



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2022 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Furst, Benner, Alabi

ABSENT: Cullinan (Excused), Zollars (Excused)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Special Meeting – February 10, 2022

Minutes Stand Approved

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Stands Approved

4. SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers for the evening sworn in by Mr. Furst.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Application 2021-5555; Parcel 107-017466 ; Eastwood Development Final Plat;
Applicant: Wilcox Communities LLC

Ms. Ledbetter: This is the final plat for the Eastwood development. It's very similar to the preliminary plat. The applicant did mark a couple easements on the Northeast side of the plat. Mr. Benner did catch a small clerical error on the cover sheet of the plat. My recommendation is if we approve the plat tonight that we make a condition that needs to be changed when the final plat is submitted for staff signatures.

Mr. Furst: To clarify, Mr. Benner, the error that you found reads Pataskala, Ohio and it should read Reynoldsburg, Ohio, is that correct?

Mr. Benner: Yes.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Any questions or comment from staff regarding this? Any questions or comments from Planning Commission? If not, I move that we approve this plat as submitted

with the condition that we correct the Pataskala, Ohio description to Reynoldsburg, Ohio.

Mr. Benner: I'll second.

Mr. Furst: Can you call the roll please?

Ms. Ledbetter: Ms. Alabi. Yes. Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes.

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

2. Application 2022-5047; 8617 Taylor Rd SW; Amendment of Development Plan ;
Applicant: Larry Vatri

Ms. Ledbetter: This is an application for an amendment to a development plan. This development plan was originally approved in August, it is The Ravines at Taylor. The applicant is here tonight because there was a couple of minor but important changes that they made to the project. The first is that the clubhouse size was reduced. The second change is that there was some brick removed from the facade of the building. I will say that I had a conversation with the applicant about the amount of brick that was going to be removed and he was very receptive and responsive to the wishes of the city to keep as much brick as possible. So only a minor amount of brick was removed from the interior garages. The third change is he changed the color of the materials. The original colors was a blue and green color scheme and now it is more neutral grey and white color scheme. Staff is generally supportive of these changes and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have. I know the applicant is here to speak as well.

Mr. Vatri: I'm the developer for the site.

Mr. Furst: Any questions for the applicant?

Mr. Benner: What facilitated these changes? The reduced size for your clubhouse is not paramount, but something had to occur. Then the facade, the brick.

Mr. Vatri: Originally the clubhouse was approximately 3200 square feet. In January of last year when all these material costs and everything started sky rocketing, lumber, everything. The cost of the project got higher than what I liked it. When it came to my attention I spoke to someone at the city in the development and building department that I was suggesting to reduce the size of the clubhouse due to cost. The original size was really larger than we actually needed. So, we've really right sized the clubhouse to fit this project.

Mr. Benner: How did you determine the right size? I mean, this is quite an extensive set of town homes you have there. There's going to be quite a few folks there.

Mr. Vatri: Yeah, other developments have gone to the similar size that I have now.

Approximately 1800 square feet. There will be 240 units with this size clubhouse. Originally we oversized it. I wanted to do the best project I could for the city, but under the circumstances the last year has cost of everything, just kind of put it out of reach. So I'd spoken to the people of the city, and they agreed that the changes could be moved forward.

Mr. Furst: By that do you mean that other developments of a similar size has this size clubhouse?

Mr. Vatri: Yes. The one that was originally proposed here you could put 360 units to it if you wanted. It wasn't what I wanted to do, but under the circumstances it's what I had to do.

Mr. Benner: Could you clarify Aerin's comment as far as the brick? She said a minor amount, but can you go into detail about what you're removing, please?

Mr. Vatri: Yeah, there's sections inside, it's an eight unit building. There's three bedrooms on the end units and an inside insider, six two bedrooms with attached garages. So we're removing just the side walls of the garages. The fronts are all the same.

Mr. Furst: The brick fascia on the side walls are the same?

Mr. Vatri: Yeah, on the sidewall, not on the garage side wall, the two bedrooms, but on the three bedrooms is still there, but the fronts are all the same and we added; which Aerin liked, a perimeter where they call it a.

Ms. Ledbetter: A water table.

