



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2016 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: McKenzie, Cullinan, Comeaux, Wren, Weldon
ABSENT:

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – March 3, 2016

Minutes stand approved.

2. Planning Commission – Special Meeting – March 14, 2016

Minutes stand approved.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman McKenzie: Are there any changes to the Agenda? If the Commission would allow, and time permits, I suggested in the last special meeting that we make some small changes to the Rules of Commission. I have basically four changes, to two sections, that I would like us to consider. So, I will make a motion that we add Item 2, to our business.

Mr. Cullinan: I will second that.

Chairman McKenzie: Mr. Cullinan seconds, so we will do this by a voice vote. Any discussion? All in favor say, "Aye." (Audible "Aye.") Any opposed. (No opposition.) With that, I will consider the Agenda approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman McKenzie: We have someone here who will be addressing the Commission tonight, is that correct? We ask that you take an oath to tell the truth. Everyone addressing the commission, please stand and raise your right hand. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you give in front of the Commission will be truthful? If so, please answer, "I do." (Audible "I do.")

B. BUSINESS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. **ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED - 1636 Graham Road, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from R-2/R-3 Single Family Residence District to S-1 Special District, Applicant, Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church. (Second Reading 4/25/2016).**

Mr. Snowden: 1636 Graham Road - Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church - District Amendment (Rezoning). Application: #172881 - District Amendment (Rezoning). Property is located on the east side of Graham Road between Palmer Road and Burkey Drive. Existing Zoning: S-1, R-2, R-3. The request to amend the zoning district on a portion of the site to conform the zoning of the all the subject parcels to S-1 Special District. Current Use: Semi-public Use - Church. Applicant: Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church, c/o Scott Huber, 1636 Graham Road, 614-866-5864. The applicant is requesting that the Commission review and recommend approval of a zoning district amendment to confirm all parcels at the subject site to S-1 Special District. This will allow the applicant to expand their existing church building to the south. Gentlemen, on the screen in front of you, you are seeing a current outline of all of the property that is owned by Reynoldsburg United Methodist Church. This is a break down in front of you, showing the individual parcels that are owned by the church. The history of this is that the main parcel there, that you see located in white, that is not cross hatched on this drawing, is a property that the church has owned for approximately fifty years or longer. So, when the original zoning map and zoning code of the City was implemented, since it was already operating as a church, or owned by the church, it was designated S-1, Special District. Over the years, the church has acquired various parcels, one to the east and six to the south. The total area of the site is 15.9 acres, and the area to be rezoned within that site is 6.5 acres. The areas you see here have legacy zonings of residential R-2 and R-3 from when they were used as single family homes in the past. Church use is a permitted use on those properties, so it is perfectly reasonable that would be considered a permitted use, and it is reasonable that the church has extended their semi-public use throughout that site. The issue in this case is that the church is going to be proposing to construct an addition to the south, and at the recommendation of Staff, the church took this opportunity to work with their design team to have the entire property redesignated as S-1. That provides the advantage. It allows for some more consistent site planning. It also allows that the set backs at all the various regulations related to the zoning on the site will be the same, and it makes the major site plan process much simpler. With that, I have reviewed the safety utilities and traffic. All in all, I would review this as a technicality of zoning. Basically conforming these parcels to the main zoning district on the site. This is very similar to the review that the Commission made in the Wesley Ridge case last year, where the Commission allowed the commercial properties that had been acquired by Wesley Ridge to be conformed to the zoning district of the main site. I would be happy to answer any questions. From here, if this is approved, it will be directed back to Council. If Council approves the rezoning, the applicant will then have to apply for a Major Site Plan to actually construct the proposed addition that you are seeing. With that, I will turn it back over to our chair.

Mr. Pax: My name is Joe Pax and I am an architect with Keiser Design Group. We are the design group to the consultant to the church. To that point, we are aware that as far as our

civil engineer, we will be addressing that as part of the planning and the overall site design work. The one thing that we have discovered with that topography on that site, we are going to be doing quite a bit of cut on that landscape. So, that fill, we are actually looking at doing the berming and landscaping along Graham Rd., so that for one thing, we do not have to pay the cost to haul it off. But, the benefit, frankly is we have nice screening and landscape berms to the setback point that Mr. Snowden just referenced. But, it provides a screen to the parking lots, for the resident across Graham Rd, so we see that as a benefit, win-win situation. So, that would be our intent at this point, with the development. We also did a traffic study. That was a concern of some of the residents to the south. The addition is actually a gymnasium/family life center. Main use, Saturday morning, not any additional load on the church load that they would normally have on Sundays. It is not used on Sundays. In that regard, it is not providing additional charge to Graham Rd., and the residents understood that and were comfortable. Thank you.

