CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2018 6:30 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – February 1, 2018

RESULT:	**ACCEPTED**

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda stands.

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers sworn in by the Chairman.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Section 1171.07 Temporary Special Land Use of Chapter 1171 General Regulations.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Cullinan and other members of the Commission. This was a code revision that staff had proposed. There were some issues with Section 1171.07 which deals with temporary special land uses; these are temporary fruit stands, Christmas tree lots, the overall section needed some clean up. The main issue was that the code empowered the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals to vary certain requirements and approve permits that differed from the regulations in the code but it did not specify what process they were going to use in order to approve that. I have included in the code that they're going to approve those as special exceptions. That clarifies how folks can actually apply to go through that process. That's better than a variance because a variance would carry with the ground whereas a special exception is going to apply to the individual entity that is applying. It was brought to my attention at City Council that we are allowing 90 days for temporary special

land uses, there was concern that 90 days was appropriate on a temporary special land use where the property already has a main use, but City Council wanted the Commission to consider revising the regulations that were proposed by staff which stated that 30-days for a location that was vacant or did not have a main use. The issue being that the code also states that 25% of the parking can be reduced for a temporary special land use, but when you have no vacant use there's no required parking and so the temporary special land use can sometimes grow to a level where they're no longer appropriate and you're starting to have some negative side effects. I would request approval of the item that I've submitted before you stating that revision. If it's listed in your packet, it should be Option B because there was an original Option A, which did not include that. This would have to be recommended back to City Council with a recommendation for approval or disapproval by the commission.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Eliot Bowman, Commissioner	
AYES:	Cullinan, Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

2. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Section 1151.01 Initiation of Amendments, Section 1151.02 Petition for Zoning District Change with Development Plan, Section 1151.03 Public Hearing and Referral to the Planning Commission, Section 1151.05 Action by Council, Section 1151.06 Amendment of Development Plan, and Section 1151.07 Effect of Approval of Chapter 1151 Amendments.

Mr. Snowden: This is a general revision of Chapter 1151 which governs our rezoning process both map and text amendments. A rezoning would be a map amendment. Code changes, such as this, would be a text amendment. Our process was previously governed by a charter process which required the joint hearing. Referral from City Council to the Planning Commission, notifications. I'm proposing to revise that process. Remove the joint hearing of the City Council and the Planning Commission. I have not been able to find a peer city that does that type of referral and it's going to also do two things. One is the length of time that Planning Commission would have to consider any item for code amendment or map amendment would be longer. The current requirement is 30-days after referral by City Council. Secondly, folks would be notified at the Planning Commission meeting which would be first. Basically, the process, and I believe in your packet I attached my documents laying out the process, but I can provide those if you need them. Basically, an applicant would apply, staff would review, schedule for the next meeting of the Planning Commission, the application will be required 30-days before the meeting of the commission as are all other applications for approvals to both this body and BZBA. The commission would have up to 60-days to make a recommendation. Basically, I'm saying that an application could be tabled once for rezoning or for code amendments, so we could work on them together then we would forward a recommendation to City Council where it would walk through for its three readings at the discretion of Council. This is very typical for peer cities. I also clarify the process for the commission to by motion review a code section and make a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Hicks, at one of our previous meetings started a discussion, that we needed to review our engineering standards, our design guidelines, codes, all of the above

and the way it is right now the commission is really set up so that it is just reviewing things that are already get pushed down from City Council or staff and there needs to be a way for staff to make a preliminary introduction, but the commission to kind of get in the driver's seat, make a motion and say, hey City Council at least look at this and then City Council can make the decision that they want to make, but at least the commission has a little bit more say in the process. It's going to add a lot of efficiencies to our operations. It's going to streamline the process for our applicants and make a lot more sense. It's not going to change the end result, which is, if you want to rezone or change the text, you need approval from Planning Commission, you need approval from City Council and there's a notification process. If this went into effect it would only effect applications that came in new once it was approved by Council. Any application that was already in process would continue with the current process until it either was approved or denied by Council.

Mr. Cullinan: I think anything we can do to improve the process so it's a little simpler for applicants would be beneficial, especially for developers. I know a lot of developers that the time is the most important part of the project and that anything that makes the proper notice to citizens so that folks can get involved and anything that allows a developer to get a concept reviewed and approved in front of most people earlier in the process is easier and developers don't have to commit so many resources only to get denied later throughout the process. Gives you an idea that was a non-starter to begin with. So, I think anything that we can do to improve the process to make it work a little bit more efficiently. I think City Council's got a lot of things on their plate and anything that we can do to maximize the Planning Commission. We've already streamlined this where I think tonight's our last Design Review Board tonight, isn't it Eric?

Mr. Snowden: That's accurate.

Mr. Cullinan: Tonight's the last night that we'll have a Design Review Board and that will effectively go away which streamlines the process. That is a step in the right direction. I think it will be good.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Joseph Bizjak, Commissioner	
AYES:	Cullinan, Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

3. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED: Changing the Zoning Districts of Various City Parks and Other Parcels Owned by the City of Reynoldsburg to S-1 Special District.

Mr. Snowden: In 1983 the city adopted a zoning map where it zoned basically all properties in the city more or less what there current or intended use was at the time. Since that time the city has acquired additional property for public buildings, parks, etc. that still have their legacy zoning district on them, such as industrial commercial. For example, the northern half

of Civic Park is actually zoned for industrial uses. I had a conversation with Director Bauman at Parks and Recreation. I don't see any factories going in on the ball diamonds. That's part of the community at this point. The zoning district needs to reflect one what the use is, secondly, what as you gentlemen know in commercial and industrial districts there's design review guidelines and requirements. The question would be, well, if you're installing something at Civic Park you have to go to Design Review Board to get approval for your building. That's not really the intent of the design review process. The parcels that I'm getting here are the northern half of Civic Park, a portion of the city property here that includes the Police Station to the back which was acquired back in the early 2000's. The parcel that the Livingston House is on, the parcel that the 5-way intersection is on and the north side of that intersection, a piece attached to Huber Park and a couple pieces of the Pine Quarry entrance that is off of Waggoner Road where it's an undeveloped park land that the city acquired over the last 25-years. It's really just a clean-up ordinance of what's already there, but it now makes the map reflect how we're actually using the property rather than just saying well, it's a city park so we're going to ignore the fact that it's zoned industrial.

Mr. Cullinan: I would just like staff to clarify there's a few other parcels that the city has acquired recently in the last few years and just to clarify that those parcels are not included in the application and can be rezoned.

Mr. Snowden: I don't have it right in front of me. I can pull up my sheet here.

Mr. Cullinan: Specifically, where the YMCA is going in, the old Reynoldsburg Swim Club, and then on the corner of Reynoldsburg-New Albany Road and Main Street.

Mr. Snowden: I did not reference the Reynoldsburg-New Albany Road Main Street piece because the Parks, Development, and Public Service Departments have not really come to a final conclusion of what they are going to do there. I didn't include the parking lot next to Prost as the public parking lot. I just left that as well. Don't get ahead of me because if you look on number four that is the parcel that the YMCA is on even though it has a Main Street address. Item four on the agenda is addressing the exact same thing for the YMCA parcel, so I'll go over that in more detail.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Joseph Bizjak, Commissioner	
AYES:	Cullinan, Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

4. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED: Changing the Zoning District of a 10.58AC Parcel Known as 7227 E. Main Street, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from CC Community Commerce District to S-1 Special District, and Removing the Parcel from the Historic Overlay District.

Mr. Snowden: The city acquired the property from Nance Family Properties where the Swim

Club was located and the Bingo Hall, as well as the property across the street from that with the house and the small wedding chapel. As you have seen the YMCA project is chugging along. Many details for the city departments still to address with those projects; however, the use is no longer commercial. The use is now public institution and that is better reflected by the S1 District. That portion is also in the historic district. I would like to revise the historic district zone; however, in the interim time I'm requesting you approve this ordinance which clarifies it's not part of the historic district. The architecture of what's being proposed there is not going to reflect the historic design guidelines nor should it necessarily. We need to clarify that it's not part of the historic district any longer. That might have made sense back in 1995 when the historic district went in assuming future development in that location, but it doesn't today. I am only proposing to rezone the east side of the Davidson Drive. The portion of that parcel that is on the west side is not part of this rezoning. It is still going to be zoned community commerce pending final decisions about uses and details from our city department.

Mr. Bowman: I think it makes sense to remove the historical district overlay on it because we don't want to have to negotiate around that when it comes to all of the in any design aspects. I think it makes sense. I know it's got a Main Street address. How much of it is on Main Street?

Mr. Snowden: I'd have to go back and look. The property owner went through and did a series of lot splits and lot configurations. People don't actually know there was a small alley there where Davidson Drive goes back called Brown Alley that goes back to like the late 1900's. I'd have to pull up the auditor's map and look, but there was some alley vacation. There were some properties that were kind of addressed off of that. Our piece is actually connected to Main Street via a strip of land that is along the where the trail comes to the.. yeah, exactly. I would expect our engineer to assign a new address to that as part of the process, although, it's ultimately his decision, but I think it's going to make a lot more sense. These parcels were connected. One of them was connected up. There was a parcel line through the middle of the Post Office building. Parcels reflecting the previous uses and previous construction there along East Main Street and the property owner the city bought the land from reconfigured some of that, I want to say last year. I have to go back and look at my files through the lot split. Not much is the short answer to your question and I would expect a new address to be reassigned as part of this process because otherwise it's not going to make sense.

Mr. Bowman: The only reason I ask is because if it were a substantial portion or a portion where in the future something could be built there, my only hesitance in removing the historical district overlay would be if something is being built right off of Main Street right where all the other historical stuff is. I want it to have those same restrictions. But if staff doesn't foresee that being an issue then... I don't think you could even fit anything new there.

Mr. Snowden: I don't. Let me pull up both the county auditor and GIS which has some older county data and the current map of the county because I believe it reflects what was approved.

Mr. Bowman: While you're doing that I just want to make sure it's clear why I'm bringing this up. I just don't want something that looks really out of place in the middle of the historical district.

Mr. Snowden: So, here's the current configuration. The city oh, wow, it's getting busy here with the parcel numbers. This property we own, ok, you can see it's actually connected up in the middle of the bridge, so we actually own the land in the middle of the creek there. I believe that this is still Nance property. You can see the green there on your screen represents previous lot lines. As you can see you had some lots here that were originally configured for single family when the commercial uses went in they acquired, replatted those, so now what I'm proposing is to only rezone this piece to S1 and the only way is if you were going to build a building in the middle of the creek. The thing about the historic district and I can pull that up on our GIS, but I don't think it's necessary. The historic district actually includes the cities whole building and this whole piece here. I think back in 1995 they had the idea that that might redevelop someday and it needed to have more of a historic character. I would propose and I have our mapping folks at EMH&T have worked on a map for me to possibly revise the historic district to end at the creek because these properties here don't have the same type of historic character and nor do they necessarily need to. You've got the Post Office use here. Our general commercial community commerce district and the commercial overlay are a better fit for the types of uses, the size of the building. You're still having quality materials. Its still restricts. Pulls buildings up to the street, but we don't need to worry about how the... I mean the city building is never going to have the type of historic character that we like to see in old Reynoldsburg. It's just the nature of the architecture. I think we're moving in the right direction here, but I just wanted to move this forward so that there would not be any road blocks or confusion in place.

Mr. Bowman: I'm satisfied. Thank you.

Mr. Hicks: Just one other comment about the historic district. I'm just curious if we've removed any other parcels since the inception of the historic district. Whether we've removed any other parcels from the historic district, I agree with you that the historic district needs revised. We need to touch up the language. It could be a lot better so that we actually get more historic looking buildings, but at the same time I'm sure this YMCA building will come out, this is not going to fit with the historic district. It makes more sense for it to only be on the east side of Blacklick Creek, but I just want to make sure that we are not setting precedence here. We're eventually in 20-years each parcel that wants something that doesn't comply with the revised historic district has precedence to be able to remove themselves from the historic district and say well the Planning Commission approved it for the YMCA why can't I build the building I want to build and not make it look like it's in the historic district. I just want to be careful about the reasoning and logic for why we would remove property from the historic district and I hope soon we can readdress the historic district so that it is strengthened and maybe done a little bit more practical way and an updated way to make it more clear to applicants and how to make their projects fit in with the area.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Hicks, I agree with you completely. We have never made this type of ordinance before. The only way someone could do this would be if they tried to rezone.