Mr. Vatri: Yeah, all the way around the buildings, you know, even a little bit additional on the back. So, you know, that's it was good addition. I can appreciate that. If we could afford it, we have done all brick on the first story, the last one I did. That's the way we did it. The changes of color. You know, we just we had the change from what was there. I mean, if you remember those renderings, wasn't very attractive at all. I don't know why. It was 2020, I don't think everybody was in a real good mindset. But we've updated the colors and modernized it. And I think you've seen the new pictures. So I think it'll look real nice.

Mr. Benner: And again, sorry to have so many questions. You said this is on the two bedroom units. How many of those are there?

Mr. Vatri: There's going to be a total of ninety eight and thirty, three bedroom. On the total project.

Mr. Benner: Thank you.

Mr. Furst: I just had a question, I apologize if this was included in your site plan, and I just missed it. But the nearby residents were asking some questions earlier in the application process about the tree removal and things like that, and we've had some problems here in the city with development, where maybe the existing site conditions had some more dead wood

and things like, you know, dead vegetation needed removed and wasn't necessarily replaced. You know, how did that go versus how you originally thought? Was it more or less the number of trees removed that you thought you would need to? Or did you have to remove more or less?

Mr. Vatri: No, I think it was less. We actually had like a perimeter here. We couldn't touch almost approximately 10 feet from the property line all the way around the properties to buffer everybody. So I think, you know, turned out real well, far as I'm concerned. I mean, we didn't get near the streams or anything. There's a nice big green areas on this project. You know, once the trees fill up, it'll be real nice.

Mr. Furst: Then just one final question here that I have; assuming this moves forward, do you have a planned completion date?

Mr. Vatri: We're hoping, you know, probably March in about a year the same time. 2023 complete all 128 units.

Mr. Furst: Are there any additional questions for the applicant?

Mr. Benner: Just one you just said you hoped all units to be; are you going to do a soft opening when you open? Are you going to open some units, while you're still building the other units?

Mr. Vatri: Well, that's the plan I hope to, you know, we got to see what the city's going to allow there, but we're hoping to get at least four buildings as construction continues, you know, and just fill them as we go. But the city hasn't laid out an agenda, how they want that to go through yet.

Mr. Benner: Thank you.

Mr. Furst: Thank you, Mr. Vatri. I'll certainly entertain a motion if anyone has one.

Mr. Benner: So, Mr. Chairman, I'll move that we approve this, these amendments or changes to the site plan.

Mr. Furst: We have a first, do we have a second?

Ms. Alabi: I'll second, yes.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Would you please call the roll, Ms. Ledbetter?

Ms. Ledbetter: Ms. Alabi. Yes. Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes.

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

3. Application 2022-5014; 7332 E Main St; Main and Lancaster Development Major Site Plan; Applicant: Tim Spencer Trivium Development LLC

Mr. Furst: Next item D-3 is application to zero 2022-5014 7332 E Main.

Ms. Ledbetter: Yeah, so this projects, as you mentioned, is at the intersection of East Main Street and Lancaster Avenue. It includes approximately seven parcels on.68 acres. The application is for major site plan approval. It's a two story development. It's on the old Happy Dragon site that's currently owned by the city. The plans indicate potential tenants being a dentist office, a coffee shop, an ice cream shop, maybe a restaurant with additional room for office space on the second floor. All of these uses are permitted uses in the old Reynoldsburg District, which is the district of this property is located in. The development does include patio space as well as open seating on the rooftop. The proposed development does comply with section 1103.01, which covers building height law coverage and set back requirements. The old Reynoldsburg district is set up to align buildings to be directly on the street, which is what this development is. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed site layout. The suggested building typology is a small flex retail building that encourages parking to be located in the rear or to the side of the building and access from a rear alley. That's the preferred typology for this district, which we believe the development meets. It does have parking in the rear of the building, and there are two access points. One off East Main Street and one off Lancaster Avenue. And then the proposal does call for a sidewalk that wraps around the front of the building and connects to the parking in the rear. The applicant has met parking requirements. The parking count for the district is one space per 400 square feet on the ground floor, plus one space per 450 square feet on the upper floor. So this development would require 35 parking spaces, and they've provided thirty eight, so they're accounting for a little bit more. As I mentioned before, there are two access points we as a city and our city engineer, decided that we are not going to require traffic impact study for this development because we have so much already planned for this corridor with the city engineer and within other projects, I mean, I'm sure everybody is aware of the project going on at that exact intersection right now. The applicant has submitted a landscape concept plan that does meet code requirements. They're providing a number of trees and shrubs and shade trees that will be in the interior parking area. This section is included in the East Main Street Improvement plans that this city is doing, which will add street trees on to the front area between the building and the street. The materials being used on the facade of the building meet the visual intention of their old Reynoldsburg commercial district. The materials that are being proposed is red brick, gray brick and a gray metal cladding stuff is generally supportive of the project, and it's my opinion the development meets the intent of the old Reynoldsburg Commercial District. I think

the commission needs to consider whether the proposed major site plan is consistent with the standards contained in the City Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Master Plan.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Would the applicant like to say a few words?