Chairman McKenzie: Any questions for Mr. Snowden?

Mr. Cullinan: The scope of our review is just the change in zoning?

Mr. Snowden: The short answer to that question is yes, because the applicant would be allowed to construct this facility regardless, in terms of the use. However, the site planning process, and given the time line, and when the new code changes will take affect, probably it will be this Commission that will be reviewing the site plan, per our previous round of changes. That review will be much simpler because all the set backs and the lot coverage, and all those details of the Zoning Code will be the same. It makes it a lot less complex.

Mr. Comeaux: So, am I to assume communications have been made specifically to the properties to the south of here, and they have received notice of the proposed changes.

Mr. Snowden: They received notice in the mail, not this meeting, but the combined hearing of the City Council. It also was noticed publicly in the local newspaper, per the charter. I can quote the section if anyone wants to reference that. And, I also posted a sign at the location, per the charter, as well.

Mr. Comeaux: Are you, or the applicant, aware of any communications from any of the property owners.

Mr. Snowden: I am aware of a few communications that were personally directed to me. The concern, in that case, regarding the overall proposed development, that there be adequate screening between the uses and the residential uses to the south. In the Conceptual Design Plan, you are not seeing a Landscape Plan. That will be required in the Major Site Plan, whether it ends up being BZBA reviewing it next month, or the Planning Commission reviewing it in two or three months. I also noted in my Staff Report, under the Traffic and Parking section, that one of the proposed parking lots is a little too close to the lot line, per the zoning regulation. That is ok, from this standpoint, because they are showing that they have enough room to accommodate parking for the proposed use, but that is something that is going to have to be addressed in the Site Plan process through mounding, and getting to the

correct distance. There is typically a setback, and if you are landscaping, you can reduce that setback by half. So, in that case, the setback for the parking would be fifty feet. If you have landscaping, fencing, mounding, that sort of thing, you can reduce that to twenty-five. There is plenty of room to accommodate that. They are just going to have to basically approve that in the Major Site Planning process.

Chairman McKenzie: At this time, while we are not doing the Major Site, because there rezoning involved, I think it would be within this Commission's purview, to examine the use of that rezoning. So, while your answers to Mr. Cullinan are correct, I believe it does open it up to those types of questions. So does anyone have additional questions?

Mr. Weldon: Mine would only be to the applicant which is, you need to be aware that these types of issues are coming down the pike.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Commission, let me make one final point because I think this will be a great segway into the Commission doing additional reviews for this project. What is going to happen, as we first do a rezoning, then a Major Site Plan, once the Major Site Plan is approved, we go to Plot Grade Utility approval. As you go through the series of approvals for the site, the level of detail increases, and so I would encourage the Commission to make the determination, does the use make sense at this location? It is already there in some regards. Can the entire site accommodate the proposed development? Yes it can. When we go to the site planning process. Now we are going to be saying, have we met all of our zoning codes? Have we met all of our landscape codes for the actual site development standards? That will be the concern there. When it goes to a Plot Grade utility review, which is done by our engineer, questions such as do the water and storm water lines meet the City regulations? It gets progressively more detailed. This is a pretty detailed one. We have seen them that are more conceptual, but I just want to point that out that since the Commission is going to be doing multiple reviews on a project, this is something that you can start to get use to seeing.

Chairman McKenzie: I will entertain a motion.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Per the charter, it will be returned to Council for two additional readings. The applicant can see, beginning on the third page of my Staff Report, under Next Steps, is listed what the next steps will be to complete the development review process. Also, you will receive those in a letter. Basically, you will return to Council, then you will have a Site Plan Review, Plot Grade Utility, and building plans. We look forward to working with you.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [4 TO 0]	Next: 4/25/2016 7:30 PM
MOVER:	Justin Wren	
SECONDER:	Robert Welday	
AYES:	McKenzie, Comeaux, Wren, Welday	
ABSTAIN:	Cullinan	

