



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2017 6:00 PM

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King
ABSENT: Comeaux

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission – Regular Meeting – February 2, 2017

Chairman McKenzie: I am going to ask that we delay approval of the minutes to the next meeting. We were promised to have two versions of the minutes to prepare, and the way that we were doing it that some call verbatim, and also a version done by Robert's Rules of Order, and we did not get the Robert's Rules of Order. Also, as I was reading through the version that we have I don't think that these quite qualify as verbatim, so it would be nice to have a verbatim copy to compare, as for those two reasons, and in addition I think that we should also be getting in the future a copy of the minutes to approve for the joint sessions, which have already gone before Council and been approved and Mr. Welday found that he was not even included in the roster as being present those two joint sessions, so I think we should also be getting those as well. For that, for those reasons, I would like to delay the approval of the minutes until the next meeting if that is ok with everyone. Hearing no objection we will move onto the approval of the Agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman McKenzie: Because we are packed tonight, I would like to change the order of things a little bit to make sure we have plenty of time for people who have proposals in front of us tonight. So, right now I have as Item number 8, Discussion regarding Development of the Comprehensive Plan, to change that to number 9, and to move Item number 4, which was the proposed Planning Commission Rules update to number 8. Is that acceptable to everyone? Four to 8 and 8 to 9.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman McKenzie: Do we have any Public Comment tonight? Those here with applications? Nope? Ok. And then, for those people who are going to be speaking tonight, 1., you will have needed to sign in if you haven't already. And 2., we ask that you participate in an oath before you address the Commission, so, before we begin tonight's agenda item will everyone addressing the Commission please stand and raise their right hand? Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give in front of the Commission will be truthful, if so, please answer, "I do". (*Multiple I do's heard.*) Thank you.

B. BUSINESS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. **ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 131-95 ON NOVEMBER 27, 1995 AND AS SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED – 0 E Main St, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, from CC Community Commerce District to PND Planned Neighborhood Development District, Applicant, Nicole Boyer. (Second Reading 3/13/2017, Planning Commission 3/2/2017; Held from 3/27/2017).**

Mr. Snowden: 0 E. Main Street - Wallick Communities - District Change (Rezoning). Application: #176120 - Zoning District Change (Rezoning). Location: Property is located on north side of E. Main Street between Hanson Street and Carlyle Drive. Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / CCO Community Commercial Overlay District. The request is to change the zoning district for the site from CC Community Commerce District to PND Planned Neighborhood Development District. Current Use: Vacant Land. Applicant: Nicole Boyer. The applicant is requesting that the Commission review and recommend approval for a zoning district change in order to construct a senior housing campus as a planned development. The existing site consists of two parcels along the north side of E. Main Street, bounded on the east by Hanson Street and along the west by Carlyle Drive. The site is partially within Franklin County and partially within Licking County. To the south, the property is adjacent to Glen Rest Memorial Estate across E. Main Street. To the north, the property abuts single and two family dwellings in the R-4 zoning district. In the Consideration Section I have provided you the Standards for District Changes from Chapter 1151. And the Standards for review of a Development Plan from Chapter 1183 for Planned Neighborhood Development. The site has been zoned commercial since at least 1963. A portion of the site was included in a commercial zoning district as part of the original zoning ordinance passed in 1955 and re-codified in 1969. Commercial uses that are permitted at the site by right or as special exceptions include restaurants, drive-thrus, auto sales, and shopping centers, among many others. Several multi-family projects have been approved to the east and west of the site. To the north, the property abuts two family dwellings for two-thirds of its lot line. The scale, intensity and proposed uses of the development are not significantly different than these land uses. The applicant has provided a conceptual development plan that includes sub areas for 3 related uses: senior independent living, assisted living (residential care facility), and a “multi-generational” daycare facility. Each sub area will be subject to requirements that are listed in their respective sections of the rezoning text. Any deviations from the requirements, including any non-compliance with Section 1187.06 or of the referenced base zoning districts for each sub area will be listed in the rezoning text. The applicant has provided a conceptual building rendering showing 1 story buildings within “Sub area 1”, a 3 story building for the residential care facility in “Sub area 2” and a daycare facility within “Sub area 3”. Staff has completed a preliminary review of these renderings, which do not comply with the materials requirements of Section 1187.06, and that is what is really triggering the revision of the rezoning text. 1187.06 is a section of the Cod that requires multi-family dwellings to meet certain material requirements that are pretty stringent. And, since they are not meeting that requirement, even though this is a Planned Development, it relates to the use. Multi-family dwellings is one of the uses there. Independent dwelling is considered multi-family and therefore the deviations from that need to be listed at length in the re-zoning text, and that re-zoning text needs to be

updated. The applicant has provided a facilities demand worksheet which indicates their demand for City water and sewer services. 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. That is really the purpose of the Plot Grade Utility. What I look for in this phase is whether the City Departments have been notified and are they aware of the capacity the applicant will be requesting, and can they meet that requirement? The applicant provided a preliminary traffic study which indicated that the number of new trips generated by the proposed development would not warrant additional infrastructure improvements at the cost of the applicant. A detailed traffic access study is currently under review by the City Engineer. The applicant's development plan indicated compliance with the parking requirements of Table 1179 of the Zoning Code for the independent living units. Demand for parking at residential care facilities and day care centers is generally below the uses that are currently permitted by the existing zoning district. 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 are currently under review by Staff. This rezoning text can be used to place additional requirements on the application in areas where the Zoning Code does not currently provide any requirements. Staff will provide a revised copy of the rezoning text to Council and the Planning Commission as soon as review is complete. If this application for district change is approved, this development will be the only legal use. Any deviations from that plan in the future would require rezoning. Per the requires of the City Charter, the Commission must forward this applications and recommendations back to the City Council by March 11, 2017. The Commission should apply the standards for review of district changes contained in Section 1151.04 of the Zoning Code and determine if the proposed use is compatible with the site. If the Commission determines that the application meets those standards, Staff recommends the following conditions: That the applicant shall submit a revised rezoning text for the approval of Staff indicating compliance with the conceptual building elevations. That approval shall be contingent upon approval of the traffic access study by the City Engineer. I listed the "Next Steps" beginning on page 4, and I will turn things back over to our Chairman.

Chairman McKenzie: Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Snowden? I know that was a lot to take in. If the applicants would like to address the Commission, this would be the time, and in case we have any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Swiney: Good Evening and thank you for your time tonight. My name is Timothy Swiney. Our address is 6880 Tussing Rd, Reynoldsburg.

Ms. Boyer: Nicole Boyer at the same address.

Mr. Swiney: At this time, we do not have anything to add but are happy to address any questions that you may have. We also have some renderings here for you to see.

Mr. Welday: The detailed traffic study you have, will that affect Hanson Street or Carlyle Drive.

Ms. Boyer: The traffic would impact the Hanson Street intersection because the proposed intergenerational daycare and assisted living community are above along that corridor and that is where the traffic is going to be generated.

Mr. Welday: If I'm not mistaken, I think there is a COTA bus stop on Hanson St.