Mr. Spencer: Good evening, Tim Spencer, Trivium Development, 210 North LaSalle. Excuse me. Columbus, Ohio 43215. Good evening, thank you. Ms. Ledbetter for the presentation. My comments are simply we would like the members that are in attendance this evening to provide just first reaction, first comments and input for us to take away today. We're not asking for a vote this evening, but we understand the proximity of this site at the intersection of Lancaster and Main and how important it is to a lot of folks. Some members may live nearby. Some members may drive by a two or three times a day. It certainly will have a long lasting impact for the community. We'd like to take this opportunity to listen to what you like, what you don't like, what's important to you and what the comments may be so that our team can react accordingly. I do have my architect with me this evening who can address geometry, architecture, materials, and things like that. It is certainly available for questions and obviously our civil engineers and one of your members. But is it abstaining from participating in this discussion? But this site has had its challenges to checkboxes as far as the city is required from a storm water, floodway, flood plain access management and still get a building on the site that would check the boxes that Ms. Ledbetter explained that your code requires. So that little background information, coupled with the fact that your code is new and this is an exciting opportunity, we'd like to open the floor up for discussions, questions and feedback so that we can come back next month and address those and hopefully get a positive vote from your next month.

Mr. Furst: Me first. Well, duly noted. Thank you, Mr. Spencer. So our puns here aside, but you know, I actually think it's a pretty attractive building. So it's maybe not as dramatic as the initial renderings that Mr. Meyer's predecessor may have circulated with the glass and the three stories. But frankly, you know, I don't know that that really fit in with the esthetic of old Reynoldsburg. I think this fits much better. I was actually surprised to see as much brick, and I think that's a good thing. So, you know, thank you for that. My only thought and I'm not necessarily opposed to it, but the metal cladding is, you know, we don't have a whole lot of that in old Reynoldsburg. I don't know that it necessarily doesn't fit. You know, I'm sure there were metal clad buildings, you know, in the neighborhood at some point, for sure. They just no longer are existent. So, you know, other than that, though, you know, I think it does kind of call back from the architectural design esthetic a little bit to, you know what the buildings would have looks like, you know, at the time. And it reminded me quite a bit of something that you might see in like the arena district.

Mr. Spencer: OK. I think initially when we come back next, next month, you'll see us put in a little more attention. There are a few staff comments and consultant comments on behalf of the city that we've not been able to address or haven't

addressed until we had this meeting. And really, we're getting quite a bit of massing on that site. Our team's goal and Carter Bean is our architect. The goal I gave to the team was to really look at ingress egress and water quality and floodway floodplain. This is not where we submitted to you, it's not our first iteration. We had a much more linear ingress egress into the project until we were informed that part of the city's parking lot as part of this project is in the floodway. So we had to kind of pull back as a team and really started looking at the geometry of parking. And we think that if we have a complementary of uses that are between eight and five office type of Nix's, that that'll help support the restaurant businesses that are there in the evening. And we're certainly negotiating with the city to have a non-exclusive easement across those four public parking in the evening. So that's the goal. And the byproduct is the building that we have, the building pad that we have. So Carter and I have spent a lot of time thinking about some additional comments that we have to address. And I think you'll see a building that pulls itself away from the right of way and from the drive aisles to give us more pedestrian and more patio things like that. And Carter do you want to talk about the cladding at all? And there's no love or reason behind the cladding.

Mr. Bean: I mean, you hit the nail on the head. Really we wanted to, from a massing standpoint, create buildings that were in scale and traditional inform. But we didn't want to replicate traditional buildings. So they're really kind of a contemporary interpretation of traditional buildings informs the use of the brick, obviously traditional material, the metal siding, as you mentioned. Yes. You know, traditionally used in agricultural buildings or in a vertical orientation, then in the horizontal, we'd be happy to explore other alternatives to that.

