



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long  
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

## DUBLIN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 19, 2012

#### AGENDA

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>1. Infiniti of Columbus<br/>11-040CDD<br/>Postponed</b>  | <b>3890 Tuller Road<br/>Corridor Development District</b>   |
| <b>2. Nationwide Children’s Hospital<br/>Perimeter Center Planned District<br/>Subareas C, D, and M<br/>11-066Z/PDP/FDP<br/>Postponed</b> | <b>5675 and 5680 Venture Drive<br/>5700 Perimeter Drive<br/>Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan<br/>Final Development Plan</b> |
| <b>3. Nationwide Children’s Hospital<br/>Ohio Health Planned District<br/>11-067Z/PDP/FDP<br/>Postponed</b>                               | <b>7450 Hospital Drive<br/>Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan<br/>Final Development Plan</b>                                  |
| <b>4. Vrable Skilled Nursing Care<br/>08-116Z/PDP/PP<br/>(Approved 5-0)<br/>(Approved 5-0)</b>  | <b>Tuller Road and Tuller Ridge Road<br/>Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan<br/>Preliminary Plat</b>                               |
| <b>5. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification<br/>11-020ADM</b>  | <b>Administrative Request</b>   |

Vice Chair Richard Taylor called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Todd Zimmerman, Joe Budde, and John Hardt. Chair Amorose Groomes and Mr. Fishman were absent. City representatives were Cathy Boring, Dana McDaniel, Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Dan Phillabaum, Jennifer Rauch, Kristin Yorko, Allen Perkins, Alexis Dunfee, Rachel Beck, and Flora Rogers.

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

#### Administrative Business

Claudia Husak said that there are updated versions of the Bridge Street Code for sections .057-.059. She said there is a special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 24 at 6:30, and only the code is scheduled for discussion.

Richard Taylor asked if what the Commission received is what should be reviewed by February 2.

Ms. Husak said Planning is going to get the Commission a complete new document before the vote on February 2, 2012.

Mr. Taylor briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He determined the order of the cases would be as published; noting that Case 1, 2 and 3 had been postponed. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

**1. Infiniti of Columbus 3890 Tuller Road**  
**11-040CDD Corridor Development District**

This application was postponed prior to the meeting. Adjacent residents were notified.

**2. Nationwide Children's Hospital 5675 and 5680 Venture Drive**  
**Perimeter Center Planned District 5700 Perimeter Drive**  
**Subareas C, D, and M Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**  
**11-066Z/PDP/FDP Final Development Plan**

This application was postponed prior to the meeting. Adjacent residents were notified.

**3. Nationwide Children's Hospital 7450 Hospital Drive**  
**Ohio Health Planned District Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**  
**11-067Z/PDP/FDP Final Development Plan**

This application was postponed prior to the meeting. Adjacent residents were notified.

**4. Vrable Skilled Nursing Care Tuller Road and Tuller Ridge Road**  
**08-116Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**  
**Preliminary Plat**

Mr. Taylor said that this is an application for review and recommendation to City Council for a rezoning with preliminary development plan and for a preliminary plat. He said that they will need to make two motions.

Jennifer Rauch said the site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Tuller Road and Tuller Ridge Drive. She said it comprises 6.3 acres, the notable site conditions include a large Cottonwood tree located in the north central portion of the site, as well as existing street trees along Tuller Ridge Drive. She said there is a wetland along the southern border of the proposed site as well as significant topography.

Ms. Rauch said uses surrounding the site include office and commercial to the north and east, undeveloped portions to the west and an existing driving range to the south. She said this proposal was reviewed informally by the Planning and Zoning Commission in June of 2011.