Ms. Boyer: There is.

Mr. Welday: Was the Engineer looking at expanding that?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Welday, a Traffic Access Study reviews a worksheet and a packet of information about number of trips generated by the proposed uses. The Engineer reviews that and looks for the access points and where the drives enter the public street and whether adequate. If it was an impact study, he may be looking at the infrastructure and whether there will be costs to the applicant. The type of study selected is determined by the number of trips, which is taken from national traffic manuals. Really it comes down to a lot of Engineering details, the radial, the width of the drive, how much stacking space is internal to the applicant's private drives. It does not really take something like additional bus stop capacity into consideration. As far as I am aware, that bus stop, even with COTA's revision, is not going away. That is where COTA's service ends for that line.

Chairman McKenzie: While I have you here, I do have a couple of just general questions. So, because I was at the Public Hearing, and someone, a representative from the law firm representing the Trust was there, I was just wondering, are you intending to purchase this property, be a lease holder of this property, or what's your standing as far as requesting a zoning change? Are you going to be purchasing the property?

Mr. Swiney: Yes.

Chairman McKenzie: But you have not yet?

Mr. Swiney: Correct. We have a Purchase and Sale Agreement which is contingent on approved zoning as well as obtaining the financing.

Chairman McKenzie: Ok. And, did you request this zoning change to the Planned Development, or was that something that was offered to you by the City?

Ms. Boyer: We started working with Eric in late August, early September. We went to him and stated that we put an option on this land and would like to accomplish a senior living campus. So, with the assistance of Eric, and the guidance of looking at different options within the zoning text, the PNDD is what was suggested for us to maximize the campus to the best extent possible.

Chairman McKenzie: Oh, ok, alright. I guess I am really just trying to get where this is coming from to why the PNDD was chosen instead of just an AR-3A as Wesley Ridge for

example, since they also. So I thought it might have been the daycare, but Wesley Ridge also offers an adult daycare as their services and they are still just multi-family housing. So I was just curious to why this was going for this project, cause it is different from what my understanding of what the intent of the Planned District was, and why this project would qualify as Planned District.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, to answer your question, Wesley Ridge could have very easily gone as a Planned Neighborhood District, and our current regulations, that zoning district and the planned development tools that we have today were not in place in the same way, when Wesley Ridge began.

Chairman McKenzie: No, I understand that. That was a later addition, an option before Wesley Ridge was, but still I was wondering why this was chosen for this instead of just being another AR-3A again.

Mr. Snowden: The advantage to a Planned Development such as this is that the Commission and Council have additional controls over the site design and the building design. Secondly, it allows the applicant to submit the rezoning text which perhaps takes care of some considerations that the base zoning district may not be able to accommodate in the same way. Third, it avoids a problem.

Chairman McKenzie: I am going to interrupt you. Then that means that they might have lesser requirements to meet, to meet the revised zoning, whatever, instead of what it would be to existing regulations. Cause I was trying to follow when you were going to say that they had not met certain things right now, so.

Ms. Boyer: The way that we have written the PND, is with different regions. So, with Eric's guidance and assistance, we have looked at different AR Codes and Residential Codes, and we are trying to follow them to the extent possible. So, what we have done, rather than ask for multiple re-zonings, we are utilizing the PND tool to do just one re-zoning. What the PND tool does is two-fold, 1. We are held to this campus and only this campus. We can not build something else, and this is only applicable for two years and if we do not start construction within two years, it will go back to the commercial designation. Where, if we were asking for a residential zoning, then it would be residential in perpetuity. So that is one of the reasons we went to the PND. The other is that we have overlaid regulations within the AR-3 and R-20 districts. So, we utilized the R-20 district to help the architect and our team to design the independent living side. So, we are in the text that we are working with Eric to create, we are making sure that the setbacks, the density, even just the configuration of the buildings and the units are in compliance as close as we possibly can. I don't think we have any variances within this one. We are following those, and then on the side of the daycare and the assisted living community, we are utilizing the AR-3 guidelines. So, within the PND, we are utilizing the guidelines of the AR-3 and R-20 districts. The recommendation of the PND district was more to make sure that what we are proposing today is what you will see if the zoning is approved and the finance happens. We will not be able to change our concept or our proposal without coming back to the City and making a different presentation and going through the proper channels and protocols.

Chairman McKenzie: Well that's, as I said, I just had some general things about because this is the first time we had the plan before us. See how that fits with this project.

Mr. Snowden: To finish what I was saying, what has happened here historically in Reynoldsburg, when we did not have the planning tools, folks would get a base zoning that was as close as possible, and then they would go to BZBA and get 5, 6, 10 variances all at once. Then, at that point, the requirements of the base zoning district had really been changed pretty dramatically. So, the advantage of a Planned District from the standpoint of our whole development approval process is that what you see is what you get. Planning Commission does not approve one base zoning and then folks are at BZBA asking to vary from that extensively. That is the advantage and that is why Staff made the Planned Neighborhood Development District recommendation to the applicant.

Chairman McKenzie: Just as a side, there is also another on that has just gone before Council for a filling station on Broad St. That's also going to be this planned thing. And so, how filling station and how an assistant filling station fit within the same plan was something I was curious about.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, we have two. Some communities use one Planned District for anything. I divided it. Planned Neighborhood is predominately residential, but these other uses that the applicant is proposing fit into that. Secondly, the UDF is Planned Commercial Development which is geared toward a commercial or mixed used site, but it does not allow your single family detached uses. Where some communities conflate those all into one process for Planned Development, or Planned Unit Development, we kept those two items basically separate.

Mr. Welday: I was at City Council, and from what I heard there, many of us who have lived here for quite some time, the land has sat undeveloped for a number of years. And, as Commissioners, I see this as a great opportunity to develop that land for a useful purpose. This proposed project is going to create jobs in the community, as well as provide housing for seniors. And of course, you have the day care as well. I can only think of a couple in Reynoldsburg that are built for 55 and over.

Mr. Swiney: Minimum of 55. We do have 25% of the units restricted at 62 years and older.

Mr. Welday: I can only think of a couple of projects in Reynoldsburg tailored to that...

Chairman McKenzie: There is one, Wesley Ridge. And there is a new one under construction now at Summit. We

Mr. Welday: Working in Columbus, I know that they are tailoring to a different generation and a different clientele. So I think this is a great opportunity to use that land.

Mr. King: *(Inaudible...)* northern fence along that border.

Mr. Swiney: Right now we are back and forth between general landscaping buffers, mounding, or fences. We are open to anything. It seems to be divided on whether we should put a fence or use natural landscaping. We are open to whatever the consensus is.

Mr. King: I see that trees represents mounds.