They would essentially rezone themselves. Theoretically they have the right to make that application and it's up to Planning Commission and City Council to say no. Ultimately, you are the arbiters of what is an appropriate land use and land uses can absolutely change just as conditions change, but in this case you have a substantial public purpose here. That's the difference. That's what you would hang your hat on if you receive blow back from an applicant and I think that there's a strong argument that this probably should not have ever been included in the first place just because of the character, the development that was already there even when it went in. Your point is a good one.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Eliot Bowman, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Joseph Bizjak, Commissioner	
AYES:	Cullinan, Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

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

Mr. Snowden: 9366 Taylor Road SW - Metro Development LLC - District Change (Rezoning)

App./Case:	#181277 - Zoning District Change (Rezoning)
Location:	Property is located on the west side of Taylor Road between E. Main Street and Morning Dew Drive.
Request:	Request to change the zoning district for the site from CC Community Commerce District and AR-2 Multiple Family Residence District to PND Planned Neighborhood Development District.
Existing Zoning:	CC Community Commerce District and AR-2 Multiple Family Residence district
Proposed Zoning:	Planned Neighborhood Development District
Current Use:	Agriculture
Applicant:	Metro Development LLC

The applicant is requesting that the Council and Commission review and approve a zoning district change in order to construct a new multi-family residential complex and related site improvements.

The 24.3 acre site consists of three separate parcels and is improved with an existing single family dwelling and accessory buildings. To the west, the property abuts single family dwellings in the R-3 zoning district. To the north, the site will abut single family dwellings in part, and an existing multi-family dwelling complex in the AR-2 district. To the south, the

site is adjacent to a grocery store (retail sales) in the CC Community Commerce District.

The westernmost portion of the site is already zoned AR-2 with a different development plan. This represents a transitional use between the single family neighborhood to the west and the existing CC district zoning on the parcels that front Taylor Road. Taylor Road is designated as a major arterial street per the City of Reynoldsburg Thoroughfare Plan, which means that the street corridor can support intensive land uses. Multi-family dwellings are generally a less intensive use than the uses and special exceptions permitted in the CC zoning district with regard to traffic and conflicts with neighboring uses.

The applicant has provided a conceptual development plan that proposes a 240 unit multi-family dwelling complex. The proposed density for the entire site is 9.88 units per acre, which exceeds the 5 unit per acre maximum prescribed by Section 1183.04(b) of the Zoning Code.

The applicant's development plan proposes to arrange the twelve multi-family buildings around a main entry boulevard. That boulevard will terminate at a central clubhouse. The applicant proposes to front the buildings along Taylor Road directly to the street, and arrange several of the interior buildings around a central greenspace. Staff generally supports site designs that screen parking from public streets.

The applicants proposed landscape plan show general compliance with the provisions of Chapter 1180. The applicant is required to screen the single family dwellings to the west with a 15FT landscape buffer, which they propose to meet with a combination of plantings and mounding. The applicant proposes to provide additional screening along the lot line with the existing multi-family complex to the north. Along the south lot line of the site, the applicant has proposed a preservation zone at the request of Staff. This will create an area that cannot be disturbed during construction and must be maintained in its natural state permanently. Staff suggested the preservation zone in order to provide protection and buffering along the creek.

The applicant is proposing 13.46 acres of open space on the site, including a 7.19 acre of potential parkland. The applicant has engaged the City's Parks & Recreation Department in discussions about the potential of deeding this portion of the parcel to the City. Regardless of any actions taken by other City departments, this area would need to be maintained as open space in accordance with the approved development plan. Staff will work with the applicant to add language to the rezoning text that will limit uses and activities within that portion of the site.

The applicant has provided a conceptual building rendering showing 2 and 3-story residential buildings in a "garden style" configuration, which means they are accessed off of common interior stairs that are open to the elements. The proposed exterior materials are shingle roofs, vinyl siding in several styles, and stone accents around the building foundations

The applicant has provided a facilities demand worksheet which indicates their demand for City water and sewer services, as well as studies of their water and sewer impact in the area.

This information has been distributed to the Water/Wastewater Division and City Engineer for review. The applicant will have to provide detailed utility plans for review by City staff in conjunction with their major site plan and plot-grade-utility reviews. The applicant indicated that their site will be served by retention ponds along the west side of the site, and has committed to a 60FT setback for such ponds. It will be the responsibility of the City Engineer to determine if the size of the basin is adequate per the Stormwater Manual of the City. Staff supports this approach because the ponds will be a natural feature that will add to the beauty of the development, when compared to other typical stormwater mitigation methods.

The applicant provided a required traffic access study which was reviewed by the City Engineer. The City Engineer made the determination based on the requirements of that study that additional turn lanes at the main entrance drive of the property would not be required, but that some modifications of lane striping would be required.

Table 1179 of the Zoning Code requires two parking spaces per each dwelling unit for multi-family dwellings. One space must be enclosed, per the Code. The applicant has proposed 499 spaces, giving them a parking count of 2.08 spaces per unit. This complies with the number of spaces required by the Code, however the applicant is only providing 66 enclosed spaces. Staff has previously reviewed a concept plan with the required enclosed parking, and this decreased the open space provided by the development significantly. The Council and Planning Commission need to decide if they want to waive this requirement.

In conformance with Chapter 1151 of the Zoning Code, applicants for district change are required to submit a development plan, which becomes part of the rezoning text. The applicant has submitted a narrative statement and rezoning text which has been reviewed and revised by Staff and approved by the applicant. A copy of the revised text was attached to proposed ordinance.

If this application for district change is approved, this development will be the only legal use of the site. Any deviations from that plan in the future would require rezoning or approval of modified text by Planning Commission and Council.

The members should apply the standards for review of district changes contained in Section 1151.04 and Section 1183.05 of the Zoning Code and determine if the proposed use is compatible with the site. Staff's position is that that proposed development can be supported by the City's services and infrastructure.

Glen Duggar: I'm an attorney, 37 West Broad Street. I'm here with Joe Thomas from Metro Development. He's the applicant, as well as Todd Farris. Todd is setting up our exhibits for discussion for tonight. As we need these as we go through this process we'll try and grab the appropriate exhibit. You've heard this at the joint meeting of Planning and Council and so I'm not going to do too deep a dive except on a couple of things that we continue to work on. I wanted to be sure and Mr. Snowden just mentioned it, that he has sort of a standard text form and he asked us to take our text and kind of work that into that from when we worked with Eric in order to make that happen, so, that what we have tonight is just I think Eric's standard text and quite frankly I think that's a really good idea. The second thing was that we

did have a late revision to the plan. I think Mr. Snowden brought that up and is a difference from what we had originally set forth. We had originally had two detention basins that are on the west corner of the site. Those are approximately 30-feet at the closest point to the property owners to the west to that property line, we pulled those in additional 60-feet away, so that this plan that you have here is reflective of that plan change that was... Like a lot of these things are sort of evolving and so as we make plan changes we want to bring those for it to you. I think there's one other and it's really sort of a typo on our part. We identified this, for a lack of a better term, park. It's the open space at the northwest corner of the site. Originally as a 8 1/2 acre site. It's about 7 and change once we move those detention basins further into that, but the overall open space of the project will not change. With the idea that we're going to talk about sort of some of these open issues with reference to this. First of all, let's back up, this is a high quality apartment community, ok. It's probably unlike much of the apartments that are present currently in Reynoldsburg. There have been some more recently that starting to fill that market niche, but the demographic of the residents that we would expect here are consistent with the projects that Metro has built throughout central Ohio. These are younger people under 35ish, as well as empty nesters, which is more like my age. That's the two types of tenants that would be here. This is not going to be full of kids despite what some people might like to think or be afraid of. These are one and two bedroom units. They are not in any way by virtue of their amenity package, by virtue of their price, by virtue of the entire design of the project. This is not intended marketed to or even encouraged to be a kid-friendly environment. We want to get that as sort of our jumping off point. As we develop this site, as you know and Mr. Snowden walked us through, there's currently about 16-acres that are zoned AR2, which permits multi-family at 15-units to the acre and there's a plan attached to that, an approved plan, and it shows residences that are located and if you've seen that plan and we should have probably brought it, but that plan basically covers the rest of this portion of the property with those units and those units are basically within 30-feet of our neighbors to the west and to the north. What we've done is we've basically aggregated the unit by pulling them to the southern-eastern corner of the site and gone up as opposed to being flat and vertical. That was the plan attitude. I think Mr. Snowden correctly described the idea with reference to the 7 to 8 acres northwest corner that that is an area that would be has been offered to the city and it's probably above all of our pay grade as to whether the city will accept that as a public park, but in either event it will be left as open space. The question will be whether that will be part of city ownership and city park planning and programming or whether it will be something that we will retain for our residents. As noted it would be part of the open space that is set forth in this project by aggregating the buildings and the towards Taylor Road we have approximately 55% of this site is an open space. That would be, as Mr. Snowden identified, the preservation area ravine along the southern boundary. The 7.4 acres that's potential park, the retention basins, the dog parks, the setback along Taylor Road. It's approximately 55%. It's extraordinary, really, for this type of a proposal. On the plan I don't know if we were very clear about this in our joint meeting with City Council, but the, can you show it so I can keep talking in the microphone. The buildings on the western most portion are 2-story buildings. Those right there. The only 3-story buildings are those ones that are closer to Taylor Road. Ok. What we've done is try to not only pull away from our west and north boundaries, but also to gradiate the... try to increase the height or buildings that are taller will be farther away. Todd has and one of the issues that we've had is our we in too close, too approximate to our west boundary. First of

all, on the north boundary and the west boundary that are adjacent to the park there's absolutely no presence that we would have. The buildings that we have that are set back from the property line depending upon the way you are measuring. We provided in your package various cut throughs of what that distance is. I think Todd identified it as being 178 or 246 or 326 feet away depending upon where you're measuring. Depending upon where you're measuring it, it is, well, it's important, but I think what we've tried to do is show that these residential buildings have been pulled. It's very significant distance away from the west boundary line. I think that's important because when we look out our back windows now we see a farm field and with the current plan the approved plan is something very very different than that and that's something that I think needs to be understood by all of us. On that edge boundary we've had some continuous conversations primarily by Joe with the Reserve at Reynoldsburg Home Owners Association and we have submitted to them and want to make sure that it's a part of the package as to that edge treatment and in terms of what would be on that boundary in terms of landscaping and fencing. We have provided that to those residents and we want to make sure.. I think there were some questions Mr. Snowden as to whether that would be included as a part of our commitment tonight and I want to affirm that it is in fact part of that commitment. Does anybody have any questions so far?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar, just to clarify, so the second proposal that I received, I believe it was the 22nd or whatever it was, that I distributed to City Council and what I'm showing right here and the one that he's showing that is the development plan. I'm showing the exact same thing Todd has on the... that's the plan you want to commit to.

Glen Duggar: I'm going to say yes, unless Todd says no.

Mr. Snowden: Ok. Well, sorry if you can't see that, but part of what I'm saying is the one...

Glen Duggar: Mr. Snowden, you have that correct.

Mr. Snowden: The only reason is because at the end of the day it's your applications, so if you want to amend it I want to know what you're willing to commit to.

Glen Duggar: We want to make sure is that we do what we say and we show what we say and I think that's what we say.

Mr. Snowden: The revised *inaudible.

Glen Duggar: That's a part of the *inaudible residential.

Mr. Snowden: Oh, absolutely. In the rezoning text that you were comfortable with the rezoning text as revised.

Glen Duggar: Yes we were.

Mr. Snowden: Just making sure. Like I said, I'm...