Ms. Rauch said the Commission requested the applicant try to meet more of the objectives of the Bridge Street Corridor. She said Commissioners also spoke of the consistency of the proposal with the Community Plan recommendations and supported the proposed use. She said the Commission expressed concerns about the site layout and the automobile-oriented nature of the proposal, there was an expressed desire for it to be more pedestrian-oriented and the Commissioners urged the applicant to try to decrease the building footprint, make the building taller and provide more open space to the areas around the building. She said the Commission asked for more information from the Fire Department as it related to the circular road that was originally proposed around the perimeter of the building.

Ms. Rauch said the Commission also wanted to ensure high quality architecture was incorporated within the proposal, such as brick and stone used as a primary material on the building. She said the applicant was urged to strive for more sustainable stormwater management solutions for this proposal.

Ms. Rauch said this site includes a 122,000-square-foot rehab and skilled nursing facility. She said the building footprint is 79,000 square feet which houses a one- to two-story building located in the central southern portion of the site. She said the main building entrance is located off the east-west road located on the southern border of the site. She said the proposal includes a new street network, the applicant has worked with Planning and Engineering to ensure the consistency with the street network map as it is outlined within the BSC corridor. She said it includes modifications to Tuller Road, located on the northern portion of the site, as well as modifications to Tuller Ridge Drive, located on the east. She said there will be construction of the new east-west road on the southern border and the north-south road will be located along the western border.

Ms. Rauch said there are four access points; one off the east-west road, two on the north-south road and one at the rear entrance off Tuller Road. She said the applicant is providing two parking areas, one at the main entrance along the front façade of the building and a staff parking area located to the rear of the building. She said the applicant is indicating stormwater management is provided on the site. She said the applicant has worked with Planning to work toward the stormwater solutions outlined within the BSC draft code.

Ms. Rauch said the original loop road located outside of the building has been eliminated, as well as the proposed roundabout previously proposed at the intersection of the new east-west road and Tuller Ridge Drive. She said the applicant was proposing an additional right in and right out on Riverside Drive which has also been eliminated. She said the building has been rotated slightly and oriented toward the south on the east-west road; the parking areas have been separated with the elimination of the circular drive around the perimeter of the building.

Ms. Rauch said the original proposal included off site stormwater which has now been incorporated on the site. She said the pavement and building setbacks have been reduced on all four sides of the proposal. Ms. Rauch said the proposal meets the proposed development text for the uses, setbacks and lot coverage. She said the two new streets will be provided with the development of this site and are consistent with the BSC street network. She said a traffic study is typically required with preliminary development plans; however significant modeling has been done as part of the BCS. She said Engineering has only required an access management study be provided at a final development plan stage.

Ms. Rauch said Planning and Engineering are recommending a condition of approval that the applicant is responsible for the construction of the north-south roadway as well as the dedication of rights-of-way adjacent to this site. She said the City has offered to construct the east-west road contingent upon the applicant entering into a TIF agreement with the City. She said sidewalks and bikepaths are provided in all the required locations. She mentioned there are potential conflicts with street trees on Tuller Ridge Drive, which will need to be worked out in the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Rauch said the building is sprinkled and alarmed; Washington Township Fire has reviewed the plans and has requested minor modifications to some of the turning radii to accommodate fire trucks. She said the Commission expressed concern about the number of parking spaces since Code requires 80 spaces, and the applicant proposes 122 on site which is based on the applicants needs. She said the proposed plans do not include ADA parking spaces, those must be provided at the Final Development Plan stage as well as the on-street parking.

Ms. Rauch said preliminary details have been provided for landscaping. She said Planning has requested additional information be provided in the development text as well as on the proposed plans regarding vehicular use area screening. She said specifically, that the measurement of the heights of the screening walls for the vehicular use areas of the site and the masonry walls needs to be clarified. She said Planning recommends the stone walls along the east-west road are eliminated due to the scale not being in line with the street wall. She said more comprehensive tree replacement details need to be provided at the final that relate to all the improvements adjacent to this site. She said any implications to the street trees based on the final placement of the sidewalk along Tuller Ridge Road need to be mitigated, and the text must be modified to ensure all the inches removed are mitigated per the Zoning Code.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has worked with Engineering to identify locations for stormwater management that are more in line with the draft BSC code. She said the site does have access to all existing utilities, there are some details to the water line capacity and stormwater sewer potential relocation that Engineering requested the applicant continue to work with them to ensure those requirements can be met.