Mr. Snowden: If I could give you some of the Staff's thoughts on fences... Dan and I when talking about a new development where we have the opportunity to do something really nice, always encourage landscaping first. For something like a fence addition, and again we are talking a 6FT privacy fence, that is something Staff could approve administratively at another time if that was something that the applicant wanted. So, in this case, my encouragement to the applicant and to the Commission would be to try the landscaping, which is an easy change that will not involve new site plans and so forth. If it is determined that that is desirable or neighbor complaints increase to the applicant, they can do that and the cost would be very minimal. There is no specific reason to warrant the fence at this time given vehicle circulation and some of the things we deal with when dealing with commercial shopping centers, etc... My encouragement would be, let's try the landscaping because it is more attractive. Sometimes even nice fences are not as nice as landscaping. If it becomes something, we can revisit the issue.

Mr. Havener: To clarify, along with the landscaping, we have some mounding to give you the height, in lieu of the 6FT fence. You would have a combination of trees, smaller plantings, and mounding to give you that additional height you may need.

Mr. Swiney: I would take it one step further and focus in on the open site plan concept. As you can see in front of you, we have walking paths incorporated throughout the entire site. A detention basin with bio swells, rain gardens. We are really trying to promote wellness, social interaction, within the actual campus setting as well as the neighborhood. We are also going to promote increased security, not just with sidewalks and way finding, but also with technology. That technology will include security cameras throughout the entire site. Everything is digital. The IP address can be shared with police and fire, and they can log in anytime with 24 hour access. It is all DVR recorded. If something were to happen at 3:00 in the morning, we could go to the DVR and share it with the Police Department.

Ms. Boyer: If they get really bored, there is an app and they could watch it in real time too.

Mr. Swiney: That is why you are not seeing any fences right now. We are really just trying to promote openness and connectivity.

Chairman McKenzie: So, that brought a question to my mind. The playground, would there be a fence around the playground?

Mr. Swiney: Right now there is no fence planned to be around the playground. The only place we are considering a fence right now is around the detention pond. Around the playground you would have a barrier to hold the mulch, but there would be no fence. It is more like a tot lot.

Ms. Boyer: The feedback we have heard from of operation division for other properties that we have like this is that kids come to visit their grandparents and that it is a nice feature to have a place where they can go and be entertained along with their family.

Chairman McKenzie: The reason that it came up, the apartments that are to the north of your property will likely have children and will have been used to playing in that field, so if they were to find out that there is an open playground on your property, they may very well wish to make use of it. Robert Frost was saying it sarcastically because good fences don't make good neighbors, although that is usually the way that it is stated.

Mr. Swiney: Our common practice, we try to be good neighbors, not just with what is surrounding our properties, but with the community, and to the extent that if children wanted to come over and utilize the playground, as long as there are no criminal activities, they are not damaging the property, we are not going to say they are not allowed. Again, that is why we have the security cameras, if we find out that there is loitering, vandalism, fraudulent activity, then we will have to take the next step.

Mr. Snowden: One item I want to remind everybody on, we are reviewing the Site Plan as part of this rezoning and a Major Site Plan review by the Commission is still required when this is done. The specific and details of landscaping will all be dealt with that at that point. In the old language of the Planned Development, that was called Preliminary Development Plan and Detailed Development Plan. I am calling it, Concept Plan, Development Plan, and Major Site Plan.

Chairman McKenzie: Yeah, that change was before us, I seem to remember that about a year ago or so. I had one question more for my curiosity. That night during the Public Hearing, the representative, the lawyer representative said that they had contacted you about selling this property several years ago? So, this question was for Mr. Havener, so did you approach very many people about taking an interest in this property? This is because of Norm's comment that night about doing something else with the property.

Mr. Havener: There was at least one that I am aware of.

Chairman McKenzie: Please let the record show that Mr. Snowden has raised three fingers.

Mr. Havener: The last one that I recall was for a multi-family development. They originally came in with no other proposed uses and we suggested at that time that if a facility like that was to be approved, it had to incorporate some sort of commercial whether it were office space or another type of use to bring some value to the community, and it couldn't just be a strip.

Chairman McKenzie: But these were people that approached you rather than you approaching them. That was really the question as to whether you had approached people about it.

Mr. Havener: We were approached by the real estate broker that was handling the property at the time. They had an interested party and they came in to visit with us.

Mr. Snowden: That happened on several occasions and the scale of that development was much more intense. Multiple stories and more of what we think of as a traditional suburban complex. There were three separate proposals that were similar in scope. In addition, Dan and I get calls almost on a daily basis as to available land in Reynoldsburg. If a comment was made that nobody knew about this property, I cannot tell you a number, but I can tell you that we do shop the property to individuals.

Chairman McKenzie: No comment was made to that effect, at the Public Hearing, or any other time. I was just curious that since it had been brought up that it had been on the market for multiple and no interests and that you had been requested for help, what that help entailed. The only one you mentioned was another multi or dense housing. So, for those other two as well, were all housing developments?

Mr. Havener: Mr. Snowden and I's previous proposals were not in line with our expectations and the proposal that the Wallick Company has before us today is definitely more in line with our expectations and is something that we could definitely support more positively.

Chairman McKenzie: Any questions? So, this is the time where I usually entertain a motion. The motion would be to the effect that we will forward this for, what would the language be? Forwarding for adoption?

Mr. Welday: I make a motion to recommend approval to City Council, of application 176120, with the zoning district change from CC-Community Commerce District to PND-Planned Neighborhood Development District.

Mr. King: I second.

Mr. Snowden: Gentlemen, any considerations to the two items that I listed as possible, I think they are minor issues, and I believe they will be resolved on the Staff side, but I want everyone to have the comfort level that they will be resolved, the traffic study and the re-zoning text to reflect the conditions that are proposed.

Chairman McKenzie: Is everyone clear on what those re-zoning items are going to be? What changes to the text would be?

Mr. Snowden: Specifically, to modify for the 1187 requirement. And, there is one overall density requirement. Let me explain, since you can see there is a county line running inside of this, because there is a need to make the parcel go down that line rather than be further to the east, there is a need to take an aggregate density of the entire site, so that would be listed in the re-zoning text as well. It is a building coverage requirement.

Chairman McKenzie: Do you have firm numbers on that building coverage? Do you have something like what percentage of the site is going to be covered? It is hard to make a visual.

Mr. Swiney: I want to say that the maximum is like 46.6. We are like 29% below.

Mr. Snowden: There are different lot coverage requirements for the different sub areas, and that is a little of what is causing the confusion. The max lot coverage for the independent living is 15%, with a 30% open space. That is for buildings. The 46 he is referring to is for impervious surface, and the requirement for that, in this case, would be 60.

Chairman McKenzie: Wasn't a big deal but not really answering my question as to what our maximums are versus what you are proposing, that is what I was getting at. But that is fine. More curiosity than anything since that was a condition. Have you written down that motion with the caveats and everything so that we could see it?

Mr. Snowden: If you look at page four of the Staff Report, I have the two texts there. You do not have to state verbatim because the re-zoning text has to match their site plan. So, the site plan in front of you is not going to change. It is just a matter of making the re-zoning text match that.