Glen Duggar: Yeah, I think there was a typo in the staff report about traffic improvements being necessary and I think that you corrected that and then we had the typo about what our open space requirement was, but it's really only a typo on this, but doesn't change the overall total area that would be contained in the open space. It may squish around in terms of what the city ends up with, but that's something that will be determined between us and the city if they choose to accept that area as a public park. We good with that? Ok so far? Ok. Mr. Snowden mentioned, and this gets into some other things that... We don't just file this. We file it and then we've been engaged with the residential neighbors to the west. We've been engaged with the city. Mr. Snowden, in terms of plan revising a text. Mr. Bowsher with some of the economic impacts that are relevant to this particular proposal which are a little bit unusual and probably bear a little bit of discussion. They kind of roll out of some discussions that we've had. We've had public meetings and invited meetings with our resident neighbors. We've had a good exchange as we always do in those sorts of meetings. One of the things that has come up in those meetings is that there's perception and I think it's probably real that the intersection at Taylor and Main has experienced some fairly significant traffic increases primarily driven by the economic development, which is occurring further east in Licking County and a lot of the construction there. While when we performed our traffic study it indicated that there would be no improvements required other than some striping that would be a part of that plot grade utility plan approval. There might need to be some improvements primarily because there's a perception or there's a sense that the south bound Taylor Road to west bound traffic movement is not working very well especially at the morning peak. Typically that would be one of those things that's too far away from us and obviously if there's a problem now it has nothing to do with our particular proposal. Having already submitted a traffic study which indicates that no additional improvements are necessary. There is at least within the four corners of this proposal the potential for the resolution of that. We've been working with Mr. Bowsher in the economic development infrastructure with the city. This property is subject to tax increment financing district which is established long before any of us got going on this project that was back in 2006 and without getting too deeply into the nitty-gritty workings of that it would basically provide a fairly substantial sum on an annual basis to the city to deal with improvements, public improvements. Public improvements typically in the right-of-way that would have some relation to or benefit to this particular property. That's a much higher and much different discussion that has to occur with Reynoldsburg City Council. It's public improvements process. Its capital improvements budget, but at least with reference to this particular property it would be a significant contributor to the tune of about $148,000 a year of additional revenues that would go to the city that would be able to be used for things like additional improvements to the intersection at Taylor and Main. Now, we can spend a lot of time talking about how that is and what that is and Mr. Bowsher and I were working on it even today. We're not terribly certain exactly or at least there may be some question as to how long some parts of that tax increment financing goes works on. I understand you are a Planning Commission and typically an economic development discussion is typically not a part of your *inaudible. The only reason I mention it is because that I just want to refer to the possibility that if there are perceptions of necessary public improvements with this project would come potentially a revenue stream that would help with some of those improvements. That's all I'm really suggesting. Again, that's really not a planning issue, but

it is as we try to figure out how to finance city government it does become more and more important in these discussions. I think the final thing to address that again without having to regurgitate the entire presentation again there was some concern, lingering concern, about storm water retention for this property. We've talked about the location of those storm water basins. Those are storm water retention. They are wet. The intention as I think Mr. Snowden pointed out we prefer them to be wet as opposed to dry. Dry, I don't think we've ever done very successfully. I'll refer to the engineers in the room as to whether dry basins can be done aesthetically. I think it's probably significantly easier to do them as wet and that's what we've chosen to do here. There's a 30-inch storm water pipe at the south west corner of the site into which most of our property flows. Currently, as you know the property is used for agricultural purposes so there's absolutely no control of run off from this site into that pipe and it's essentially an uncontrolled circumstance. We would be installing full storm water control mechanisms including these storm water retention basins which would provide not only storm water retention, but also water quality so that the overall storm situation for this piece of property in our downstream neighbors should be significantly improved. I've kind of hit a couple of the high spots that have been sort of in play I guess for a lack of a better term over the last month. You may have others. We're happy to answer any questions you might have. Again, I've got Joe's here to answer kind of any questions with reference to the plan and operations and how he perceives the project. Todd's done really quite frankly all the heavy lifting on this as is always the case. Todd's really had to and understands the work, how this is going to work a little bit better than probably anybody and we're happy to answer any questions you may have or as individual people comment on this we're happy to answer and address any of those issues as they may come up over the course of tonight's hearing. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you sir. I appreciate the summary and your presentation. Any further brief words from the applicants. Any of the other folks present. Ok. Ok. Mr. Snowden, do you want the commission to ask questions first or would you... I just want to make sure we go according to what the typical rules are. Should we go ahead and concede to the public first so that they can get their questions done and then what's remaining the commission could...

Mr. Snowden: The commission's questions could really happen at any time, but if the commissioners have a list of specific questions I would probably let the members of the public speak because that may inform commissioners questions as well and then have the applicant address any of those in a rebuttal. It might be a good thing for our chairman or one of the other members to help out by just listing questions that need to be answered so that the applicant can respond. That's the whole point of having a rebuttal. It's not so Glen can come up and give the same presentation he just made. It's so he can go through additional questions. I can help with writing them down or another member can help out or maybe both so we don't miss anybody, but ultimately it's your commission. I'm your advisor. You all can ask questions whenever you want.

Unknown: Mr. Chairman, I'd agree with Eric. We let the public speak and hear any concerns the public would have about the recommendation and I would recommend that the applicant could rebuttal and then we could go through our list of questions and come to a

conclusion on the issue.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Snowden, would you mind if as you're able to maybe writing down some of those questions and Mr. Hicks maybe as just as a second could you do maybe the same if you're inclined to do so. With that being said, I'm going to go down this list of people who have signed in and we'll have you come up individually. If you feel like you're concern or questions has been addressed by the initial presentation here you're not obligated to come up, but if you would like to you can. Would Miss Linda Grimes please come to the microphone please. When you get up there Miss Grimes would you mind just repeating your name.

Linda F. Grimes: 1370 Reserve Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. I am not a public speaker. I am a concerned citizen. I live at one of those primary areas located in front of the pond. First of all, I'm against the rezoning. Now I thought this meeting was about the rezoning yet what we are discussing and what has been discussed is as if a decision has been reached and the construction will take place, but it's difficult to separate totally responding to this in a business like fashion and separate emotion because the impacts that I see are the water. First of all, you've got the ponds located there. I understand what the intent of those ponds is. I would just have to see it to believe it. The fact that it would cut down on any run off coming from the existing field. The other thing is the high density. The quantity of people in units that are proposed to be to me stuffed into that area. That's an awful lot of people. 13-structures, 2-ponds, 500-parking spaces, 9-garages and though the intent may be to rent those units if the zoning approval is granted though the intention may be to rent to individuals 35 or over and empty nesters, intentions very often don't come out to be what was intended, in other words. I am concerned by the sheer volume of people and the traffic that would be entailed based on the number of structures, parking spaces for their intention. Why not build homes the way the community is right now? But to propose such a huge effort behind a pre-existing community I don't see anything positive in that primarily due to the sheer numbers we're talking about, buildings proposed to residents, parking garages, and then the water. Now I also have a friend who submitted and I wish my comments to be a part of the record. I am not...

Mr. Snowden: Mrs. Grimes, I'm so sorry to interrupt you, but I wanted to answer this. You're recorded comments are part of the record.

Linda F. Grimes: Thank you because there was a, never mind. I won't go through all that. In any event, I also have a neighbor who is currently not available. She submitted a written, online, she submitted her comments. She wanted me to reiterate that she wanted those to be a part of this record. Her name is Wanda J. Ellis and she lives at 1320 Reserve Drive. I mean, for me to continue to talk would be to reiterate what I've said already, but those are the reasons why I am against the rezoning to accommodate this proposed structure or these structures.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Miss Grimes. Do you have any specific questions for the applicant or did you feel like you said what you wanted to say.

Linda F. Grimes: I said what I wanted to say, but in the event this occurs I would want to know who's going to assume financial responsibility if some of the intended results don't happen. In the event there is excessive water. In the event there are negative outcomes behind this reaching fruition. Then who addresses that financially or would it be us and the community who currently live in those homes up there? So, is the company going to assume financial responsibility in the event this is a go or does the City of Reynoldsburg? Those are my only other questions.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Miss Grimes. Thank you very much.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman, while Miss Grimes is sitting down I did receive the written communication from Ms. Ellis, which was sent out to the commissioners via email and that will be incorporated into the case file for this particular application. Just wanted you to know that.

Mr. Bowman: I have next here, is it Thaah Young? Did I say that properly?

Thaah Young: My husband is next on the list, Aaron Young.

Mr. Bowman: Yes, I see Aaron Young. Would you like to come up together?

Thaah Young: 9167 Taylor Road South, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Thank you for this evening. I wanted to submit, per Mr. Hicks' advice, we sent an email to each and every one of you addressing our concerns with the application itself and Mr. Hicks suggested that we actually bring that tonight.

Mr. Hicks: And one comment I would like to apologize between Thaah and Aaron. I think I had the Mr. and Mrs. confused in response to the email.

Thaah Young: Oh, that's fine. I'm glad you're cautious, but we also tonight have a document that actually addresses the content of this application. For us to begin, 20-years ago my family and our neighbors has had the pleasure and the honor of knowing the steward of the property listed in the application. In 2005 Mr. Bard asked for our support in his decision to annex into the City of Reynoldsburg and we did. He had a vision and this resulted in multi-family, private ownership, and property in the form of condominiums which we believe to be compatible with our community. As business owners ourselves we also look forward to the remainder of the property. One day being comparable...

Mr. Snowden: Mrs. Young, I'm so sorry. Do you want me to bring up the other microphone? You can hold it.

Thaah Young: No, can I stand here.

Mr. Snowden: You can stand wherever you want as long as you speak directly into the microphone.

Thaah Young: Ok. But what I'm trying to get at is Mr. Bard had a vision for this property back in 2005 and he did actually see that the 10-acres there in the front part on the east side of that property to be community commerce development across the street from Taylor Road Elementary is comparable property is what he saw. On February 8th a neighborhood meeting hosted by Metro Development to discuss the current rezoning proposal 9366 Taylor Road. The presenters of this meeting were Mr. Joe Thomas, Mr. Glen Duggar, and Mr. Todd Farris. There are many questions and concerns from the invited property owners concerning the decrease in property value, increase in traffic, many concerns about flooding and fencing, safety of the retaining ponds, safety of proposed park land in the middle of single family homes and possibly increase crime. A question was asked, what is the reason that the Metro Development project does not fit in to the already zoned AR2. Mr. Farris stated, maybe building size, density, and maybe something else, I don't remember. In the week of February 20th we emailed a series of questions to Mr. Eric Snowden. Thank you Mr. Snowden. We also asked he forward our questions to any and all city departments that could help answer our questions. This series of questions was focused on any anticipated incompatibility effects of the proposed development upon the *inaudible and adjoining approximate neighborhoods and properties. Our understanding and reading through the code is our proposed neighborhood development is to permit and approve new development. The suspension of traditional zoning provision should enhance existing development and promote compatibility to project the school districts and private investment which results in the value of all land. We simply ask the Planning Commission and the City Council consider current code and the City Charter and deny the application request to the zoning district planned neighborhood district. As proposed by Metro Development 7.2-acres of the 24-acres are not to be developed for dwelling units. The decrease proposed dwelling units on 17.1-acres not 24-acres would result in a reduction in traditional lot sizes. We ask both the developer and City Council for what that density would be on 17-acres not 24-acres and we did not get a response. The incompatibility is the second consideration in the denial of application. The surrounding area is majority single family homes with a mix of ranch and 2-story. There are zero 3-story residential buildings in the area. The height and the bulk of the applicants plan would dominate the neighborhood. Second and most importantly, the long-term impact of lost and property value to one of the school districts most valued communities, The Reserve at Reynoldsburg, and highly probable ripple effect and private investment in the value of *inaudible from Taylor Road to Waggoner Road to Broad Street with this proposed development plan, proposed use, and the characteristics. Third under incompatibility, the Department of Development, City of Reynoldsburg, we work to energize and maintain a thriving community where all citizens prosper and realize their potential by committing to the following: increasing the commercial property tax based in our community, the zoning district change from community commerce district planned neighborhood development would be incompatible to the Department of Development's mission statement. Fourth incompatibility, the Mayor signed a contract agreement for services for $120,000 for a professional comprehensive master plan on November of 2017. The zoning district change requests are for the 24-acres may be incompatible with the planned uses within OHM. Third consideration, traffic, and I'm not going to go into that other than the traffic impact study is within the city's development handbook. In the City Council minute meetings President Joseph referenced that, Mr. Baker referenced it and so it would be beneficial to everyone who is considering this proposal. The Planning Commission and the City Council per code

shall determine when studies and experts advice are necessary to evaluate the development plans for a proposed planned neighborhood development. Also, within the faculties demand sheet, the city reserves the right to change these requirements if special conditions exist. We believe that current traffic on Taylor Road is a special condition. Fourth consideration, inadequate constructive notice. In the public notice hearing, the 8500 Taylor Chase Drive address, the major portion of acreage in the proposed zoning district change is not listed in the public hearing notice. Number two, the 9370 Taylor Road and the 8500 Taylor Chase Drive addresses two major portions in the proposed zoning district change is not listed in the Metro Developments letter to invite for public comment. These addresses have caused undue burden on a reasonable person to additionally review complicated property detail descriptions to comprehend the gravity and any and all anticipated effects of the proposed development upon their neighborhood. Because of these considerations the Metro Development proposal is not compatible to the surrounding zoning districts in accordance with the city code and the City Charter. We also ask that the city Planning Commission consider our recommendations before any request to change the zoning districts in this area. We also ask the Planning Commission to forward our recommendations to the professional comprehensive master plan committee for consideration. First thing, widening the right turn lane in the intersection of Taylor Road and Main Street. Second, address any and all storm drain and sewer drain concerns. Third, review TIF, tax studies and possible negative consequences that the TIF has had on school districts. Fourth, review the State of Ohio development agencies TIF program rules. Also, and I'm not sure how this works Mr. Snowden, is we would like to ask for the EMH&T traffic access study review to be removed from record per our concerns stated.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. and Mrs. Young. I have a Jerry McCoy next on the list. Mr. McCoy would you like to come on up?