Mr. Furst: I'm not terribly opposed to it. I mean, you know, in fact, when you look at, you know, more industrial areas, you know, it did strike me as something that you might see and, you know, a warehouse district or a port or something like that. So yeah, I just was a little surprised to see it as all. So. But, you know, kudos to your imagination on that.

Mr. Spencer: So that was part of our discussion. In addition to that, we looked at the rhythm of the windows, the mopane's in the windows, the lining of the windows and how that would play into it. The thing you need to remember is we prioritized the develop ability of the site and in realizing we had to deal with floodway and floodplain issues. So when we went back to the team and said, Look, the building has to fit in this space because we want this parking yield. We really started putting ourselves in a box that we I think we came out with a good product, but the materials and all those other things, we get that a certain level of scale. We even played with a three story building versus a two. We want to maximize it as much as possible, but we also have to lease it and we have to make sure it's compatible and it provides a product that is rentable. So we do have a little bit of a challenge from our distance from Main Street back to that first parking row is only thirty two feet, 30 feet, which isn't really desirable, but we're not going to execute any parking. We have to keep the parking as is, so we're open to any other ideas will be a material, window

placement, window configuration, design, colors. Carter, and I call it the feels. I mean, if you've got a certain idea that makes it feel more appropriate, we'd love that input.

Mr. Bean: It's interesting how difficult problems can result in very interesting. This was a really tough building to mass and make sense of, but I think because of that difficulty, it resulted in something that ended up in a really great scale with the other buildings around.

Mr. Spencer: And to your comment about the previous iterations that really didn't take into consideration right of way, which we worked with the city to give up an access point and massing was kind of carte blanche and parking in floodway floodplain. None of those things were considered in those drawings. And what you see is about a six - eight month effort of our team to come up with this. So we're reacting to the natural environments and conditions and in what you see as is our best foot forward so far.

Mr. Furst: Well, and I appreciate all the work you have put in with the city. Can you talk a little bit about and I know it's been very extensive in my conversations with the administration, some of the work that went in to mitigate the flooding or at least the flooding concerns because we actually the city heard I believe last month, you know, a property that's almost immediately adjacent, behind French Run that's subject to flooding very frequently. So I know how there's always a concern with flooding adjacent to a waterway.

Mr. Spencer: I can answer that is Tyler permitted to speak or testify as to the technical aspects?

Mr. Bean: Fortunately, he's really good, he's really good.

Mr. Shook: I have no doubt that Tyler is really good, it's one of the reasons why he's a Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Spencer: Tyler is going to get a nervous twitch and shake like he's having a seizure. If I say something really, really bad. But for all intents purposes, we had intended. I'm thinking about your comment there for a second, Chris. For all intensive purposes, we thought we were going to get good ingress egress from Main and Lancaster and move traffic that way when we found out that the city had paved on essentially a floodway and we needed to work within those parameters. We went back to the Tyler and said, how do we make this work? So we're addressing all storm water quality floodway flood issues. Essentially, we're keeping the site pretty much as is, and if I had a pointer, I would take the French Run parking field and as it makes that bend to the area, that's no longer developable, that wall is going to stay. That will be a substantial wall so that we're not cutting it in the floodway or floodplain criteria. The feedback we got from the administration was then make a transition to what it is today. So don't interrupt the grade. Don't change the grade. Don't do

anything to that. In keeping that, that's why the parking is awkward as it is in a perfect world, we would have come in our main street and made a left hand turn to get back to Lancaster that was always our intent. That's what appealed to us to look at developing the site, so we're not touching that. Part of our plan was then to take down the helping hands clean that area up, bury utilities, bury drain lines and start making our way to the east to acquire more parking. We have all that ironed out where we're continuing to discuss that with the city of how that gets rolled out. But as of today, we can put parking all the way back to the drive back to the signal we can pave and redo that. So hopefully that continues to materialize. With that, we've been very cognizant not to bend the rules, tweak the rules or do anything to, infract any of the rules. So from the letter of the Ohio Revised Code and the storm water manual, we're checking all the boxes.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. I just have one last procedural question. You know, the I understand your desire to table this, if this were to move forward and I assume that your tenants the kind of those conversations are ongoing, would we see a separate signage application at a later date?