2. Rules of the Commission

Chairman McKenzie: I have a couple simple changes to Sections 5.2 and 6.4 of our Rules of Commission. In 5.2, I added the word voting in front of members. So, instead of just three members requesting a special meeting, it will be three voting members. And, I removed or replaced "discussed" with "act on". So, even if you do give an overly close reading of it, there where be no dispute. Under Section 6.4, to bring us in line with the way the Rules of Council are written, I have added for the Secretary, under the guidance of the Commission's Chairman, and with the assistance of the Vice Chairman, shall prepare the Agenda, whereas in the past, it simply said that the Secretary shall prepare the Agenda. One other thing, under 5.2 I have also said, "within the limits set by *Robert's Rules of Order*". *Robert's Rules of Order* specify that in special meetings, we should not be entertaining things that are carry-on. For example, this is something that would not be appropriate, changing the Rules of the Commission with the approval of a special meeting. So, the regular business, the things that we will just decide, as we did for tonight, would be fine. But things that would carry-on, should be held for regular meetings instead of special meetings.

Mr. Welday: Are the things you amended on the last special meetings, will this exclude those from moving forward, since they were carry-on items.

Chairman McKenzie: So, our responsibilities were to recommend the adoption by Council of those three packets of changes. That finished our business with those. There was one section, that I pointed out to Mr. Wren, that could be considered a carry-on, for he made this commission the members of the Nuisance Board and previously that has been appointed by the Mayor.

Mr. Snowden: The language that was in the code change was exactly the same procedure as was in there previously for addressing the Nuisance Abatement Board. It was the same as what was currently in the Code.

Chairman McKenzie: As I read it, it seemed like it was changing it to be appointed by the Mayor to be the Members of the Commission. So, that may have been an example. That is a small point. We say in another section that we defer to *Robert's Rules of Order*, so I do not know whether that is really needed or not. This section is certainly debatable and is not absolute. But mainly, *Robert's Rules of Order* says you do not use special meetings to change you by-laws. We didn't change any of the Rules of the Commission. We had a special meeting that was on the question of recommending those changes to code, but I brought this up and we decided by motion to waive the section that said to discuss. And, that ended, it did not carry-on to this meeting, or any other meetings after that.

Mr. Comeaux: you say we already have a reference to *Robert's Rules of Order*, is it the general provision that in the absence of further guidance that meetings will be conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*?

Chairman McKenzie: Yes it is. It comes however, at a later section.

Mr. Comeaux: My only concern is do we need that reference to *Robert's Rules of Order* here?

Chairman McKenzie: To my memory it has something to the effect that we will follow parliamentary procedure in the meetings, as laid out in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

Mr. Snowden: What I would request is that you provide Staff with a written copy, so that I can create a new revision for the Commission. The Commission's Rules state that a thirty day notice is required. So, this would be a change we would want to make at the next meeting. Am I correctly understanding your thought process? What the Rules say is that the Rules can be changed, provided that there is a thirty day notice to the Commission. So, for example, tonight the Commissioners are receiving the notice of the proposed change, so the next meeting they could act upon it, and I could provide a revised document to your approval that you felt properly incorporated your proposed changes. Or, you can provide one to me, I will provide you the Word file and you could edit it and send it back to me. However you propose and whatever will work consistently with your capabilities.

Chairman McKenzie: Whatever will be fine with me.

Mr. Comeaux: I think the clarification about voting members is well put and striking "discuss" and to "act on" is well put. I am not sure about the reference to *Robert's Rules of Order*, or if it is not appropriate. This is why it would be helpful to look at the thing, if you could send it around. If we refer to it broadly elsewhere, then we might not need it. Other than that, I think these changes are well put.

Mr. Snowden: Let me pull up the actual document at time.

Chairman McKenzie: There is no hurry. I do not expect a special meeting in the next thirty days. Section 5.5 says, "unless otherwise specified, Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the proceedings at the meetings of the Commission."

Mr. Snowden: Maybe we could amend that to say, "Shall govern the operation of the commission", or some other broad statement to cover what you are discussing here.

Chairman McKenzie: I don't want to get into two fine of an interpretation, but, as I would use the words proceedings because it really does cover the operations during the meetings.

Mr. Wren: A meeting, whether it is special or scheduled, is still a meeting of the Commission. It would be my thought that this would still cover that.

Mr. Snowden: I appreciate your work this evening and over the last few weeks, and I know we will meet together more often in the future. But, so that we can move on to Design Review Board, over the next month, Staff, Dan and I will need to speak internally, but we will figure out if Staff needs to make any request to the time change to any of our Boards and Commissions; given that starting in May, the Planning Commission is also going to be reviewing Major Site Plans, so we sill need more time than just a half hour. If our Chairman could provide Staff with something to get started, I will start the process.

C. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning Administrator