Jerry McCoy: 8475 Morningdew Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. I wish I had a pointer.

Mr. Snowden: You just describe what you're talking about Mr. McCoy and I'll move the mouse.

Jerry McCoy: The far right, where the open slab is presently, the condo slab, I've been looking at that through my back window for 8-years. Have you purchased that property to remove that slab? It says in the paperwork that that slab will be removed now. Ok. Another question. If this approved, how long will the construction take?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. McCoy, I'm going to write down everything you say and you can come back and correct me. I'm going to write down your questions and we'll ask those back. The only reason is because if... I look like a young guy, but I've been doing this long enough. The questions are just getting shouted back and forth. You're not getting any information you want. Metro can't respond and all that, so just go ahead and hit your questions. I'm going to write them down. If I misspoke you can jump up and wave your arms when Metro gets back up there.

Jerry McCoy: Ok. I'd like to know when the construction would start, which we don't know,

and how long it would take. The open area back there where they're talking about could be turned over to the parks. Is that going to be... can the parks department make a park out of it? The traffic, my only access is off of Taylor. I live on 8475 Morningdew Drive, right beside the slab, and the traffic backs all the way from Main passed my street on many occasions throughout the day. You've got the Limited's traffic. I don't know what else is going on up there. The condition of the road itself. You've got Buckeye up there. You've got the Limited with all the semi-trucks. You've got the Kroger trucks. There's nothing but getting holes everywhere. How come they can widen Taylor Road from Main to 256 when there's nothing there per se. Why can't they do that from Main to Broad. Just re-striping isn't going to do it in my opinion. Is any of this going to be eligible... I don't know if there is still a Section-8 program. I think there are grandfathered people or subsidized housing. Is this housing... can people get that on these different programs? It's one thing about saying there won't' be a lot of kids, but I hate to say it, but what kind of people are we going to have? When they built the condos and rezoned it was because it was going to be a senior citizen program and because of the housing crunch they dropped everything and it just went wide open. Nothing but fields and now they're trying to make apartments out of them. That's all I have.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. McCoy. Next, I have a Randy Lott.

Randy Lott: 1229 Reserve Dr, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. A couple of concerns I think. First of all, I don't think that there's really any other 3-story buildings anywhere on Taylor Road at this point in time until you get clear down to the commercial end of it. So, I'm not quite sure how that would fit in. Secondly, I would really urge the city engineer to look strongly at the retaining ponds. Obviously, we have a drainage issue now down at that end of Reserve Drive. Based on some of the pictures and what not I've seen I can promise you that you will collect more water off of pavement and off of roofs than you will off of undeveloped land. Ok. You may have natural drainage and what not going on there, but you're still going to have all this water that's coming down that you have to contend with. So, definitely urge Mr. Snowden to talk to the city engineer about perhaps the potential for what else can be done. One of the other questions I have is we talked about a 30-inch tile right now that goes through underneath somewhere for present drainage. Does Metro plan on increasing that size tile to something larger to handle additional flow that's going to be coming off of the ponds as they fill up or not? Outside of that that's all I've got. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Lott. Next on the list is Lori Berens.

Lori Berens: 9197 Taylor Road SW, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. This is the property just across the street from the proposed site. I'll first start out stating that I have lived in Reynoldsburg only for 7-years. I have been a part of developing before. I used to live on Diley Road when it was 2-lanes. So, I've been this road a couple times and I do understand that growth is not always a negative thing. I would like to say that after one of the Council meetings I was out in the lobby and I did run into Joe Thomas and I mentioned to him, and as I introduced myself I said I'm Lori Berens, I live across the street from the proposed property. He goes, oh, I thought that was farmland. And I thought, hmm, it doesn't seem like he's taking much interest in the surrounding areas or the people or the homes that are going to be affected by

this property zoning change. Again, some of the things that some of our other neighbors here have already commented on is the real concern with traffic on Taylor Road. As you all, if you travel it if you do understand that traffic from Main Street to Broad Street at any given time during rush hours, specifically, we can wreak havoc even just trying to get out of our driveway. We have a boat and I have actually resorted to putting myself on Taylor Road and directing traffic so that I can get in and out of our driveway. I just have a concern about that when they discuss 499 parking spaces in this proposed structure. How many cars that will generate for this particular area. Cars generate traffic and as we've all mentioned, without beating a dead horse, we already realized that Taylor Road it's at capacity. Again, mentioning the traffic study, the access study I understand was done; however, I don't know how much that came into play. I think an impact study would probably do the city better and I have to reiterate that I don't think painting lines, turn lanes is a solution to that problem. I do think that again the 3-story structure does not seem suited for this particular area because there are surrounding this whole property there are homes that people are living in. I don't see where a 3-story structure is, especially that close to Taylor Road would aesthetically be pleasing to that area. I think the condos that are there look nice because they are 1-story and I think they're more suited to the actual, what's there structurally now, which is homes, multi-family homes. I guess a lot of the stuff that I was going to say was already said. I think that when people own something they do take pride in ownership. I think the condo community does a great job over there keeping it nice. I think when you get renters in sometimes these are transient people that are living there for short periods of time that are going to move on somewhere else. Again, I don't think you can pick and choose who's going to live there. You'd like to say you want certain people to move in, but that's not always going to be the case. Enclosing, I just I would say I hope that the Council takes the traffic study again and really looks at that realistically. I'm not opposed to growth in this community. I just don't think that this particular structure would be suited for this area of Reynoldsburg in our community. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Ms. Berens. Next is Dan Albert.

Dan Albert: 9197 Taylor Road SW, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. I've lived here in Reynoldsburg my whole life. I've been here 52 1/2 years. I started out in the Huber Home community with my parents. They purchased a home on Carrousel Drive off of Briarcliff, brand new. So, if you know where that area is Greenleaf Apartments came in shortly after they purchased their home. It didn't start off well. It was started apparently it went bankrupt, sat vacant, then they finally came in and finished up and it was a nightmare ever since. The crime rate went up. I'm sure Reynoldsburg knows the area that I'm talking about. I lived there until I was 25. I purchased my home in Reynoldsburg off of Palmer Road. I like the community. That's why I stayed here. I stayed there for another 13 years and then I purchased the home I'm at now at 9197 Taylor Road directly across the street from the development. I live with Lori Berens who just spoke earlier. I've seen the good and the bad in Reynoldsburg. One of the good things was streetscape. Wow. You drive down Main Street heading west you see the sky. It's clear now. It used to be full of power lines. It was really not aesthetically pleasing to the eye. Now it is and I was proud of Reynoldsburg for doing that. Getting back to that aesthetic view I'm going to have a 3-story apartment building sitting directly across the street from me blocking my view now and it doesn't fit in with the neighborhood. It doesn't. The

development that was brought in behind my parent's home brought in the crime, it also brought in the flooding and that was a big concern. My parent's house had flooding issues the day that project started. The news was out. We had video cameras that where the water was just flowing through the backyard. Mom and Dad had to block their basement windows in because the water was so bad. It kept flooding their basement, so they resulted into putting in blocks over the windows. Then finally the development came in and changed. They put in a retaining pond obviously and corrected some of that issue, but the crime still existed. I just don't see this fitting in to the community where we're at. Obviously, we've gone over the traffic issues are horrendous and adding to that won't help anything. So, just please consider all what I've said. Being in the community for my whole life, I like it here. I like where I'm at. I just don't think that's going to fit. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Albert. That's the last name I have on the list, but seeing as how there are lots of people here I would ask if you do want to share or have questions for the applicant please feel free to come up. I would ask, it is pushing 8:00, if you have a specific question definitely and bring all your concerns. Don't hold any questions back or concerns back, but coming up and speaking into the microphone. If you're not on the list go ahead and say your name and address as well so we have that on the record.

Mr. Snowden: I was just going to remind folks to say their name and address as they come up.

Mr. Bowman: Do we need to swear people in as they come up if they're not on the list.

Mr. Snowden: Yes. If they didn't already swear in, so ask them that as they come up.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Young you're on the list, so you don't have to be sworn in.

Aaron Young: 9167 Taylor Road SW, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. Sorry about that. I was up there earlier trying to support my wife. When she was done I sat down and didn't speak. I was wondering, can you guys bring up the slide that was up here kind of earlier when this all when we all kind of first talking up here. Yeah, this one here. As far as questions goes, can we get some kind of answer from somebody how this math works out. We keep seeing this in the proposal. 240-units on 24.3-acres. The way I'm understanding the proposal 7-acres that is not going to be developed, right?

Mr. Bowman: 7.19-acres is being partitioned for potential park land use.

Aaron Young: Can somebody explain how it comes out to 9.88 du per acre.

Mr. Snowden: To answer your question, if you recalculate, not including the park land, the density is approximately 14-units per acre. It's just a simple matter taking a number of units by that area of the land.

Aaron Young: So, that number's not correct up there?

Mr. Snowden: It's correct when you assume the whole site, but it's not correct when you don't assume the whole site.

Aaron Young: *inaudible that whole site is not being developed.

Mr. Snowden: It's not an incorrect number. It's just a different calculation.

Aaron Young: I mean, if I were to come across this site and say here's the 24.3-acres, I would say hey, according to Reynoldsburg code we can put 240-units here and hear no problem. Right?

Mr. Snowden: Ok. Clarify your question for me Mr. Young.

Aaron Young: If you were to rezone to AR2 from commercial?

Mr. Snowden: If you were an AR2, straight AR2, the maximum density is 15-units per acre if memory serves me correctly.

Aaron Young: Ok. So, you would still have to step outside the bounds of the...

Mr. Snowden: If you were straight AR2 this 14 would be under 15, so it would be permitted. It's a maximum density.

Aaron Young: If we were developing all 24-acres would we have to rezone to the, what is the planned neighborhood.

Mr. Snowden: They are rezoning to the planned development for a couple reasons. One is they don't have to meet the requirements of the straight district. That's the purpose of the plan development and it allows them to come up basically how a plan development works and this is just good information for people to just understand how it works is you build this. Ok, so you come to us with this document, which is called a development plan and if the development plan is approved by Planning Commission and Council you can build that and only that. It used to be many years ago you could get a piece of ground zoned and then if you could meet the zoning requirements you could build whatever was permitted within that zone, but in a plan development they commit to this project, so, if you came in and let me just give you an example, somebody comes in and says, hey, I'd like to put this on my land. My response is well, ok, but you better do a plan development to go through the process. There in a plan development mainly due to my recommendations. Not because I think the use is great or bad or any of that. They just said how can I do this. This is the tool. It's my job to give them the tool that they would use.

Aaron Young: As the developer said, I think these are high quality apartments, but it's too dense I think and I think a lot of us think that. I think the stories, the amount of stories, the height doesn't fit into the community, and again I just don't understand how you come up with that number up there we keep seeing. I mean you might be able to explain it a lot, but I'm not getting it.

Mr. Snowden: We'll talk.

Aaron Young: Ok. One thing that I heard earlier, I wasn't quite understanding, but the developer was saying there was going to be a certain type of people or persons that are going to be renting these units.

Unknown: *inaudible.