Chairman McKenzie: I just want to make sure that we are all clear on what we are moving.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: The remaining items for the applicant are listed in the Staff report, and I will reach out to you regarding City Council's remaining meetings.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 3/13/2017 8:00 PM
MOVER:	Robert Welday	
SECONDER:	Ivan King	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King	
ABSENT:	Comeaux	

2. 1051 Waggoner Rd.; Application #175747; Applicant: St. Pius X Church, John A. Eberts, Architect; Major Site Plan

Mr. Snowden: 1051 Waggoner Road - St. Pius X Catholic Church and School - Major Site Plan. Application: #175747 - Major Site Plan. The property is located on the west side of Waggoner Road north of E. Main Street. Existing Zoning: S-1 Special District. The request is for a review of a major site plan in order to construct building additions and related improvements. Current Use: Church and School Campus. Applicant: John A. Eberts. The applicant is requesting the Board review and approve a major site plan in order to construct additions to four existing buildings on their church/school campus, as well as add additional landscaping and modify a portion of an existing parking lot. Their campus has a school building, a church assembly building, a parish residence and office building, what is now a children's center that was originally a residential convent, a small assembly building, and some maintenance structures and a ball field. The site is an existing church and school

campus with associated parking and accessory buildings. To the south, the property abuts an apartment complex (multi-family dwellings) in the AR-2 zoning district. To the north and east, the property is adjacent to large-lot style single family dwellings in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. To the west, across French Run, the property abuts single family dwellings in the R-3 zoning district. Considerations for site plan review from Section 1143.05 are listed, as well as some additional site plan development requirements. This major site plan represents that applicant's master planned campus expansion. The applicant proposes to construct the project in phases, but all phases will need to comply with this site plan application. The applicant has already been granted variances from Section 1175.05 and Section 1180.10 of the Zoning Code, in order to allow expansion of Building #1 along its existing setback and reduce the landscape requirements along the northern side of the property. The applicant's property follows a creek and there are some significant terrain there as you can see on the contour lines. So, the applicant requested BZBA grant relief from the Landscape Buffering requirements which require a 15FT landscape buffer. Given the terrain, and the Board agreed, it was not reasonable to require the landscape buffer and it would be superior to retain the natural vegetation there. Also, to allow expansion of this building, building #1 in the plans, known as Holman Hall that was probably constructed as an accessory building. They will be expanding this into their Parish Activity Center, but it was probably considered an accessory structure when it was put in. It is expanding and it really going to become another main structure, given the uses. So therefore, it had to get the uses in order to expand along its existing facade. Some zoning codes have requirements that allow a building to be expanded along its existing setback, even if that setback does not meet the Zoning Code, but our Zoning Code has no such language. The applicant has submitted a basic utilities plan and facilities demand worksheet, which have been forwarded to the Department of Public Service and City Engineer for preliminary review. The applicant does not indicate that any modifications to utility capacity is required. When you are talking about existing church and school use like this, they already have the large sized tap, so adding a little meeting space and some small building additions, is not dramatically increasing their utilities usage.

Chairman McKenzie: Were they not also asking for an expansion of the school portion of it? Or, is that going to be later?

Mr. Snowden: That is included in it. That is building #4.

Chairman McKenzie: Yes it is.

Mr. Snowden: The existing tap is what they are looking for, and the water tap, where the water line for the site goes in, is already a large capacity tap. Staff reviewed the application for compliance with the requirements of Chapter 1180, which are generally speaking, being met when the variance to 1180.10 is considered. The applicant is not proposing any modifications to the existing parking area that would require the Parking Lot/Landscape Standards of Chapter 1180 to apply. You can see the original parking and the parking addition which was done about three years ago. You can see there are parking islands with

landscape and interior plantings. The applicant is decreasing the parking area, they are not increasing it, therefore we can not require them to go back and put islands, but it was required when they did the expansion. The applicant is actually decreasing the impervious surface, if you look on item #4, in terms of the surface run-off, not in terms of building.

Chairman McKenzie: Ok, yes, but impervious surface, they're still increasing. Yes.

Mr. Snowden: It is increasing. You are correct. I should have said non-buildable impervious surface. The applicant has provided a lighting plan indicating the location of proposed fixtures, as well as a cut sheet of their technical specifications. Lighting levels along the southern, northern and western edges of the parking area do not exceed 0.1 foot candles. This is consistent with the lighting standards contained in Chapter 1182. Building Architecture - The applicant provided architectural elevations showing the proposed building additions. The additions to buildings #2 and #3 utilize the same building height, roof design and exterior finish stonework present in the existing structures. The proposed addition to Building #4 is consistent with the height and mass of the existing school building, and retains the same window rhythm, which is basically how the classroom windows progress across the building facade. The addition to Building #1 is a significant expansion of the existing structure. The proposed Hardie plank, painted stucco and window treatments are consistent with this type institutional campus. There are not specific material requirements for the S-1 district. It is really up to the discretion of what the Commission finds appropriate given what is existing. The Board should apply the standards for review of variances contained in Section 1143.05, Review of Site Plans, and the Zoning Code, and determine if the site plan as proposed complies with those standards. Staff finds the proposed site plan in compliance with those standards and the development standards of the Zoning Code, and recommends approval of the site plan on the following condition: That approval of this major site plan shall be contingent upon approval of the traffic access study by the City Engineer. Our Engineer is reviewing the traffic access study, but the information that the applicant provided showed that no change would be required. With that, I will turn things back over to our Chairman.

Chairman McKenzie: Alright, thank you Mr. Snowden. Is the applicant, a representative of the applicant here tonight?

Mr. Snowden: I do not see them in the audience but they were notified.

Chairman McKenzie: That then leave any questions that anyone might have for Mr. Snowden about this. Mr. Cullinan.

Mr. Cullinan: I have a couple of questions looking at the buildings. Along the north portion of the buildings, are they doing extended footers to match into the grades of the ravine, or are they grading onto the adjoining partial.

Mr. Snowden: Their grading plan indicated that the grading would stay as existing and that the foundations would go into that. Again, that is probably a question for Mr. Eberts given that he is the building architect.

Mr. Cullinan: Also, it looks like they have plantings on the north side of the property line?

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Cullinan, if I may, let me clarify that. Because the applicant was asking for consideration relief from that section of the Code, they tried to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Cullinan: I guess the follow up to that is that they have been talking with the neighbor,

Mr. Snowden: They have a written agreement that was reviewed by their legal team, signed by both property owners of the parcels to the north stating that they are going to allow access to the installation of those trees, as well as maintain a five year maintenance agreement on the trees. The purpose of that from their standpoint was to, 1. Be a good neighbor to them, and 2. To allow some of that vegetation to be maintained which I felt, and BZBA agreed that instead of cutting that down, just maintain what was natural.

Mr. Cullinan: Just looking from that direction, I am not sure what it is, just taking away that requirement. I think the vegetation is good to maintain.

Mr. Snowden: That was a requirement of their variance.

Chairman McKenzie: They definitely may have a fall onto that. There is potentially a problem with the vegetation that they are proposing to put into that section, which is Hemlock. Hemlock does not grow very well in our soil. The section that they provided, even states that Hemlock prefers moist, sandy, well-drained soil. It is not drought tolerant. We have balanced to alkaline soils. We have heavy clay, and we experience drought too. So, there really isn't very much chance that these hemlock trees that they are proposing for this section are going to thrive.