Ms. Rauch said the text outlines permitted building materials which include brick, stone and stucco. She said the proposed building shows the variation in height from one to two stories. She said Planning is requesting that 75% of the building elevations be brick or stone. She said the applicant has provisions for signs in the proposed development text including one sign per frontage. She said Code would permit two signs since it is a corner lot. She said Planning recommends two signs are permitted, one along the east west road and one along Tuller Road plus one directional sign with the business name located at the rear entrance along the north-south road.

Ms. Rauch said this application includes a preliminary plat with information about the lot, right-of-way dedication and street layout being created for this site. She said the only condition Planning has is the information provided through the other sets of plans also be provided on this plan before it goes before City Council.

Ms. Rauch briefly reviewed the proposal against the BSC draft code and said that the proposed use would be conditional in the draft code within the BSC office Residential District. She said the building size would be limited to 75,000 square feet and the proposal is 122,000 square feet. She said the street network and access is consistent with the BSC network map; however, no access would be permitted on the principal frontage streets, Tuller Ridge Road, Tuller Road and the east-west connector.

Richard Taylor said he is confused about the building size.

Ms. Rauch said 122,000 square feet is the total building square footage.

Mr. Taylor said that is not the footprint, but includes both floors of the building.

Ms. Rauch confirmed and said the 75,000 square feet limitation is outlined within the draft BSC code.

Ms. Rauch said no access would be permitted along principal frontage street within the draft BSC code and the applicant has three on their proposal. She said the there is a maximum block length and a perimeter block length that this proposal exceeds. She said the proposal is most similar to a civic building type and the building height is required to be a minimum of one- and one-half to five stories along an entire elevation; this proposal varies from one to two stories. She said parking is not permitted in front of the building; it is permitted to the rear and must be set back at least 20 feet. She said in the proposal, parking is located in the front of the. She said the intent of the main entrance is for it to be designed to be pedestrian in scale; the main entrance for this proposal is a vehicular drop-off.

Ms. Rauch said the number of entrances is based on the façade length and there are not enough entrances provided with this proposal to meet the requirement. She said vehicular canopies are required to be located to the rear; this proposal has them located to the front and the side. She said the draft BSC code requires 306 parking spaces; the proposal is providing 196 parking spaces including adjacent on-street parking. She said there is a requirement to have one bicycle parking space per 20 parking spaces, there are none shown in the proposal. She said the BSC requirements for landscaping are not met, but the plans could be revised to meet the requirements. She said no open space is required for civic buildings, thus none is provided with this proposal.

Mr. Taylor said the code in reference is inactive as of yet, this information has been provided for informational purposes. Ms. Rauch agreed.

Ms. Rauch said that Planning reviewed the application based on the appropriate review criteria and is recommending approval of the Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan with the following seven conditions:

- 1) The following items will need to be addressed as part of the final development plan:
  - a) The submission of a more comprehensive tree survey and tree replacement plan that indicates how all the trees affected by the proposed improvements are mitigated.
  - b) The two oak trees identified along Tuller Road should be included on the comprehensive tree survey and mitigated.
  - c) Any trees removed along the west side of Tuller Ridge Drive must be replaced in accordance with the tree preservation requirements.
  - d) The plans should be revised to include top of wall heights to ensure the height requirement is met and to ensure all vehicular use areas incorporate the required screening.
  - e) The proposed plans should be revised to show the masonry piers located one per every 50 feet.
  - f) The applicant should continue to work with Engineering regarding the impacts of the wetland area based on the proposed improvements and address how it will be mitigated.
  - g) The applicant must verify with the City of Columbus and/or the Washington Township Fire Department the waterline located on Tuller Road has adequate capacity to handle the domestic and fire demand from this facility, until the proposed waterline improvements occur with the relocation of Riverside Drive.
  - h) The applicant should continue to work with the City to determine if the relocation of the existing sanitary sewer is necessary and what party will be responsible for the completion of these improvements.
  - i) The applicant will be required to conduct an access study as part of the final development plan approval process.
  - j) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Engineering to determine the final layout and design of the cycletracks, sidewalks and other streetscape elements.
  - k) The proposed plans need to be revised to include required ADA accessible parking spaces.
  - l) The applicant will need to continue to work with Engineering to ensure the ground recharge methods are incorporated to meet the stormwater management requirements and the water released from the site does not negatively impact the Scioto River or upstream facilities.
  - m) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Engineering on the design and landscape materials for the stormwater facilities to ensure the desire for high quality stormwater management facilities and features is met with the final development plan.
  - n) The applicant work with Planning and Engineering to identify appropriate materials, installation methods and maintenance provisions regarding the pervious pavement proposed on site.
  - o) Planning will continue to work with the applicant to finalize the plant material at the final development plan.
  - p) The two 16-foot gatehouse features at the east/west street entry should be removed.

- 2) The development text should be revised according to the following, prior to review by City Council:
  - a) State the height of the wall or hedge be 30 inches in height, as measured from the top of wall in the parking lot and require one tree per 40 feet.
  - b) Eliminate the provision exempting the replacement of the existing street trees along Tuller Ridge Drive.
  - c) Permit two main identification signs limited to 50 square feet each, and not to exceed six feet in height. The directional sign may display the name of the business but should be limited to three feet in height, as measured from established grade, and no more than four square feet.
  - d) Require 75% masonry materials on the building elevations.
- 3) The applicant will be responsible for the dedication of right-of-way along the proposed roadways and for the construction of the north/south road.
- 4) The construction of the east/west road by the City is contingent upon the applicant entering into a TIF agreement with the City.
- 5) Minor modifications to the turning radii in the rear parking lot to meet fire truck maneuvering requirements must be made prior to submitting for City Council.
- 6) The plans must be revised to identify the replacement trees within the landscape requirements section of the proposed landscape plans.
- 7) The final location, design and construction of the on-street parking spaces will be determined with the roadway improvements.

Ms. Rauch said that Planning reviewed the Preliminary Plat application based on the appropriate review criteria and is recommending approval of the Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

- 1) The preliminary plat must be revised, prior to submittal to City Council, to include all required plat information on the preliminary plat, including but not limited to any minor technical adjustments.

Ben Hale Jr., 37 West Broad Street, representing the applicant, said this site was chosen deliberately because the east is an existing one-story office development and to the north is a veterinarian clinic. He said the architect has pulled the two-story elements to the south and the west, which are the elements visible from Riverside Drive. He said the BSC shows a road that goes through to Sawmill Road, our intention was to accommodate that plan with this road, Tuller Road becomes a right in and right out only. He said the roads are all being built to the BSC standards.

Mr. Hale said the applicant provided the City with a development agreement that states the applicant will sell the City ground at clear market value, which includes the potential relocation, property along the river, and ground west of the potential new road. He said the City is having the ground appraised, as is the applicant.

Mr. Hale said a part of the agreement is who is going to pay for what and how it will be paid for. He said condition three of the rezoning is inappropriate as a condition because the condition concerns the construction of the road; it is unknown who will end up building the road and we will not know until the agreement is finished. He said that agreement needs to go before Council.

Mr. Hale said the applicant is responsible for all of the roads until there is an agreement with the City regarding who is responsible for what roads. He said we have taken the previous comments to get rid of the ring road and reduce the size of the site. He said we are trying to maximize the usability of the remaining property as part of the BSC and believe we are doing the right thing.