Mr. Snowden: Folks, I can't have people shouting from the back for the simple reason I'm recording.

Aaron Young: If there's not going to be children or it's going to be a certain area or a certain demographic of people and that's what we're kind of being told tonight can we get something like that in writing or something that's substantiates how that's going to come about for the community? For myself, I'm not concerned. I like all kinds of people, but I mean if this is what we're being sold is this going to be a certain demographic of people can, what do we have to substantiate that? Can we get something in writing on that for this proposal? As far as this traffic things goes, I mean, we've got 0800 hours, an hour of scampering, that roads full, backed up all the way to the lights to the north. About 1400 hours around the time the Limited gets out around there it's also backed up. Then you get to about 1700 hours it's all backed up all the way to the lights. It's a lot. Traffic doesn't bother me too much, but I guess the folks up there to the west they have a lot of flooding and I think the more pavement we put down on road you put these parking lots up in here in the development and then if at some point you do need to widen Taylor Road and you end up taking some of our property and some of the property across the street for the other folks. There's going to be more pavement. Those folks to the east there's going to be a lot of water that needs to be traveling due to the amount of addition of pavement. I think that's a concern. I'm not those folks, so I can't ask the question for them. I think I'm done. That's all I wanted to say. I'm still just not catching up on this math here, but I do appreciate the time. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Young. I appreciate you and your comments. Since you're standing sir. Looks like you've got something to say.

Ken Wozniak: 1325 Shelby Circle, Reynoldsburg, Ohio. We moved here about 8-months ago.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Wozniak, I need to swear you in. If you would, go ahead 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.

Ken Wozniak: I do.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you sir.

Ken Wozniak: I just wanted to mention that if this should go through I want to make sure

that the residents aren't able to use Reserve Drive to come in and go over to the other property because that just causes a mess on our side of the road. That's all I wanted to mention. So, if he can't come in and go over to the residents.

Mr. Bowman: Right. We have that on record now.

Ken Wozniak: Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Wozniak. I have a lady in the back that went ahead and stood up and we'll do this as orderly of a fashion as possible, but we do have to go one at a time. Mam, thank you for coming up. Mind if I write your name down.

Megan Nixdorf: 8651 Robins Loop Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you very much. Go ahead.

Megan Nixdorf: You need to swear me in sir.

Mr. Bowman: You're right I do. You should come up here. Ok. Go ahead and raise your right hand if you would for me. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the commission will be truthful? If so, please answer I do.

Megan Nixdorf: I do.

Mr. Bowman: Ok. Go ahead.

Megan Nixdorf: I actually have two questions. Again, we can't control who comes in to our community and I'm not against community growth; however, the infrastructure of our school system is something that I'm terribly concerned with. I have two children who are currently enrolled in Reynoldsburg City School. We love the school district. We love the teachers. We love the infrastructure. My concern is is that we are already at capacity with the open school district. Now I do know that the school district has stopped taking applicants for the 2018 and the 2019 school district for non-Reynoldsburg residents. Moving forward these infrastructures would be potentially families. You would have families, children, that would be going to the school district which would get preference over non-district members for the school districts, but how is the school going to support with this when we are already at 25, 26 children teacher/child ratio in the classroom? Are we going to plan on building mobile classrooms and having trailers on site? Or are we going to plan on building additional schools to support these children in our community and hiring additional teachers for the infrastructure? I don't see how the number of just this one unit can be substantiated by the community support that we have with our school district. As it stands now with the number of schools and teachers that we have. It's just not possible. I understand they say 35 single. I understand they say retirees. You get what you get. You can't throw a fit about it. You want people to come in and support your community and live here and pay rent, but you're going to get whatever you get and that's my number one concern. My second concern is that I've seen a large influx of single multi-generational families moving in. Not just having Mom

and Dad and 3 to 5 kids or however many children that you have in that family unit. You have Grandma, Grandpa, Mom, Dad, Sister, Brother, additional family units and then their children all living under one roof. There still a single family, but they are multi-generational, so you're talking from 5 to 7 people per household to 15 or more per household and how can that be safe living in closer quarters like this? Is there going to be an occupancy cap on these residences? I think that's a valid point that the board and the committee needs to address and take into consideration. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you. Sir, do mind giving me your name.

Justin Crawford: 1350 Reserve Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Bowman: And before I forget and Ms. Nixdorf reminds me again, I'd like to swear you in. Please 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.

Justin Crawford: I do. Thank you. Yesterday I provided to Mr. Snowden, as well as the rest of the Planning Commissions emails that I had, basically a 4-page Q&A with general responses, accumulated data from phone conversations from personal communications with not only the developer, but not only our home owners association, as well as people that live in the community. We've been gathering this data and that's what I've presented. There's 4-pages of Q&A, as well as an additional 9-exhibits. Those are some of the communities. I'm part of the board member Reserve at Reynoldsburg. Four other board members are all here tonight. We've been sending out notices to the community getting feedback and I wanted to share some things in addition to what you guys have been provided already. Especially in response to some of the things from the community as well. The reason why I want to share these things is not to say yes or no for the development, but just to bring into light that some of these things are not controlled by the developers. They're not controlled by the city, but they're controlled by codes and regulations that are already set forth. One of the things that I want to talk about was the traffic. I actually contacted Carpenter Marty Transportation. They're completely independent of the EMH&T or the other consultation group that was going to review the EMH&T traffic access study and what they came back with was I provided them the study that was done and on record. They came back and said that based on the study that was done that everything checked out. The number of units. It was at less than the peak hours, but that traffic access study is only at the entrance to this community. It's not at Main and Taylor. So, there was no study on the traffic at Main and Taylor. One of the things they did say though is that based on this and based on the growth of the east side of Reynoldsburg as a whole that actually Main and Taylor probably needs to have a traffic impact study done just based on the growth over the last 10-years and that would be something that they had said would be more so a city responsibility. They actually already agreed that they looked at the review at no charge and they agreed to provide a proposal for a traffic impact study at Main and Taylor that would be less than when I had asked Mr. Thomas how much it was for a traffic impact study was $15,000 - $20,000. When I asked Carpenter Marty they said they could do a quick one to know whether or not you would need a full blown for $2,000. So, I think that that's something that we need to present to the Planning Commission and something that if Metro Development really wants to move

forward this and get the communities buy in that they would possibly look at maybe having this done on the cities behalf or helping us out to look at really what the city should do for Main and Taylor for the traffic there. One of the other things, so at 1350 Reserve Drive I can stand here and swear that I get all the water. Next to Thaah's property, on the east side of Taylor, and then to the west side there is literally a bowl that feeds across Taylor, goes underneath the culvert. I've talked with the person who actually farms that field and I've stood there with him while I've watched 6-feet of water rise up out of the culvert that goes underneath Taylor Road and then it bee lines it straight to my house. So, I've presented pictures as a part of the submission as one of the exhibits of my backyard. It's up to my foundation and luckily for me everything's solid. I know my neighbor immediately to the left of me that was, I don't know what happened to her, she just left and I think she got evicted, but I know she had water in her basement. I know one of our other neighbors down here, she had water in her backyard. It's an incredible amount of water. The current plan for the condos and I have seen that plan that was something that the Metro's attorney had mentioned. There plan was that there was going to be condo units 30-feet from my property line. My 2-year old could throw a stone that far. So, for what it's worth we're going to have 60-feet that's a lot better than the 30-feet that we currently have in the zoning. The property line is actually not, most of the property line is just kind of vegetation and trees. It actually consists of a lot of poison ivy and what's considered invasive species. That's not controlled by the home owners, but it is up against our property line. So, as a part of this communication with Metro and a part of what I've submitted in the packet is basically agreements that they have made that if this moves forward that they agree to basically take care of all that and they agree to come out and mark whatever trees the homeowners wanted to keep, didn't want to keep, they would do all that for us. That's great and Reserve regards to the water shut off the property, which again impacts me. They agreed that their plan, their proposal, that they've already studied that and that would all be fixed and that would be good for me because if I'm trying to sell my home and it's raining and my backyards flooding it's not going to sell. A couple of other things is the reason why I presented that packet is to get the concerns across from the community without having every single person either not be here, not be able to speak, but to provoke thought and investigation and Metro's responses in terms of accuracy. We've asked a lot of these questions already. They've responded. I'd really like for the Planning Commission to look at those with your knowledge and make sure that those are accurate statements, so that way they're not misleading the community that if this does go forward what their plan would be to mitigate our concerns. The school district, so my wife contacted the enrollment office, there's already an issue with the schooling. The STEM school at Summit is already overbooked and is on a wait list. There's a problem the school district has to plan for. Based on our response from Metro they projected based on their calculations, again, this was from Metro that there would be 10% families with children and they kind of provided some other facts for that. It's still going to be a problem. If every one of those is filled with families there's still a problem and it should be addressed in some way or another. There was something that was brought up by some of the HOA members about a federal law suit in 2016. We were wanting clarification on that. What were the details of that law suit against Metro and what was the outcome. If there was an outcome. They did respond to my question to them, but I think that HOA and some of the other members want an answer from Metro here today. My final request is that if we're going to pass this plan because at the end of the day what they're talking about spending is 20 plus million dollars on

putting in a really nice apartment complex that $900 for a single bedroom and $1400 for a 2-bedroom. That's really expensive for apartments. If this plan goes forward, my only request that everybody's vote here tonight would be under a good moral high ground that you guys are going to look over all the documents, all the presentations, and that everything's going to be accurate, as well as whoever would be responsible when they do start construction to be out there monitoring city code, state code, and that they're not doing anything they shouldn't be doing. That's our request.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Crawford. Does anybody else care to... Ok, if you wouldn't mind coming up. You're fine there. If you would, give me your name please.

Karen Cline: 1310 Reserve Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Bowman: If you could raise your right hand please. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the commission will be truthful? If so, please answer I do.

Karen Cline: I do.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you very much. Go ahead Ms. Cline.

Karen Cline: Yes, I've been a resident of the Reynoldsburg area for over 20 some years and I have seen some major changes within Reynoldsburg's area. I originally started out at Century City Apartments. Those were awesome. 70's and 80's those were the best apartments around along with the one over by Channing Way area. Everybody who was single, starting out, that was where they moved. I had lived there at Century City for 8-years. I was one of the longer residents along with my sister, my 2-ex brother-in-law's. They actually used my apartment for 8-years for inspections to keep Section 8 out and once I moved out 2 or 3 years later Section 8 came in. Low housing came in and that was one of the top places in the City of Columbus. I've seen it in a lot of other areas. My concern is they're wanting $900 to $1400 rent in these locations. They say that they get this kind of rent in their other communities, but those other communities are New Albany, Worthington, Hilliard, all that, that's not what the Reynoldsburg incomes are going to bring in to live there. You're also going to see, like the young lady said, multiple families. I'm sorry, but I back up to this. You cannot tell me that you're not going to have 2 and 3 kids bunked up, if not 4 in a 2-bedroom. They're not going to be able to control that. There's going to be a lot of crime coming in. If you have the little park down at the end of the street because already right now I can tell you within 20-minute timeframe I can probably see 15-cars going down Reserve Drive flying at 25-30 mph. I have reported it several times to Reynoldsburg Police Department. They can be raking in the dough if they sat on one of the side streets to start stopping these cars that are flying down here. There's several people that have these young kids. I can't tell you how many times I've had to yell at these kids saying, you guys watch yourself. The traffic, it's going to bring the flow in. I've lived in Reynoldsburg off of Taylor Road for several years. I could sit there for 20-minutes just to try to get to work at 6:00 in the morning at Taylor and Main. I mean, it's just not going to be feasible to bring in a large community of apartments in that small area. I just don't see it. They may be beautiful in other areas, but it's not going to be feasible in that community right there. I also get flooding

in my backyard. That concerns me because the pond is going to back up to my backyard. I come from a father who's construction, plumber, pipe-fitter, I've seen flooding. I don't want my backyard backed up or my basement. It's going to happen. I hope you consider it. I'm not against apartment complexes, but I've seen a lot of declining of the best apartments in the city decline and get bad residents in there. You can't control that. So, I really hope you consider. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Ms. Cline. Is there anyone else who would like to ask any questions? Sir. Time is yours.

Chuck Stanley: 8421 Morningdew Drive, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Bowman: If you could raise your right hand please. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the commission will be truthful? If so, please answer I do.