Mr. Snowden: Mr Chairman, there is nothing to prevent the Board from approving the site plan on condition that the specie be revisited. I did not look at the USDA soil conditions for that area because

Chairman McKenzie: The soil conditions, by the way, are way out of date, are in the land use plan that MORPC did for us back in 1991. You don't have to look for USDA.

Mr. Snowden: USDA are going to be more up to date than that.

Chairman McKenzie: Our soil types haven't changed in the last 30 years.

Mr. Snowden: They have a wonderful geographic information system which is just as easy to use. There is nothing to stop the Commission from recommending a different species or asking the applicant to revisit the plant material type.

Chairman McKenzie: The reason they may have chosen Hemlocks is because 1., they are evergreen, and they are very dense. So, unlike many evergreens, as they grow, they don't void out from the bottom, so they would act more. But they are simply, I fear that they will most likely either not thrive or die placed in that environment.

Mr. Snowden: They would be required to replace it with another piece of plant material. It is whatever the Commission is comfortable with.

Mr. Cullinan: There is a five year agreement between the property owners, but if this is approved as part of their site plan, it is really required as part of their zoning.

Chairman McKenzie: Would this have been negotiated with the property owners since they are after all putting them on their property?

Mr. Snowden: It was negotiated with the other property owners. But again, I am not sure how detailed the property owners were involved in specie choices. There are agreements, and I have them on file basically saying that they will allow St. Pius and their representatives access to our property to plant the trees and maintain them for a certain number of years. It did not specify plant materials, planting conditions, etc...

Chairman McKenzie: Alright, thank you Mr. Cullinan. Any other questions? I mean, this is just a preference type thing but I am not over thrilled with their decorative choices, but it does fit what they have got back there anyway, and since it is off the street I am not overly concerned about it. Also, I am concerned about the run-off just going down that hill into the creek from the increased impervious surface from those buildings. Since we have so much problems with creeks now flooding downstream or projects, and there doesn't seem to be any amelioration in this site plan at all for increased building run off. That does concern me.

Mr. Snowden: They do have an existing catch basin and flow from the back of this parking lot. If you will look at the aerial in front of you, you will see this outflow. What happened is, they installed this and put chain link fence around the parking lot expansion, and about five or six months ago they made the determination to take the pipe all the way out to the creek. There is an underground pipe from what is now the new parking lot. They did not provide any information on storm water in their Major Site Plan application, and that is a requirement of the storm water checklist on the major Site Plan. That is usually what I review in this phase. Have they provide some consideration that our Engineer can say it is big enough, not big enough, etc... But they did not provide that in this case, if you look at the Utility Plan.

Chairman McKenzie: And so, I would just like to make sure that when our Service Department does the Plot Grade Utility Review that that's looked at because this change to just having a pipe to the creek for run off from their parking lot, I don't know if that really meets our stormwater. And, since we are based on current EPA and not what will be coming.

Mr. Cullinan: Do we know how much area they are disturbing roughly? More or less than an acre?

Mr. Snowden: I do not know.

Mr. Cullinan: In Ohio, the EPA does water quality, not quantity. Water quantity regulations are based on (*inaudible*), and I am not sure exactly what Reynoldsburg's requirements are. But lots of municipalities, when you are abutting a creek, or something like that, they want you to get the water in the creek, so that way you can get out before your other developments that are upstream are drawing down over 24 to 48 hours. Maybe that is something for the City Engineer to work out.

Chairman McKenzie: It is. It is.

Mr. Snowden: Just to give you some insight, our Stormwater Manual complies with the current EPA

Chairman McKenzie: I may point out, it does so, simply by referencing EPA. And so, that is something different than if you take what is simply stated in our Stormwater Manual, but it's current only because sections of that reference what the EPA requires.

Mr. Snowden: Correct, Sir.

Chairman McKenzie: And that is how it maintains its current status.

Mr. Snowden: Unfortunately, I do not have more insight in this case, or any recommendations for how the commission...

Chairman McKenzie: That is just something that I want to make sure they are taking a look at that pipe. Because they do quality for run off.

Mr. Cullinan: For over one acre of disturbance they are required to.

Chairman McKenzie: Question is, does the change from just running a pipe from there to there.

Mr. Cullinan: Because they are not disturbing this. It would be the trench.

Chairman McKenzie: Ok. Thank you. No questions, alright. So, I would like a motion in regard to this.

(Vote)

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, there is one item on Design Review Board tonight. DRB is scheduled to start at 7:00. If it would please the Commission, and given that our next application is Dollar General, would the Commission agree to recess?

(Recessed at 7:02 PM)

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Welday
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King
ABSENT:	Comeaux

3. **7578 E. Main St.; Application # 176471; Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd.; Major Site Plan.**

Chairman McKenzie: So, the March 2nd meeting of the Planning Commission returns from recess at 7:42.

Mr. Snowden: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is 7578 E. Main Street - Dollar General - Major Site Plan. - Application: 176471 - Major Site Plan. Location: Property is located on the north side of East Main Street, just west of Waggoner Road. Existing Zoning: CC Community Commerce District / HCO Historic Commercial Overlay. The request is for a review of a major site plan in order to construct a new commercial building and related improvements. Current Use: Vacant Land. Applicant: Evans Capital Investments, Ltd. The applicant is requesting the Commission review and approve a major site plan in order to construct a new, freestanding, commercial building. The proposed site consists of a 4.3 acre commercial shopping center with various commercial business uses. The applicant intends to split a portion of that parcel off, in order to construct this proposed free-standing commercial building. To the north, the property abuts an apartment complex (multi-family dwellings) in

the AR-2 zoning districts. All adjacent properties that front E. Main Street are within the Historic Overlay District. The applicant was granted several variances from Chapter 1193 in order to accommodate their building. The applicant has received approval from a variance in order to accommodate their parking in front of the main structure that is related to the previous variance. The applicant has provided a pedestrian circulation with a clear path from E. Main Street to the main structure, and attempting to meet the requirements of 1193.09. Staff has reviewed the application for compliance with Chapter 1180, and made some recommendations regarding the potential materials for screening of the dumpster. The applicant has provided a basic utilities plan which was forwarded to the Department of Public Service in the City, and Engineer for preliminary review. They proposed to accommodate the stormwater run off in an underground basin, which will be reviewed for compliance with the City Stormwater Manual by the City Engineer. The applicant has provided a lighting plan. Lighting levels along the property edges do not exceed 1/2FT candle required by Section 1182.03, and the proposed fixtures match the existing fixtures at the site. The applicant has provided architectural elevations showing the proposed building. The applicant applied for and received a variance to allow the proposed setback. However, the current facade, the south facade of the structure is not matching the plane of the existing facade or the existing overhang of the shopping center to the east. The applicant provided a small screened area for outdoor sales and Staff would like clarification of what exactly they are proposing to install there. With that, The Commission should apply the Standards of Review for site plans contained in Section 1143.05 of the Zoning Code and determine if the plan complies with those standards. If the Commission determines that the application meets those standards, Staff recommends the following conditions: That the applicant submit a revised landscape plan indicating a change in the dumpster screening to a masonry wall. That the applicant shall submit a revised site plan showing the front facade of the proposed building parallel to the facade of the existing shopping center to the east. The approval of this major site plan shall be contingent upon approval of the traffic access study by the City Engineer. With that, I will turn things back over to our chair.

