: And this is not a huge deal, but it does say there are eight and I'm only able to find seven.

Ms. Gunzelman: OK.

Mr. Benner: Blow that one up, I think. Yes, there they are. So there's two between the town homes and apartments. I think there's two directly across. There's three sets of two. And then there's one out towards the Lancaster Avenue. You know what, never mind. You know, look at the look at the drawing with the rendering. Apparently one of those sitting by a tree.

Ms. Gunzelman: OK, well, might be. I knew it was easier to see on here because she actually put the ADA sticker on there.

Mr. Benner: So we do have eight of those board and baton. Is that a hardy board material or is that vertical vinyl or?

Ms. Gunzelman: It's a vertical composite material. So cement board is a composite. This is a different type of composite, but it's a composite material.

Mr. Benner: It's not vinyl.

Ms. Gunzelman: It's not vinyl.

Mr. Benner: OK, thank you very much. And the last question actually, I got over the weeks listening to some of the citizenry complain, and I don't really think there's much you can do about it. But the dumpster's, if we could get the drawing. There both at, I believe, northwest and southwest or southeast corner.

Ms. Gunzelman: They'll be in dumpster enclosures, so there'll be an enclosure around those dumpsters.

Mr. Benner: That you say enclosures. Are you talking fence?

Ms. Gunzelman: Yeah, it would either be a masonry or a wood type of fence, correct.

Mr. Benner: And are those two the only ones for the area or for the project?

Ms. Gunzelman: We also have vegetation around them too, to help screen them.

Mr. Benner: OK, screening wasn't the actual complaint. It was the odiferous nature of having dumpsters back there. But if they can't be moved, it can't be moved. Who

will manage the apartments?

Ms. Gunzelman: There will be an apartment management company, but I can't tell you exactly who that is.

Mr. Benner: OK, and you say they'll be an HOA for the townhouse provided there. So and how long before you'll turn the HOA over to the people that live there? Will you maintain it for a period of time?

Ms. Gunzelman: I think that is to be determined. I don't know that all of the details have been worked out in that particular way.

Mr. Benner: Is it not standard that until a certain portion of the properties are sold that you will maintain that and you will?

Ms. Gunzelman: There's usually a percentage of ownership before it will be turned over to official HOA home ownership.

Mr. Benner: I appreciate your time. Thanks very much.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you very much. Anything else from the commissioners up here? Anything the staff wants to add? All right, we're at a crossroads. We need a motion one way or the other.

Mr. Furst: I move that we accept this application as submitted.

Mr. Zollars: I have a first, can I get a second?

Mr. Hicks: I'll second.

Mr. Zollars: Thank you. Emily, could you call the roll, please?

Mr. Hicks: I would like this discussion before we vote, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think. When the project was originally proposed, some of my biggest concerns were the three story town homes and the proximity to the house on Lancaster, I think it was eleven twenty two or something, and it always kind of felt like me the site would work better if that lot were included in the development in order to make it work a little bit better. I think the biggest thing I've been struggling with on this as we've reviewed all the materials, is that this is what technically an amendment to all are already an approved plan. And so I'm asking myself, looking at the elevations in the site plan, is this a better plan for the neighborhood than the old plan was? Is this a better plan for the city than the old plan was? And I think reducing the height of the town house buildings from three to two, which was overwhelmingly the biggest issue that we we're dealing with, especially in proximity to Brookside, I think that it is an improvement over the prior plan. And so I just wanted to make that as a statement and part of before we vote.

Mr. Zollars: Emily, would you roll call the roll, please?

Ms. Wheeler Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes. Mr. Hicks. Yes. Mr. Zollars. Yes. Four yeses. The motion carries.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Zollars, Hicks, Furst, Benner
ABSENT:	Cullinan

E. OTHER BUSINESS

None

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman

Planning and Zoning Administrator