Mr. Hale said part of this is a nursing home and another part is a rehabilitation center. He said that there is more parking than necessary to accommodate different shifts.

Mr. Hale said we agree with everything except condition three, it is a development agreement not a zoning issue. He said if the City does not agree to build it then we have to build it; it is all part of an agreement with the City.

Michael Milligan, project architect, said they are trying to break the patterns of nursing homes. He said this is an all private room nursing home. He said they are trying to create a facility that accommodates the various needs of the residents and create neighborhoods so those with the same needs are located together, such as keeping short term patients separate from the long term patients.

Mr. Milligan said this is designed as 12–13 bed neighborhoods, each neighborhood has its own dining space, and there is not a communal dining area. He said they are striving for an environment that resembles a home life. He said we cannot have a double-loaded corridor scheme and keep our neighborhoods.

Mr. Milligan said the common areas will be double-story spaces for the dining room which will resemble a cafe, a rehab gym space which will look like a health club that will be two stories with rooms on both floors. Mr. Milligan said the ends of the building have been redesigned to reflect more front on the streets, the setbacks have been reduced, the main entrance has been made into a building element with a drive under it, and the dining room for the assisted living has been designed above that. He said they are anticipating using a watered area pump system for the HVAC so that they will not have grills through the walls throughout.

Mr. Taylor reiterated that they we will not see any HVAC on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Milligan said no. He said we are looking at a high quality finished building, we are not at 75% masonry with this proposal, but said that they were very close. He said pervious pavement will be used for the rear parking spaces.

John Hardt asked how tall the proposed gate houses will be.

Mr. Milligan said they are approximately sixteen feet in height; the walls are an average six feet. He said the street slopes about six percent and the walls step down the hill. He said there are two small retaining walls on the site with 40 feet of slope.

Mr. Hale said one of the things that makes the east-west street complicated is there are many places that will intersect it, such as where the new Riverside Drive may be located. He said we will have to flatten it out for that. He said Mr. Milligan has completed a facility in West Virginia and it works.

Al Vrable, the owner, said the concept is known as the Eden Concept which has gained popularity throughout the country. He said this nursing home allows a better quality of life for its residents.

Mr. Taylor asked if the east-west road will go farther than Tuller Ridge.

Mr. Rauch said yes.

Mr. Taylor asked if there is a building size limit in the current zoning.

Ms. Rauch said it is based on the lot coverage setbacks.

Mr. Taylor asked if we have an idea of what that might be.

Ms. Rauch said lot coverage as proposed in their text meets Code at 75% and the proposal is 58%.

Todd Zimmerman said it is good to hear there will not be through the wall HVAC units. He said the parking is 122 spaces on site. He asked where the 196 parking spaces come from.

Ms. Rauch said some of it is on-street parking.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the on-street parking is on public or private streets.

Mr. Rauch said they are public streets.

Mr. Zimmerman said there is no guarantee the spaces would be available to them for use because it is not on their site.

Ms. Rauch said yes.

Mr. Zimmerman said referring back to the 2007 Community Plan what would be the square footage allowed on this site.

Ms. Rauch said the Community Plan for this site calls for Mixed Residential Medium Density so it five units to the acre.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if we were constructing this building per the Community Plan standards.

Steve Langworthy said it would be hard to know without a site plan and it would depend on the type of building that was built.

Mr. Zimmerman said if we went with what they are looking for in the Community Plan for this Planned Unit Development, instead of what is currently offered on this site.

Mr. Langworthy said there is no way to know.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if they need 196 parking spaces or are offering it.

Mr. Rauch said they are offering 196.

Mr. Zimmerman said the conditions cover quite a bit.

Mr. Hardt said he would be in favor of keeping the gate houses because if they are removed, there is a site surrounded by a stone wall with no features. He said although they are on the tall side, the gate houses would provide a relief from the stone walls. He said the brick and stone on the exterior of the building has nice architecture and if it is as close to 75% as it sounds like, he would not make them revise the building.