Chairman McKenzie: Thank you Mr. Snowden. Is the applicant here.

Mr. Frazier: My name is Alex Frazier. I am with Hurley and Stewart, the Civil Engineer that represents both the developer and applicant, Evans Capital. We are proposing a 7500SF Dollar General store here. We received a variance for the parking orientation and building placement. We are proposing 38 parking spaces which matches the zoning requirements, as well as four bicycle parking spaces up near the northwest corner of the parking lot. We have got landscaping that is taking into account the requirements of the City. We are going to look into matching the area a little better as well. We have got the loading area off to the west of the building that we are looking at converting over to mason or brick. I am here to answer any site related questions.

Mr. Snowden: If I could make a comment for the knowledge of the Commission because we have not had this come to a head quite so badly. You can see that there is a little overlap between the review of the Design Review Board and the review of the Planning Commission for Major Site Plans. Part of the reason for that was the original manner in which the DRB was set up and there was no other site planning review. So, Design Review Board was set up

for consideration of all site planning. In this case, I do not have a whole lot of insight on how to move forward. You were all present in DRB passing this on to their additional meeting, considering the architecture of the building and a few other landscaping considerations. With that, use your judgment, but you can see there is definitely some overlap.

Mr. Welday: As far as the developer, has he spoken to the businesses in that strip mall regarding the use of the semi truck as you proposed here, do deliveries through that mutual access easement? Have you spoken to them and gotten their approval?

Mr. Frazier: I do not know if we have spoken to the businesses specifically, but we have spoken with and are getting it from the developer that owns the strip mall on either side. Whether or not Evans Capital has reached out to those business owners, at this time, we are not aware of that.

Mr. Welday: Having sat through DRB, I understand that you have a computer model going through, dealing with semi trucks driving through there. Having driven a semi truck, I can tell you that coming in off Waggoner Rd. With a semi truck, with their GPS, they are going to drive the closest or fastest route to get there. It is going to be impossible to make a right turn if it is coming south bound on Waggoner. And, going north bound on Waggoner, if you have it coming in on that east side, you are going to block traffic a little bit. I know the traffic study is obviously going to count the number of cars and so forth. But, having driven that area every day, everyone knows that is a busy intersection. And, if it is once or twice, still having a semi truck, I think that what is recommended here, I think it needs to be a little bigger to allow access in there. My second thought is, as far as it coming out, what is depicted here in the drawing, once it backs into that loading dock and it has to come out onto Main St., obviously it is going to take up, if it is going east bound or west bound, it has to come out into the opposite lanes. I don't think that the way that egress is in front of the ice cream shop, I don't think it allows for him to make an east bound or west bound turn with a trailer on the end of the semi. Like I said, from experience, that is going to be a hard turn for the driver. I hope they take that into account. Besides this program, it obviously just has them going through the parking lot. So, I would like them to take that into consideration. Also, I would like to recommend, if they had a path behind that building, obviously it will aid fire and they need to get in and around., I think you are kind of restricting the way it is now for any response. Everything else was answered before.

Mr. Snowden: The City Engineer's review of the traffic access study will include the review of the point there, whether it is wide enough and so forth. That is specifically included in what they are reviewing. I definitely will pass your comments along to the person doing the review. At this point, I think we almost would want to incorporate the DRB meeting by reference because everyone was present.

Mr. Welday: By looking at Google, it is not the same unless you are in a semi truck. I am telling you, it is not the same. You are going to take up that intersection and you are coming off Main.

Chairman McKenzie: I am sure semi trucks, I believe semi trucks have come in and out of here before. And, just seeing how much they had broken down (*inaudible*) that is why I was asking.

Mr. Snowden: I will definitely forward those comments on to our City Engineer. Again, to see an example of what can happen when you do not have a wide enough apron. Obviously the applicant is not accountable for what is going on, on the neighboring property, but that is an example of the need to do a proper review of the access point.

Chairman McKenzie: You can see, there has been some rolling over of the apron at that entrance both going from the south side, and there is a little patch on the north bound side that extends beyond what is a (*inaudible*). There has been some (*inaudible*).

Mr. Welday: You are correct Mr. Chairman. And, having sat there, as they go by that Valero gas station, if somebody is trying to turn into that plaza, you will have them going to the right, on the apron of the Valero, just to pass, and that deterioration.

Mr. Cullinan: I was just going to say, Waggoner, to the north, is that curved or just pavement. So, you are going to have that transition from where the curb stops, probably a couple of feet away from the edge of pavement. You driving flush on the pavement, and then there is a curb, where the curb is channelizing the drivers. I think that portion by the road, we are going to have what we have now, unless it is swung out more.

Mr. Frazier: That is one of the initial comments by the Traffic Engineer, was we are looking at proposing to improve the south radius here and widen it a little bit to allow for the truck movement. But they kind of gave some preliminary feedback, wanting to see a smoother radius. But again, the traffic study is going to provide results.

Chairman McKenzie: I would say, from the standpoint of us taking action tonight, in lieu of what the DRB has done, do you have any recommendations for us?

Mr. Snowden: Let me get you a little deeper into the history here. When Major Site Plans were reviewed by BZBA, they were reviewed on a separate night. There was not a specific requirement in our code that said whether it was supposed to be reviewed first, however, there is a section that said variances were suppose to be reviewed first. So, the reality of how everyone did development was, they got their major Site Plan approved first, then they had their DRB approve the building architecture and any remaining details. It was not a perfect system, but that is what they did. In the current system, the way that I revised the Code, and this was sort of by default, and if there is feedback by the Commission that they want to see a change, the Code says that the Site Plan needs to be approved first. So, what that could mean is additional details of the landscape plan and the building architecture, could be approved by DRB in a different way than Planning Commission approved it. The problem with that is how do you reconcile two different approvals? I do not have an answer to that question for you. What many communities do, and the direction we could go is, have Planning Commission do all the work, as you can see there is a lot of overlap, or what you could do, you could limit DRB to only reviewing architecture and landscape. Do that review first, and

then you would have that review done, and when it came to Planning Commission, the building itself would not change. Those are two paths that we could look at. Mr. Frazier made a comment at our pre-application meeting that that is the way he experiences this process in a lot of other communities.

Chairman McKenzie: For example, Mr. Hicks comments about whether he would support the project or not, and recommending that he would have greater support if it went into an existing building instead onto a site of new construction. And, it seems like that kind of trumps a decision we might make and if DRB were to go in that way, that is why I am asking this question. It seems they have taken a position, they have put forth a possible position.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with that, the only insight that I can provide is, you know that DRB is going to review at the next meeting. You will be meeting the same night before, and as of right now there is only one other re-zoning application, and this typically would happen first. So, maybe you just want to table as well, review what Mr. Frazier...