Mr. Spencer: That's actually why we're tabling it. I am much more comfortable. You know, the gentleman before me had an application got approved, and he's back here tonight for various reasons. I would like you to see, understand, critique and comment on our sign package and make sure there's no surprises there. I don't want to come back in six months, and it's alleged that we're doing something that wasn't approved. So I would like you to see those things. We'd like to get comments like you've provided the other members have. We have worked in Dublin, Reynoldsburg and Worthington and created sign packages specific for sites there. And I think Carter will take those comments. And I think for me, it's not so much the signage is got to be big and ostentatious, like Sawmill Road in the 90s. It's got to be signage that's appropriate and scale to the buildings that we're trying to do. And if that's a blade sign, if it's above the door, if it's in the window, we'd like to discuss those things. But I do not want to get an approval without our sign package being discussed, and understood.

Mr. Furst: I actually appreciate that very much. Thank you. Any other comments?

Mr. Benner: Just a few. I'm the slow member of the group, so back to the flood wall, the flood plain. Originally last summer, I walked that with the city attorney and we kind of looked it's almost two different levels. You're not raising it up?

Mr. Spencer: We're not changing anything. What you see today is what we'll build on.

Mr. Benner: And you're not doing anything to alleviate the flood. You're not building anything back.

Mr. Spencer: So, yes, we will have underground detention. We are negotiating a

TIFF agreement with the city to improve this area for underground storm water detention quality.

Mr. Benner: You're not allowed to look at him.

Mr. Spencer: You know, technically he's allowed to sit up there and not vote. He's allowed to way in, he's a technical expert. So we are making those improvements and that'll help downstream. What we're not doing is changing the grade or infecting any more impervious pavement or introducing anymore impervious payments, which will cause a downstream issue. So we're making it better.

Mr. Benner: You mentioned the presenter before you. Are you confident now that you've picked the brick and metal cladding that you'll be able to find that and get it delivered and built?

Mr. Spencer: That's a fair question. I've been doing this 23 years, I've never presented a material that I couldn't buy, acquire or obtain to a planning commission and got it approved. So how you get yourself in that situation, I've not found myself in that situation before, so I wouldn't understand that.

Mr. Benner: Well, lastly, you mentioned the metal cladding that you decided to go horizontal. Just to fit with the building?

Mr. Bean: Actually the window patterning is so vertical on this building.

Mr. Benner: You didn't want to go with?

Mr. Bean: Vertical, you know, we just get so stripy. You know, it was it was nice to break.

Mr. Benner: Yeah, and I realize we're in early stages here, but in looking at your parking, you have two handicapped spots, I believe both of them by the ice cream store, but none.

Mr. Spencer: Yes, we ultimately want to move those back to the drive aisle that we'll share with Prost.

Mr. Benner: OK, that makes sense. Item seven here the loading for the proposed building. Do you need an easement for that or has that been decided?

Mr. Spencer: It's not been decided? So currently people say currently that area between our site and which is the city's parking lot in protest. It looks to the eye to be rectangular, you know, 35 feet by 90, or whatever it is. You can see the lines going through that, that's not a straight out right of way. From 1832 and October 13th of 1832 that was created, and that's not true right away. It's an access point. And we trying to work with the city to basically take that entry from Main Street all the way

back to the creek and work with the adjoining property owners so that the helping hands building would come down in that block. That rectangular area would become city right of way. In doing so, that would prevent or that would improve access to our site and then back through the properties back behind that, we'd like to improve the parking. So we'd like to see loading in that drive be there. I think we've tweaked the width and I won't look at Tyler. But I think we have a width now that exceed your code and still allows for a traditional LTL tractor trailer to come in there and pull off to the side is our goal.

Mr. Benner: I have nothing further, chairman.

Ms. Alabi: So my only concern was flooding as a resident, so I'm glad that you've addressed that and I appreciate the care that you put into it. My other question was you were saying you originally wanted to make a left hand turn on main. Can you explain a little bit what you were saying about the turn there?