Chuck Stanley: Yes sir. The only thing I would rather you do before they ever put a tool away in that field, if it's going to happen, is to do something about the traffic situation on Taylor Road. It needs to be twice as wide. That's something that the city, Council should try to improve before they ok these guys to get in there and dig and building buildings. Right now it's already out of whack. Down there by Kroger, you can only get 2-cars through at a time and they're held up by the stop light down there. So, you need to do a study on that part of the highway before you ever ok this construction. That's my 2-minutes. I'm going back to sit down.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Stanley. Do you have something else to say sir? Would you mind just saying your name so our...

Unknown Resident: You already swore me in. I had one other item that I forgot about. I guess I would like to see the fencing if this goes through. It's along the back, separating Reserve Drive, to continue the rest of the way northward, toward the property boundary. It would limit a lot of transient people cutting through people's yards and if anybody really wants to go to the park let them use the sidewalk the way they should. That's it.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you very much. Anyone else? Sir.

Al Igwebuike: 1295 Shelby Circle, Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Bowman: If you could raise your right hand please. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give in front of the commission will be truthful? If so, please answer I do.

Al Igwebuike: I do.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you. Go ahead.

Al Igwebuike: I am the President for the home owners association for the Reserves at Reynoldsburg. This is the first opportunity that I've had to attend the Planning Council. I've

had a lot of questions and it's really interesting with the concerns. Clearly the members of the community and with the Reserve has communicated I think those are all valid. For me, I just want to really want to make this very simple. What I'd like to know would be the next steps? What occurs going forward from the Planning Commission in terms of what's recommended to the City Council? And then from there what decision takes place? How will we as a community get to know what the decision is? So, if that can be addressed that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you very much. Mr. Snowden did you want to address that right now?

Mr. Snowden: Regardless of what recommendation of whether it's a positive or a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission this will go back to City Council. It will go back to the City Council on the March 26th meeting of the Council. That will be for 2nd reading. It's going to then be referred back to the Service Committee at the April 9th meeting where it will go back to the committee and to the Council for 3rd or final reading. Council will either make a decision at that point. They could. They could continue to table it if they chose to. Typically, they make a decision when something comes up for 3rd reading. At that point that's how you'll know is that the Council approved it and it will be put on the Council agenda website as an approved ordinance or you can contact my office and I'll provide a copy of the ordinance should it be approved or disapproved. We'll provide you a copy one way or the other. At that point the rezoning would be approved, theoretically, assuming approval. You can look on page, the last page of my staff report where I've outlined this, but they would then have to apply back to the Planning Commission to approve a more detailed site plan. This is called a development plan. They have to get what's called a major site plan approval from the Planning Commission. They would then apply to our City Engineer for an approval and to the building department for approval for the individual building. That's the process from a 30,000 foot stand point. Each one of those has ten different moving parts, so feel free to see me if you'd like me to break any of that down for you or I have some helpful stuff on the website that I can decipher for you, but that's the process in a nutshell. Mr. Bowman, at this time my recommendation would be let's, I know Mr. Duggar's been taking some vigorous notes. Maybe see if he wants to respond. I have a list of questions. If I miss any questions, please don't just shout them out. Come up here and tell me again that you had an additional question and I will ask them. Is that acceptable to you sir.

Mr. Bowman: I think that sounds like a good idea. So, would a representative from the applicant, if you don't mind, please come on up and Mr. Snowden according to tempo feel free to just to read off the questions as you see fit.

Mr. Snowden: I'm assuming Mr. Duggar has a list and I'm guessing his list is similar to my list, so I'm going to...

Mr. Bowman: Fire away Mr. Snowden.

Mr. Snowden: I had Linda Grimes wants to know the density of the site not assuming the park land. I had 14-units per acre and also who assumes the financial responsibility. I'm not exactly sure what that meant.

Glen Duggar: I'm not really sure either. I guess in the first instance if it's our responsibility, it's our responsibility. The city has sovereign immunity. Confirming that with the City Attorney. Qualified immunity. For many things that are the cities normal customary source of responsibility they have qualified immunity, but in the... there's also, maybe we ought to talk about this. There are so many layers to this approval process that we have to go through. First of all, all of our engineering plans will be prepared by an engineer qualified licensed to practice in the State of Ohio. He submits those plans to the city. The city has then their engineer review it and that engineer is also licensed and qualified by the State of Ohio. Some engineering plans have to be actually submitted to the state for their review. Some of you do that on a daily basis and are more familiar with that than *inaudible. We just don't show up and start hammering nails. We have to go through an extensive review process. As Mr. Snowden just detailed, we'll have to come back before this board several more times for plot grade utility plan, as well as the detailed development plan. We have several trips back to this board, as well as submission of our plans. The architect's actual building has to be designed by an architect. Those plans have to be stamped and those will be submitted to the city and then the city would have those plans go through the building review process. So, there's countless layers of review and we as the developer are responsible and our consultants are responsible as we move through that process. The idea that we just start throwing things up I think is a misunderstanding of how this whole process works. You all know how many times we'll have to come back and I think that everybody in the audience should have some assurance that we have to go through those processes in order before we can ever put a shovel in the ground. All of those, by the way, some often will say, well, they missed the flooding in my backyard from 25-years ago. I was working in Reynoldsburg 25-years ago and Reynoldsburg was very slow to adopt Mid-Ohio Regional Planning storm water guidelines. In fact, there was quite a fight between the city and FEMA regulators out of Chicago over the construction of the Board of Education building across the parking lot from us here because FEMA took the position that was in the flood-way and the city took the position that it wasn't. The School Board built it anyway. Those things don't happen anymore. We still have to go through a multi-layered process in order to get our approval. Hopefully, that addresses many of the questions that were raised. I won't be so lengthy in addressing the rest of them.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar, let me help you out. You'll come back to Planning Commission one time for the major site plan and the plot grade utilities reviewed by the City Engineer, so, just for clarity. From Mr. McCoy, would the slab be removed on the existing condo development?

Glen Duggar: Yes. That's a part contained in our plan.

Mr. Bowman: Just to clarify, there's two un-built slabs out there I believe and one is within the boundaries of the parcel and the other one is not. I don't know if we have an actual Google aerial.

Mr. Snowden: I think you're referring to this area being a slab and this area being a slab as well. Is that accurate?

Mr. Bowman: I believe so. Do we have the... So, there's two slabs. One's on the subject parcel and one is not on the subject parcel. So, I'd just like some clarification whether both slabs will be removed or only the one that's on your subject parcel.

Mr. Snowden: Building permits were pulled for this slab several years ago.

Unknown: That's an old aerial.

Mr. Snowden: So, folks from that condo...

Unknown: That one's done.

Unknown: That one right there has already been built.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you.

Glen Duggar: It would only be just to confirm for Mr. Snowden and you Mr. Hicks that there's only one slab out there today. It's a part of the property we are purchasing. Our agreement with the seller is that has to be removed. It would then become part of the park/open space whatever you want to call it.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar I have construction schedule and the anticipated length of construction for the project assuming approval.

Glen Duggar: Yes, assuming approval and knowing that we have to go through this detailed architecture and engineering review process we would hope to start in the fall and construction should be complete in 18-months.

Mr. Snowden: I have parks department, will the land be used for a park? I'll answer that question for whoever asked that. The answer is that it's up to our Parks Department, but they are open, assuming approval that they would develop park facilities there and they would work with the neighbors to determine what facilities they wanted there if any. It would be a city park. I am not the final decision maker. Ms. Bauman, our Park Director, is. I have general comments about the condition of Taylor Road. Widening, I think that was a general comment. I would probably definitely have those folks come speak with me or to our Director of Public Service because there's a layer there that these guys are going to deal with and there's a layer there that's just, hey, this is a city problem. Mr. Duggar, Section 8 housing or subsidy to the project. Do you want to comment on that at all? That was raised several time.

Glen Duggar: We are building this as a market rate project.

Unknown: What does that mean?

Mr. Snowden: Could you clarify?

Glen Duggar: Not a Section 8. Not subsidized. Not low income. Not any of those things.

Unknown: *inaudible

Glen Duggar: We're trying to build into this.

Unknown: *inaudible

Glen Duggar: We're trying to build into this by our commitments to the plan, commitment to building elevations. First off, I can stand here before you and say, this project will never be Section 8 and I'll put it in writing. It's legally unenforceable. Ok. Everybody who wants to say it's not Section 8, it's not subsidized, it's not market rate, they all live in homes they could rent tomorrow as an Airbnb. That we have a changing landscape in the housing that occurs in our country and to say we don't want Section 8, we don't want subsidized, we don't want... I understand the motivation, but there's no methodology for me to do that. Ok. All we can do is provide as high a quality a project as we possibly can by keeping our rents high, by running an attractive project, by landscaping the daylights out of it, by providing a really terrific environment for our tenants. That's the only way that we can ensure that subsidized, Section 8, whatever, won't be an issue in this particular location. There's just no other simple way to do it.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar, the next question I had was and this might actually be for Mr. Farris, there's questions raised about storm water and the size of the storm water pipe.

Glen Duggar: There is a 30-inch pipe there.

Mr. Snowden: The existing pipe is 30-inches?

Glen Duggar: Yes, the existing pipe is 30-inches. The size of the outlets, the size and location of those outlets will be subject to final engineering, which will be prepared by our engineer and reviewed by your engineer. They would additionally; I think there's also a state component to that review process as well. At this point in the process we would typically not be able to tell you and I would hope that there wasn't an expectation of telling you exactly the size of that pipe, but that would be the subject of final engineering.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Duggar, if you could, I know you're not an engineer, but could you comment on in general as far as following the storm water guidelines. The differences between an agricultural field and then developing a field. The applicants requirements on that as to whether the subject parceling your non-engineering opinions going to create more water run-off on the neighboring properties or less.

Glen Duggar: Well, first of all, our regional Planning Commission, storm water guidelines which Reynoldsburg and virtually every other municipality in central Ohio adopted basically do not permit us to develop the property and put more water off of it to the downstream user then exists today. An agricultural use, like it exists today, generates a tremendous amount of

non-detained, non-retained, non-control water. What we are building, I think a statement was made that, well, everybody knows that when you do parking lots and streets and curbs and gutters you're going to have more water. That's actually not correct. The correct requirement is that we do detain that water. We do control its release, so that we don't have a type of flooding storm water, which, quite frankly, is mostly from agricultural run-off. Stop me if you disagree with this. I know you have some expertise.

Mr. Hicks: No, I just thought it would be nice in the discussion to talk about in general and obviously a lot of responsibility falls on the engineers, the design, and review, and approve these, and the execution of the construction that in general post development of whatever happens to this parcel it should have less run-off and impact the neighbors than it currently does, should.

Glen Duggar: There's one additional component to that too Mr. Hicks, which is really a condition which is post-recession. Prior to that time we really didn't have much of a focus on water quality and I think as you know and maybe some of the people who are in attendance here would also be interested to know that we now have water quality requirements as part of the clean water act, which would be administered to the state through local entities that we now have water coming off projects like this which has to go through an *inaudible process. So, we actually have cleaner water than would be clearly cleaner water than what's coming off the agricultural field that exists today.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar, did you want to address a question a resident wanted to know why the 3-story building on Taylor and your comment about that being whether you think that's out of character with the area or not.

Glen Duggar: We're next door to a fairly significant commercial enterprise in Kroger which has a commercial scale type building. The other thing is what we are trying to do is make this as viable a community and I think that the people who are concerned about this becoming Section 8 or subsidized or something other than a market rate project, but the math, the economics of this type of a project say that it has to be of a certain size to be financially viable and efficient as it possibly can, so it has to be of a certain size to have a full-time, on-site management. It has to be of a certain size and total unit count to have a full-size or to have a full-time maintenance crew that also deals with the property as well, so that sweet spot is right about where the number of units that we have proposed for this project. We thought it was consistent with the density of the project as its currently zoned, 16 or 17-acres zoned ARC2 and so it was a consequence we didn't think it was out of scale. The 3-story building enables us to pull the buildings further to the south and to the east, farther away from the residences to the west and the north and to create what we thought was a significant amenity, which is the 7 plus acre public park.

Mr. Bowman: If I may ask, are you familiar with any other multi-family properties in Reynoldsburg that are 3-stories?