Chairman McKenzie: But we still would be meeting before DRB.

Mr. Snowden: Yes Sir, you would be.

Chairman McKenzie: So, it would not change our position, as we are right now, if they were to move in a different direction.

Mr. Snowden: That is accurate, Sir. But, you would have revised plans from the applicant that may reflect some of the comments that were received tonight, both from Planning Commission and Design Review Board.

Unknown Speaker: Would the traffic study be completed by then?

Mr. Snowden: I am assuming. Typically they are done in several weeks. I am not really sure what the hold up was. In the defense of the applicant, they had to wait a few extra days for our Engineer to get back to them with a scoping, which basically says what the perimeters are going to be, and it is kind of an agreement between what the Engineers have done and the extent of what the survey is going to be. It is a bad situation that you are in.

Mr. Cullinan: Does any action affect the timeline of the project because it has to go to DRB, right?

Mr. Snowden: In this case, if you tabled it, or approved it, it would not affect project timeline in any way, given DRB's action.

Mr. Cullinan: I think it would make sense to table, that way we see the application and have the traffic issues addressed. I would like to make a motion to table.

Mr. Welday: I will second that.

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 4/6/2017 6:00 PM
MOVER:	Tyler Cullinan	
SECONDER:	Robert Welday	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King	
ABSENT:	Comeaux	

4. **ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Chapter 1131 Definitions. (Second Reading 3/27/2017, Planning Commission 3/2/2017).**

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Chairman, would you like me to say anything about this particular ordinance. Since it is an amendment to the Zoning Code, the Commission would want to make a recommendation for approval back to City Council.

Chairman McKenzie: I would just like to point out, in reference to something, I mean whether we include the new titles in here or just leave it as the Director and his or her designee, really doesn't really make much difference. It does cost us money to republish these.

Mr. Snowden: To re-codify it does, but we are re-codifying anyway. And, the changes that we are making to the Zoning Code, in this case, are not the driving force behind re-codification.

Chairman McKenzie: I realize that, ok. So, we are going to be re-codifying anyway so we can slip this one in. It is not like we have to pay per addition.

Mr. Snowden: Yes, Sir, exactly.

Chairman McKenzie: Alright, enough said. Any other?

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 3/27/2017 8:00 PM
MOVER:	Tyler Cullinan	
SECONDER:	Ivan King	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King	
ABSENT:	Comeaux	

5. **Ordinance to Amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio: Amending Section 1161.02 Special Purpose Districts of Chapter 1161 Zoning Districts; Section 1183.04 Use Regulations and Development Standards of Chapter 1183 Planned Neighborhood Development District; AND AMENDING THE TITLES OF Chapter 1184 Planned Commercial Development; Chapter 1192 F-1 Flood Plain Overlay District; Chapter 1193 "HD" Historic Overlay District; and Chapter 1196 Community Commercial Overlay. (Second Reading 3/27/2017, Planning Commission 3/2/2017).**

Chairman McKenzie: Does the Commission feel any need to hear Mr. Snowden's recommendation or explanations of this? Can we get it from the text? Do we feel

comfortable with the text? I see a nod from Mr. Welday, and a smile from Mr. King, so I think we are good. Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Snowden? Hearing none, would anyone like to make a motion?

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 3/27/2017 8:00 PM
MOVER:	Ivan King	
SECONDER:	Robert Welday	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King	
ABSENT:	Comeaux	

6. **ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO: Amending Section 1181.06 General Sign Regulations of Chapter 1181 Signs and Graphics. (Second Reading 3/27/2017, Planning Commission 3/2/2017).**

Mr. Snowden: This is a case where once upon a time there were no requirements in the State Building Code, so we had a separate requirement in our Sign Code. This is no longer required. The State Building Code has structural requirements for sign which far exceed this requirement. And, as a State certified Building Department, we are required to go by that code, so we just simply need to remove this requirement and reference the Building Code.

RESULT:	REFERRED TO COUNCIL [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 3/27/2017 8:00 PM
MOVER:	Robert Welday	
SECONDER:	Tyler Cullinan	
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King	
ABSENT:	Comeaux	

7. **Proposed Planning Commission Rules Update**

Chairman McKenzie: Previously it was proposed to us, other than a slight correction, to change the title to the Planning Administrator. It seemed to me, that in addition to taking care of that, we could also improve the Rules of the Commission. In particular, there was one case where there is, what I consider to be rather elementary instruction, which is insulting to the members of the Commission, that we must contact people if we are not going to be here, if we know we are not going to be able to attend that meeting. It seemed to rather, as adults, it is something rather that we would be expected to do, without it being demanded of us. So, I have recommended that we simply eliminate that section, which also covers change of the title. And, in the next two, they are referenced as requirements of Code, and I have checked, and I checked with Mr. Snowden and the fact, unlike stated there, there is no specification in the Code to do that in the Planning Commission. And so, in addition, Code does allow additional requirements such as, that you have to have materials in three weeks before the date of the Planning Commission, is something that can go into the Handbook. Since, up until now, the Rules of the Commission have not been published. It seems to me that those requirements are far better made part of the Handbook which is published along with the Rules of the Commission. So, I have recommended that we also delete those two sections as well. And that, would take care of everything. And of course I also include the addition of the Secretary as a yearly election. So that is my reason for deleting sections of

the Rules of Commission that were previously brought for, for amendment. So, that is my rationale. Any questions for me?

Mr. Welday: I have a question for Mr. Snowden. So, for the Rules of the Planning Commission, is that going to go in the code, Chapter 1101?

Mr. Snowden: The Rules of the Commission are not part of the Code. Chapter 1101 in the Planning and Zoning Code is a space that is reserved for information about the Planning Commission that could be placed there. There is a corresponding section, 1139 for the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. I already have language written that would go in there and clarify that. But, in response to our Chairman, the Rules will be published to the website, regardless of what decisions are made here, for both the Planning Commission and BZBA, regardless of how the Commission chooses to edit the Rules. Secondly, with regard to the two items that the Chairman has stated, those items are in there for a reason, at the request of Staff, when Staff drafted or re-drafted the original Rules of the Planning Commission. The rationale behind the attendance requirements is because there are requirements that are listed in the City Charter for Boards and Commissions. In my opinion, we have a great Commission right now where attendance is not an issue, but what would we do in the event where there did become an attendance issue and folks were not notifying staff. There would need to be some sort of procedure in place, and that is the purpose of that section. The section regarding the items that are in the Code, there were, and were previously in the Code, a variety of suggestions, and this is specifically in the Subdivision Code of the City, where it says the Planning Commission will do x, y, and z, the Planning Commission will receive copies of plans, copies of plats. The reason for that is boiler plate language from model subdivision codes, and some from state law that basically says Planning Commission shall do these things. And the purpose of putting that in the Rules is to clarify that although that is what Code says, we do not have to provide a member of the Commission in the office in order to receive those documents. The Planning and Zoning Administrator will receive those documents on behalf of the Commission, wherever the Code is silent on who exactly is doing what, receive those documents, take them through the proper procedure. I would like to go on record of saying those items are in there for a reason.