Mr. Spencer: I wanted the full access. We were trying to get it and maybe I misspoke, but the area between our building and Prost, we want to make sure that was a an ability to turn in there, whether it's left or right, turn in there and then turn left, which where the helping hands building is and then you would go back to Lancaster to use the signal. So for example, I'm one of the new people that's moving in the M/I sub divisional Wagner Road and the Happy Dragon site comes down and I build a little 5000 square foot building for ice cream shop. If I come from Waggoner Road, I would turn right into here. And I try to get home. And today I can't, can't do it. We're trying to improve that. And then we were notified that that was floodway that obviously put a challenge. I mean, we were attracted to the site for a couple of reasons. One, the opportunity to do something in the market and two was to correct that ingress egress into the site, and three was the ability to create parking fields, whether it be across street or to the east, behind the salon and Tempe and things like that. So when we were notified that that was floodway and untouched where we came up with the site plan still accomplishes the same thing. It's not as easy and we lost maybe 20 percent of the parking that we could have had. But the idea of trying to work with the city, the city's consultants, the neighbors, and say, Hey, we should be working in the floodway. That's not a conversation anybody at the city wanted to have, and we've certainly entertained it anyway. So we've left it alone and not change the grades. And in doing so, we're we came up with a product that still get you back to Lancaster because that's the way for those folks to get back to that new subdivision. That's how they're going to come have ice cream or drink or something to eat. And now we think that's better for not only our properties, but for Tempe, Prost, The salon, everyone else behind. We think that's a great option for those customers.

Ms. Alabi: Yeah, thanks for explaining that.

Mr. Spencer: No problem.

Mr. Furst: I just wanted to say that, you know, you made a comment about how the building is really the product of the concern about the storm water wastewater and the parking. And so I appreciate what a challenge that can be and you know. I don't think it's a bad result.

Mr. Spencer: Well, thank you. Thank you. And please don't be surprised. It's going to contract a little bit, but the tradeoff is going to be, we think, more energized patio spaces and a better use of the site. And we love to see more parking. We're not satisfied with the parking we have or the pace of parking being done in the area. So we think we're going to come forward with a product that is really going to fit in if it in quickly for the community. It will change, but it will be for the better.

Mr. Furst: Understood. With that having been said, I move that we table this application to our next regularly scheduled meeting.

Mr. Benner: Second.

Mr. Furst: Second by Mr. Benner. Would you please call the roll Ms. Ledbetter?

Ms. Ledbetter: Ms. Alibi. Yes. Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes.

Mr. Spencer: I have one question. If we could, for the record, could we be told when submissions need to be back to the city for consideration for your next meeting?

Ms. Ledbetter: So the deadline for old business which you would be considered old business as you were on this agenda is two weeks before the meeting deadline and the meetings the first week and April. So I can pull on my calendar really quick and give you an exact date. So the next meeting will be April 7th. So your deadline will be March 24th.

Mr. Spencer: OK, thank you very much.

Mr. Furst: Thank you. Thank you. Thanks. All right, that moves us on to other business. I will say that since we tabled this application, I will withhold my objection to receiving the engineering report right before the meeting.

Ms. Ledbetter: Yeah. So the problem is that this project was a little bit fluid for a long time. It changed weekly there for a little bit. And so when we knew that we had the final thing that was coming to Planning Commission, that's when we had to engage an agency to do the final engineering report. So I will say I probably could have got it to have a little bit sooner. But at the last one, I was like, Oh no. So I apologize for that, and hopefully it'll be sooner that we get that done beforehand.

Mr. Furst: Understood and apology accepted.

Mr. Meyer: I would just add that there was a very iterative process with EMH&T,

very intensive. So but as director, my goal is to give you materials as early as we can to review them. Understood.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 4/7/2022 6:00 PM
AYES:	Furst, Benner, Alabi	
ABSENT:	Zollars	
EXCUSED:	Cullinan	

E. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Furst: One other thing and I apologize for the city attorney. I probably should have added this to the agenda earlier, but I do move that we excuse the absence of Mr. Zollars.

Mr. Benner: I'll second.

Mr. Furst: Thank you, Mr. Benner. Please call the roll.

Ms. Ledbetter: Ms. Alabi. Yes. Mr. Benner. Yes. Mr. Furst. Yes.

Mr. Furst: Thank you.

Mr. Meyer: And we do have it on the record that Mr. Cullinan was here but recused himself from discussion. Correct?

Mr. Meyer: We actually do not, so we should say into the record, I guess no enter it into the record. And for the record, his firm is on all three projects, which is why he was here, but not speaking or voting on the projects or presenting, I guess would be the appropriate term.

Mr. Furst: Is that satisfactory for record keeping purposes?

Mr. Shook: Just trying to protect Mr. Cullinan's attendance record.

Mr. Furst: Oh no, I understand, thank you. With no other business before the board, I'm sorry, the commission, this meeting is adjourned.

F. ADJOURNMENT

G. PC MOTIONS

Chairman

Planning and Zoning Administrator