Glen Duggar: I don't purport to be the expert. I've worked on a number of the project site down at Taylor Road South West that were in the Noble Properties project and some of those

may have had some kind of walk-out conditions, but I can't, I guess the right answer Mr. Bowman is, I don't know.

Mr. Snowden: I have some comments made about ownership about whether it was a for ownership vs a for rent product. I'm going to jump in and say only that particular item, although I understand the concerns, is really not a concern of the commission because it doesn't play into the way that land is used. Multi-family is the same from a land use standpoint, whether it's a for rent or for own project. Please come up and discuss that with me at length, but that's kind of the reality. I have, site plan connection to Glenview or Glencrest Drive. The site plan indicates no connection and the site plan cannot be changed without approval from the commission and Council. I had, school system, how does this project effect the school system?

Glen Duggar: This always comes up. The fear is that and I heard it expressed tonight that somebody will or somehow rent one of our residences and they'll have however many multi-generational kids in that. I guess I'm uncomfortable with where that questions really going, but what we do is we have every tenant sign a lease and the tenant is obligated to list who the other people that they are living with. Under Federal Law the rule is 5 unrelated adults. What we have is a limit that a 1-bedroom can't have any more than 2-people in it and a 2-bedroom can't have any more than 4. Now that can be Grandma, a couple and their baby. There's anyone of a multiple range of arranging the number of school kids. Joe's number on system wide for projects that they've developed over the years is 10%. What he means by 10% is that there would be 10% of the number of kids would be school aged children. If you have like here 240-unit project we would expect to have about 24-kids. We have done the financial analysis and the financial analysis says that we will more than pay for the number of kids that we theoretically might generate by the tax revenues through the TIF that would come from this project that would exceed $338,000 at build out. We think that this is a really there's a lot of emotion in this type of question. There's a lot of great sort of well everybody knows type of, but what we are trying to do is to look at for instance a couple of the comparable projects like the one on Taylor Road South West to see just exactly what that project is generating. So, we're comparing apples to apples, but we don't think there's a school *inaudible.

Mr. Hicks: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't mind jumping in real quick. Mr. Duggar, in regards to the TIF I guess we could use a little bit more information. I think, I'm aware that there was a TIF for the Kroger parcel. I was not aware that any of the subject property is a part of that TIF. How many years are left on the TIF? It might be something the new Development Director might be able to give us some more information on as well.

Mr. Bowsher: Absolutely. Yes, there was a Kroger TIF. There was actually two other TIF's located on that property that are split. We found out today through our conversation that in 2005 they were enacted and they started generating revenue in 2006. They have a 30-year lifespan on them, so they will go to 2036.

Mr. Hicks: So, development on the subject parcel then would the applicant, if it's approved and they build, they start making their service payments to the city are the terms of that TIF

where those service payments are split with the school system or not because I think that when it was originally developed here was the condos which would have been more of a senior friendly, maybe, I don't know, you're saying there's going to be a very minimal impact on the schools, but chances are there's going to be more of an impact on the schools with the proposal than the single-story condos that were on there originally. So, just to repeat my question, is any of the TIF funds and the service payments going to the schools or not?

Mr. Bowsher: It is. A portion of that will go to the schools. I don't have the figures correctly in front of me right now to give that to you, but we'll make sure that we will publish that so everybody can get a copy of that and then as well as make sure that you have that. Actually, I think Mr. Duggar, do you have that?

Glen Duggar: Yes, I do. These documents were exchanged between myself and the city's municipal finance attorneys, Pat and Boggs Squire. They did confirm a couple of things. One is that it's a non-school TIF. That's the most important thing because there are TIFs and there's non-school TIFs. The non-school TIF is a TIF where the dollars that are supposed to be paid to the schools actually in fact flow through to the schools and more importantly there's a wrinkle on that that those dollars are come to the schools unencumbered they also come to the schools without having being impacted by the, it's very complicated, but it being effected by the reduction factor. So, whatever the schools duplicate is today....so, the consequences to the school $329,000 a year for whatever term is left in the schools and that's a non-duplicate, non-reduction factor amount that comes in. It's not recognized through, typically through, at least our understanding from Mr. *inaudible today is that's not in any way reduced by the typical reduction factor tax calculation. It's a fair sum of money. The one lady was correct, at least our understanding is that while the schools have today had open enrollment with Columbus and Whitehall that that's in the process of being terminated. Many of those kids were in the Reynoldsburg schools. That's apparently going to decrease over time. Did that answer your question Mr. Hicks?

Mr. Hicks: Yes, thank you Mr. Duggar.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Duggar, I have a question here I'm going to answer. There was a question about what's an occupancy cap? What's the maximum amount of folks that can be in the unit? The answer is it's dictated by the building code that there's *inaudible them. There's a maximum amount of people per square foot. If you'd like to discuss that with me I'll get you in touch with John, our chief building official, who can talk to you about that for hours, but there's a maximum number of folks that are permitted in any space based on its square foot dictated to us by the building code. Mr. Duggar, again I'm just going through my list here. There was a comment made about would Metro address whatever their legal situation was. I just became aware of this from folks comments. So, I don't know what that's even about.

Glen Duggar: I don't either. I think it's a non-issue. If Joe wants to comment about it. I believe it's...

Mr. Snowden: I'm repeating resident questions just so we don't have total chaos of things

getting shouted from the back.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Thomas, let me go ahead and swear you in.

Joe Thomas: With Metro Development. I've already been sworn in. Full disclosure, we have a pending ADA lawsuit in the Federal Court of the United States. It was actually handed down to us or a complaint was brought to us by the Miami Valley Fair Housing Association that we're dealing with currently and it's in litigation and we hope to come out on the other end of it. As we perceive ourselves to be right now be fully vindicated.

Mr. Snowden: It's not anything related to this project.

Joe Thomas: No, not at all.

Mr. Snowden: I can go over, I've commented on the development approval or inspection process. I'd be happy to go over that in detail just because each one of them has a step to it or I can put you into the relevant city official that is going to do that inspection. I have a question from Mr. Lott, will you consider fencing of the proposed park extending the fencing on the back regarding the site plan.

Glen Duggar: I think the answer is yes, but we're not totally sure we understand the questions, so we'd like to meet with him after this meeting. Ok, which we'll do out in the hall.

Mr. Bowman: Just a statement, in regards to the fencing I understand that the motivation of the fencing and the reaction to the request from the local residents. I would just like to make a statement that my preference would be that we not have a fence, that we would do a mound and buffer of the landscape buffer only because fence looks great first 5-years, 10-years and on they tend to deteriorate and not be maintained because it's in the back of the property and it's not going to effect the leasing up of the units. So, I just want to be careful when we're asking for fences that my preference would be that we think about more mounding and buffering because the trees grow themselves and 10-years they tend to look a lot better than fences.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Bowman, that is the end of my questions that I have listed. What I'm going to do is I'm going to turn things back over to you. I assume that the members have questions. With your permission, if there's another resident and feels like their question did not get asked and they want to come up and talk to me and then we can ask that at the very end. Just so we don't have folks shouting from the back. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Bowman: That's acceptable.

Mr. Snowden: If you have an additional question, if you feel I skipped over your item come up here to the podium and I'll be happy to ask your question at the end.

Mr. Bowman: Thank you Mr. Snowden.

Unknown: *inaudible

Mr. Snowden: Mam, if I missed it or it wasn't addressed or whatever come remind me what you want to know.

Mr. Bowman: Any discussion among the board?

Mr. Hicks: I've got a few items that I think would be good if we all just kind of discuss and work our way through. I think we've heard a lot of concerns today about density storm water. Mr. Duggar and Mr. Thomas *inaudible. I heard a lot of questions about storm water flooding and I think we've addressed a lot of those. Density is obviously a large issue. I think a lot of people have some concern about the 3-story building, multiple 3-story buildings, especially along Taylor Road right there at the front and I understand the intention of the design and the layout to try to get the buildings the least impactful away from the neighbors and the Reserve, unfortunately you have to account for the neighbors that live across the street on Taylor Road. The site itself is kind of an awkward fit. You have a failed single-story multi-family development there, which I think all of us would prefer that what was originally planned would have just gotten finished, but I think it fell victim to the recession. I think everybody's first priority would be to finish that out because it's an incomplete project and you're trying to fit some compatibility into something that, it's kind of a square peg round hole issue were dealing with. In regards to the dedicated open space/public park area I think I have a lot of concern about that. I've walked that site and its construction spoils. There's a significant amount of dirt that's on the site and I think that as the Parks Department, you're talking to the Parks Department and what City Council, they're going to have a lot of things that they're going to need to consider with that about the liability of taking over a piece of property that needs improvements. I would recommend, when we do recommend to Council, if this does become open space or a park that it is part of this approval or non-approval. If something is approved that there would be some improvements on that open space and that it not just be left in its current condition.

Joe Thomas: I'm responsible for building the community. I represent the owner of the community. I understand what you're saying. I didn't think of it being any other way. If we were going to dedicate this ground it's going to be flat, it's going to be grass, it's going to be maintained until dedication. All construction spoils removed. Whatever stuff is there currently. It's going to be graded. Be graded to the grading plan. Flat as can be so it can be used as a park and fully restored. That was our commitment. I thought I was doing something good for the city when we made that recommendation, maybe not. I understand there's some frustration possibly that just might not be the best idea, but we have 7-acres of open ground. We would just be as happy to maintain it ourselves. We mow grass every day. We can maintain the grass just as well as the next person, fertilize the grass, make sure it’s perfect. So, if it's not a city requirement or if it's not a city issue we can maintain it as good as anybody else. Again, we would restore it to a good grade that's usable without mounds, flat area, whatever it may be. As far as your question about the 3-story units, as Mr. Duggar alluded to earlier, we are trying to mass everything away from the residents that are adjacent to our property lines. I understand Taylor Road has the same consideration, but I felt like

Taylor Road designated a larger impact area, a more intense impact area, and that's possibly what the 3-story units were geared towards, that type of nature. I don't think it's any more impactful than the height or mass of the Kroger store. We pay a lot of attention to detail of our landscaping. We ultimately believe that the trees and the landscaping that will be immediately placed along Taylor Road will also soften that impact and again with the density trying to move everything away from the area residents and still maintain. We're less than 10-units per acre. Thank you.

Unknown: Mr. Hicks, I'd just like to address one other piece that may be helpful to the residents as well to you with reference to that potential park. As Joe pointed out we thought it was a great idea that and their appears to be a need for a neighborhood public park in that area. We also thought didn't think it was a great idea that it have lights, active softball games until 10 or 11 at night, so in the discussions that we've had with the city this is intended to be a neighborhood, passive recreational type park. It wouldn't have lighted ball fields. It wouldn't be the kind of thing that you would, you know, you would have a problem in your backyard because there guys were drinking beer and playing softball out there until 10 or 11 at night. The intention is that this is the place you can go to play frisbee, walk your dog, maybe your kids go down there to play, but it wouldn't be an active. It would be more of a passive neighborhood recreational type venue as opposed to something else. That was at least our proposal to the city parks department and there really hasn't been any direction from Council either way as to how that's going to go.

Mr. Hicks: I had a few other comments and concerns while we're talking, in general, multi-family next to a grocery you're going to get a lot of pedestrian traffic getting over to the Kroger and I want to make sure it's something that is at there's some awareness there. Generally, people walk not as straight as the crow flies and with the creek in the middle between the two I think that you're going to end up with a lot of cut-through folks that are able to cut-through and get to the Kroger in the most direct way as possible and I guess I would like to see something within the site plan to kind of accommodate that to kind of shuttle those folks as they start moving, walking across the site and they get towards your open or preservation zone by the creek to shuttle them back towards the street.

Unknown: Did you walk the preservation zone?

Mr. Hicks: It's pretty steep, but...

Unknown: It's pretty steep. That was my recollection of it, but I haven't been in there in quite some time.

Mr. Hicks: There's just, if you have residents and they do want to walk to the Kroger, the only way for them to get to the Kroger's to go through the sidewalk that is at your main entrance. There's no sidewalk or any access to Taylor Road to the south and that's where they're going to end up, cutting across.

Unknown: That's a good pick up.

Unknown: *inaudible

Unknown: Something at the southeast corner.

Mr. Hicks: Some additional better pedestrian access for them to get to Kroger. I mean, we're not talking about bridges and silly stuff would be challenging.