Mr. Welday: Mr. Snowden, on your proposed revised revision, 1/5/17, is the only thing that was added was the definition update for the Zoning Administrator?

Mr. Snowden: The items originally proposed by Staff were the "and Zoning Administrator" which is highlighted in yellow throughout, and in the course of that review, our Chairman brought to my attention Section 4., 1., which was simply an omission. I am also working with BZBA to update that language there because it is the same language. Dr. McKenzie made some additional proposals on top of that which is in your agenda as revised Item 8. The items in yellow are what were originally proposed by Staff, and what Staff supports.

Mr. Welday: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. I would like to make a motion to approve the recommended changes by staff.

Chairman McKenzie: Any debate?

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Welday
SECONDER:	Ivan King
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King
ABSENT:	Comeaux

8. Changes to the Rules of the Planning Commission Proposed by the Chairman

9. Discussion Regarding Development of Comprehensive Plan of the City

Chairman McKenzie: This is something that is in our responsibility, and while I understand that we wanted to hire an expert, it seems to me that because of how many times during a year we have not met those opportunities for preparing the ground work for developing a Comprehensive Plan, should for example, a utility aggregate be approved. Mr. Sampson has stated the \$100,000 that comes with the city, could be used to develop a Comprehensive Plan, that we have the expertise here to begin to start polling the community for input to have and invite the expertise in to address us in regards to what a Comprehensive Plan would entail, and for Members of the Commission to provide input as to what they would like to see for a Comprehensive Plan for the City in the future. And, that can be done anytime, and be a standing point of discussion for meetings whenever we have other business. To begin, I have asked that that be included in the Agenda for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Snowden: I am very happy to see Dr. McKenzie beginning this, although we have been here a long time tonight. This is the type of important thing that is charged with such a body as the City Planning Commission, of all cities. Let me give you an idea of some of the preliminary work behind the scenes that may be of interest to you on this front. I would be more than happy to continue to discuss this and keep this in the forefront of our minds. Secondly, I am also aware of the situation with possible funding as well as looking at these city finances and increases in city income taxes that get us out in front of the voters. Knowing the challenges that we are faces with development, and as all communities face as they look to deal with change, and it comes with it whether you deal with it or you don't. Our Development Department Staff, Public Service, and elected officials of the City, have reached out an over the last month and a half or so, have met with three different firms that provide Comprehensive Planning Services, partially to raise awareness and to discuss what their services are, have them get feedback from the City about they would want to accomplish or what we would want to accomplish, in such a process, and to discuss best practices for implementation. So, just yesterday was the third of the scheduled meetings for that. From here, the goal would be to eventually secure funding and put together a working committee that would monitor such a plan and would include representation from the Commission, and the Commission would be part of it. It has not gotten any further than that, but we have been discussing it. I think you can all see the need as you are asked to make decisions, for the need for such a document. With that, Dan and I would be happy to answer any questions. This is something that has not been done in the City, on a large scale basis, since the early 1990's, and it was done sporadically prior to that.

Mr. King: I think this is a good thing, if we are not meeting, for us to begin thinking proactively.

Chairman McKenzie: Also I would say that for the people on the Commission, this is also an opportunity to request to, when we set the Agendas, to have items of discussions added to the Agenda just as general discussions, in case people want to talk about involvement or goals and (*inaudible*).

Mr. Snowden: I don't see why this could not be a standing item on the Agenda going forward. My recommendation is that we place it first in our business with the exception of any re-zoning cases or Major Site Plan cases that need to be reviewed, just so the applicants don't have to sit here while we discuss that. There is no reason why that could not be standing on the Commission Business. Secondly, I have in my office, several example plans that the Planning Consultants have given us that show different levels of service, different ideas, communities with similar and dissimilar characteristics to Reynoldsburg. Those are available for anyone to take a look at. There are copies, so you can also take them home and start to get an idea of what to expect during the process. I would like to offer that to any Member of the Commission between now and the next meeting of the Commission.

Mr. Weldon: As far as recommendations that we may make, what is the best way to propose those to City Council, or get them to City Council. As a Planning Commission, I feel it is our duty to express our views on how Reynoldsburg should grow as a community, and obviously, we want to leave it better for generations to come.

Mr. Snowden: Mr. Weldon, the first thing that anyone is interested and has time, would be to attend MORPC's Insight 2050 Academy. The Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission, which is our regional development partner for Franklin County and surroundings, has done a regional demographic analysis out to 2050. They offer what they call the Academy, which is basically a series of meetings. Some of City Council and others for our Boards and Commission have attended. The purpose of that is to discuss the challenges that the region is facing. And then, we as a community, Planning Commission, electeds and staff, will work to develop a vision that fits in with that overall regional concept. That would be my first recommendation so that we all have a good grasp on this. We also could bring in one of MORPC's Directors of Planning who resides in Reynoldsburg, and I know she would be happy to come and discuss that with the Commission. That is something that has been on my radar. From there, what I think the Commission should do, and staff would assist, is list out challenges that the City is facing and highlight the needs and get a written document that expresses, and whether we do a formal Resolution and kick that up to City Council, or we start polling individual members of Council aside, inviting them to attend, as you can see, Councilman Luzader is with us and other Council Members have been in and out over the course of the last year or so, and raise that in the terms of funding. Ultimately funding has to be secured if you want to bring in a consultant. The reality is that it is really the only way to get it accomplished in this type of setting, and here is why, as Planning and Zoning Administrator, the consultants that you are going to hire that are going to have roughly the same qualifications that I do. The difference is, at the end of the day, I have to handle the administration of our Zoning Code, and that in and of itself is set up here as a fulltime job. Again, I am happy to be involved and help guide the process, but we have to have outside assistance in order to focus on drafting the plan. Either that, or I do it, and you farm all the

zoning out again, which Dan remembers what a challenge that was. We have been working to streamline our process in terms of Development approval to kind of create some space where these other things can be done, but ultimately, I don't want anyone to think I am saying I can not accomplish this, because it is just not true. In terms of workload, my position is administration of the Zoning Code type of position. We are going to need to obtain funding for outside help. In order to do that, highlighting the need, listing 10-12 challenges that the Community is facing, whether it is demographics, changes in ages and incomes of the residents, long term population trends and listing those out, that could be the motivation that moves the ball forward.

Chairman McKenzie: Did that answer your question?

Mr. Welday: It did.

Chairman McKenzie: I have one more thing. As a resident here, you can always address Council on your own. And in addition, the Commission, if they were to agree to it, could bring something to Council. Those would be the two main avenues that we would have. So, with no further business, I will close the Meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:35.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Welday
SECONDER:	Ivan King
AYES:	McKenzie, Cullinan, Welday, King
ABSENT:	Comeaux

C. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman



Planning and Zoning Administrator