Unknown: I can't tell you what that is today, but by the time we come back... What?

Unknown: He's recommending that we provide a sidewalk on the southern portion of the site out to Taylor Road and then ultimately over the stream.

Mr. Snowden: That can also be addressed at the major site plan phase. That is not a detail that needs to be shown in the concept plan because you're going to get to look at it again. Great observation.

Unknown: We'll bring it back next time with that Mr. Hicks, that will be on there and if it's not we'll put it on there.

Mr. Hicks: In regards to traffic and I know that the way this works they hired a traffic engineer that produced a study. They asked the city's engineer for a scope of work and I believe they created an MOU for this and reading through that it appeared that you are only required to study your main entrance. It's not unheard of for cities, engineers to require a little bit more of an expanded MOU, which I'm surprised didn't happen here, so it's not necessarily a question for the applicant. It's just something for staff and for our own recommendations. Something to look out for that once traffic leaves the entrance they're going somewhere and we've heard a lot of public concern about that intersection of Taylor Road and Main Street. I think it's something we should all have on our radar and we should maybe communicate to our engineer that on applications like this that the MOU, it's not all inclusive for the whole city, but there is a major intersection that's very close to this development and I'm surprised that that was not studied as part of this application. That concludes my questions.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Hicks pretty much asked all my questions as well, which is good so I don't have to ask them myself and he's much more eloquent than I am. I did have one. It's really about the drainage and that's been raised tonight as a concern and I know that we're not at that point yet in this project where we're going to have that information, but do you anticipate to have a documentation of the drainage efficiency available for the next phases, so that these people and us have hard data as to how much drainage capacity it can handle.

Glen Duggar: Yes, because the next level of this is the site plan and that site plan is a document that is 75% engineered. When you look at this you start dealing with the most challenging issues from a constraint standpoint that will affect the site plan first. That would clearly be one of the first things that would change that site plan.

Mr. Bowman: And some site plans we see estimations, we see range. I would maybe

suggest personally to maybe appease some of these people and the Reserve. They're going to want something concrete so that they can rest assured that their backyards are not going to get flooded.

Unknown: I guess from a brief summary of the storm water management we did have EMH&T review this plan as it's shown today as far as the size and the overall ponds. They did also study the drainage area. There's a couple areas, but then there's a lot of acreage across Taylor Road that also drains onto the site. We looked into that manner. I've been doing this development business for about 27-years and we understand the impact and the severity of storm water and we address it and we work with the engineers and work with the municipalities to make sure it's perfect.

Mr. Bowman: That's all these folks want to know.

Unknown: You don't get second chances when it comes to storm water. You've got to address it the first time. You've got to address it the first time right. There's no second chances because it does impact people's properties and we take that very serious as a company and continue to work with municipalities to make sure we get it perfect.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add, I'll promise to stop asking questions, but I do, the existing condos, their site plan accommodated storm water retention of some kind that based upon what I can see out on the site does not appear it was complete or fully completed, so I just want to make sure that when you are designing your storm water that you are accounting for the impervious area of the existing condos as well because that water technically doesn't have anywhere to go right now.

Unknown: Correct. That original condominium community was developed or engineered by EMH&T and we worked with them at the time knowing what we had to deal with on the existing *inaudible. There's an existing sanitary lines out there. There's existing water lines out there. *inaudible We're very clear on what we needed to deal with.

Mr. Snowden: The two questions that were raised to me were as follows: one is, and this might be for Andrew as well, does new TIF legislation need to be passed prior to the approval? I think you partially answered that. Could you clarify that?

Mr. Bowsher: Yes, at this time, unless we were to expand the infrastructure currently it basically states that only infrastructure can be used from the TIF funds. That can be expanded to encompass other things. Currently, right now, that would include doing work on Taylor Road or at the light because it's impactful from their development. So, only the money from that TIF could be used on infrastructure in that area. It can't be used on anything else.

Mr. Snowden: The second question I had is, would the applicant consider reducing the 3-story buildings to 2?

Unknown: That would take some serious consideration on our behalf. We could not answer

that question tonight knowing what our economic model is for sustainable community. We have roughly a 4,000 sq ft clubhouse that has interior amenities that are a great cost to the development. There's an exterior resort style pool with outdoor grills and patio area with fire pits and outdoor kitchens and a large area to maintain as far as the buffers and screening and landscaping. That model works well and each time we decrease, possibly the density, it continues to take away the resources to fund those for long-term sustainability of a great community. All the stuff that I've been promising to the neighbors as additional commitments to them and as well as basically the luxurious style of our apartments that's all brought to us by the density we provide, but obviously everything comes at an issue of dealing with the people that we're working with closely, which is our neighbors and we can obviously look at that in a greater detail. Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: Any other questions or items of discussion?

Mr. Bowsher: I'm not going to claim to be Bill Sampson, our Public Service Director, but to kind of talk about some of the concerns that are already kind of happening for the residents that live on Taylor or around Taylor, there's already pot-holes, there's already issues of the traffic and the situation, so we're definitely already aware of that. We have a capital improvement plan that Bill runs. There's a 5-year outlook for Taylor Road to be repaved and added additional lanes to that. Whether or not this goes through or not that is going to happen in the coming years. The only thing that this development would do is that it would decrease the time-line of that happening because of the additional funds that would be coming from the TIF to be added into it. Whether or not that plays a role or a factor into it that money can only be utilized for the road, so it would help the infrastructure and the issues that were already at play.

Mr. Bowman: Any other questions or points of discussion?

Unknown: Just to clarify as we go through and we make a motion we make a motion for approval and then we go through a roll and it's a yes, no and we're recommending either approval or not to Council for their site plan.

Mr. Bowsher: Not the site plan. Just the zoning change.

Mr. Bowman: So, will this, could a motion contain conditions or we're not there yet are we?

Mr. Bowsher: No, we're not there.

Mr. Bowman: This is the very beginning. We're voting yes, if we vote yes or no...

Mr. Bowsher: Voting does not mean that it will continue.

Mr. Bowman: Right, we're just continuing the process.

Mr. Hood: I would recommend that you wait until Mr. Snowden reappears.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Snowden, just to catch you up, we're at the point now, all points of discussion seem to be exhausted, so we're entertaining now, I'm entertaining a motion. No motions been made yet.

Mr. Snowden: If anyone wanted to approve the project as it was submitted they would want to recommend the application for approval incorporating the revised site plan and rezoning text.

Mr. Bowman: We're just clarifying that we're not making conditions on this motion. Correct?

Mr. Snowden: You can if you choose to. If you feel that there are additional conditions necessary, but remember when you make additional conditions you're making things that I have to manage and organize, so let me know. I'm not saying I don't mind doing it. I'm just telling you.

Mr. Bowman: Just to clarify, Mr. Snowden, their final development plan is a part of the zoning text is a part of this rezoning for a plan development.

Mr. Snowden: Yes sir.

Mr. Bowman: That goes before Council for two more readings and Council will have the final say as to whether this is approved or not. Then these folks got to come back with a detailed site plan to work out other items on the site plan.

Mr. Snowden: That is factually accurate.

Mr. Bowman: I know that sounds confusing folks, but what we're doing I think is just sort of beginning the conversation and getting the process, getting more people involved, more community folks and elected folks in the process. Does that make sense? Ok.

Mr. Hood: *inaudible

Mr. Snowden: I'd be happy to Mr. Hood. Gentlemen, you need to take a real close look at the standards that are listed in the report and your basically making a determination if you feel the project has met those standards. You can recommend the application for denial or disapproval. If you do, you would still move in the positive. If you recommend it for disapproval, it would go back to the City Council and would take a super majority of the City Council to ultimately enact the ordinance. If it was disapproved by City Council they cannot apply with the same use at the same location within 12-months. So, you're basically saying, hey, you're done. The idea behind that is you want to make sure that folks really are serious about a project when they come in. You could recommend if you feel that there's something, I don't think the walkway is something we can't address at the major site plan phase, but if there's anything else that you feel needs to be incorporated you can move, make a recommendation for approval on condition of that particular item being incorporated into the plan or text. You could send it back to the City Council and recommend for approval as

submitted with the revised plan and revised zoning text. Mr. Hood, did I miss any?

Mr. Hood: There was a question when you stepped out whether or not we were at the stage where conditions could be placed upon approval.

Mr. Snowden: Absolutely.

Mr. Hood: Well, that was not answered that way. That's why I asked them to wait for you.

Mr. Snowden: Conditions can be placed on it per 1151 of the code. If you feel additional conditions are necessary or germane to the project in order to protect the public health, safety and welfare. You are the determinants of that.

Mr. Bowman: I will entertain a motion if there is one.

Mr. Hicks: So, we motion in the positive. This is Mr. Hicks, I'd like to move that we vote for recommendation for approval to Council for this submitted plan and rezoning text.

Mr. Bizjak: Second.

Mr. Hicks: Can we have a quick discussion? Just a final thought. I think this is an appropriate location for some type of multi-family and I understand that there's going to be a lot of residents that are not going to want any multi-family at all in the community, but I will make a statement that demographics and housing choices are changing significantly in our country and there's a lot more people renting now than there were renting before. There's going to be a lot of demand for this type of product or some type of multi-family product; however, I cannot support this project in its current form and its current configuration due to the potential obligations of the open space with the spoils, with the current condition of what that's going to be, and the questions as to what that could be. I think it would need to have some kind of commitment from the developers for an improvement on that open space. The 3-story product I think is also a major concern and I would prefer some type of less impactful multi-family use for the subject site. As we go and we vote I'm going to vote that we recommend that Council does not approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Bowman: Your motion stands at this point.

Mr. Hicks: You have to make a motion in the positive, but each of us individually, which is only going to be three of us voting can vote yes or no.

Mr. Bowman: So what your asking is for basically a different...

Mr. Hicks: I would like to see a reconfigured site plan. I would like to see 2-story products instead of 3-story products. A little bit better blend in the community. More of these questions answered and some commitment for improvements on the public open space that's being set aside.

Unknown: I want to be on the record and share those same sentiments and want to see the same thing as well.

Mr. Bowman: So, we have a motion and a second. Do we have a second?

Mr. Snowden: You have a second from Mr. Bizjak. You just want to ask if there's any additional discussion and then you would recommend me to call the roll.

Mr. Bowman: Any additional discussion? Mr. Snowden please call the roll.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Bowman. I will remind you that 3-members must vote in the affirmative in order for this to pass.

Mr. Snowden: We had 3-negative votes and 1-abstain, which means this is going to be returned to the City Council on the 26th with a recommendation for disapproval. Like I said, it will take a super majority of the City Council to approve something different.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [0 TO 3]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Steven Hicks, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Joseph Bizjak, Commissioner	
NAYS:	Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSTAIN:	Cullinan	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

6. ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED: Changing the Zoning District of a 49.88 Acre Parcel Owned by the State of Ohio on the South Side of E. Main Street, Known as 8895 E. Main Street SW, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from CO Offices and Institutions District and CS Community Services District to GI General Industry District with Limited Overlay; and Waving the Traffic Study Requirements of Section 1151.02.

Mr. Snowden: This is an ordinance to rezone the property that is owned by the State of Ohio, where the Fire Marshall Academy is, that property and the property immediately to the west of it. It still has the legacy zoning. It has a CS zone on a portion. It has a CO zone on another portion that were place holder zones or reflect the previous use. We were approached by the State, a contractor for the State saying that they would like to have an accessory structure placed on the, that they would like to place an accessory structure on the former property that was used as a drive-in movie theater and I recommended that we should get all their properties into the same zoning district because it makes it doing site plan approvals much easier. My recommendation was GI general industry because that was what the existing Department of Agricultural site is zoned and because of some of the processes and things that they're using there that seemed a logical zone. That does permit adult uses as a permitted use. I think it's highly unlikely the state would ever unload the property, but in the event that they do I placed a rezoning text that said adult uses are still a special exception, so it would be the same conditions as now with the general industry zoning placed for the whole site and they can move forward with their project.

RESULT:	**REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]**	**Next: 3/26/2018 7:34 PM**
MOVER:	Joseph Bizjak, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan, Vice Chairman	
AYES:	Cullinan, Bowman, Hicks, Bizjak	
ABSENT:	Zollars	

E. OTHER BUSINESS

None

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cullinan adjourned at 9:22 pm

_____ _____

Chairman Planning and Zoning Administrator