Mr. Hardt said his biggest issue is the proposed reconfiguration of Tuller Road and Riverside Drive. He said when the road network and the BSC are done, then the east-west road can be utilized to get to Sawmill Road, then it would make sense for the intersection to be right in/right out, but not until then.. He said many people currently use Tuller Road to get to Sawmill Road and if it is turned it into a right in/right out, a problem will have been created.

Dana McDaniel said the reason for the Tuller Road relocation was the construction of Emerald Parkway Phase 8. He said when Emerald 8 is constructed; Tuller Road will need to be moved. He said Tuller Road would have been a slight bend to the south to redirect it from northbound turn lanes. He said the project has been 100% designed for two years and we are working though the acquisition process.

Mr. McDaniel said adding the east-west connector to Tuller Ridge Drive helps get some of the traffic away from the northbound stacking to Emerald Parkway.

Amy Kramb asked if the existing Tuller Road is being kept right in/right out, and if it is, is it going to solve the northbound turn lane problem.

Mr. McDaniel said according to the Engineers it would help.

Mr. Langworthy said he asked the same question, he said the counts on northbound Riverside Drive are greater than Tuller Road.

Ms. Kramb said she is not sure how the new east-west road will eliminate any traffic moving northbound from Tuller Road.

Mr. Langworthy said it is intended to lengthen the ability to put left turn stacking for Emerald 8. He said the current northbound turn lane will be lengthened back. He said the length of the lane will help get some traffic off Tuller Road.

Ms. Kramb said the northbound traffic is what creates the backup, because everyone gets off I-270 and heads south and cuts down Tuller Road.

Mr. Langworthy said this is not part of the PUD it is a City Council decision. He said the right of way does not change for Tuller.

Mr. Hardt said it is a noted part of the project.

Mr. Langworthy said the timing will depend on Emerald 8 than it is this project.

Mr. Hardt said his main concern is where the traffic will go that heads southbound, that comes from the northwest and travels across Emerald Parkway to make the left turn to head up to Sawmill Road.

Mr. Langworthy said they will have the left turn movement along the east west that connects to Tuller Ridge.

Joe Budde said he likes the way the architecture looks because it looks like a ski resort village. He asked about the accommodation of bicycle parking.

Mr. Hale said it will be put in.

Ms. Kramb said she thinks this will be a great use and building, but she does not like the location in the BSC. She said she is concerned that the vision of the BSC is not being met; the building is not up against the street. She said it seems the building was made larger to bring it closer to the street; however, it is still auto-oriented and there is nothing interactive about this building and it is being gated.

Mr. Taylor said he agrees with the use, but would like to make the building reflect what the vision is for this area. He said the City has a vision for this area, we cannot make this building meet all of the criteria, but there is room to make the building closer to the vision. He said this is a fantastic building, but on another site within Dublin, this area is intended for more buildings that relate to each other. He said this is a wonderful building that is internalized which creates an issue. He said if this is approved and built the surrounding properties will be rezoned to BSC and have to have open space for public use.

Mr. Langworthy said a civic building does not have to have open space.

Mr. Taylor said in general open space is required. He said when a chunk of land is exempted from the rules the burden is placed on other spaces. He said he would like to see the right in and right out at Tuller Road removed. He said the building has gotten larger, it was asked that the building is made smaller.

Mr. Taylor said this will be the only building in the health care campus until after the BSC is adopted, meaning the future buildings would be required to meet the BSC code. He said he wonders if this building should be pushed in that direction, if this building is not closer to the BSC requirements it will stick out.

Mr. Hale said Mr. Vrable has not objected to the BSC zoning, this site is currently zoned Community Commercial. He said there is open space surrounding the site.

Mr. Taylor said in the development text on the first page, third paragraph, and last line; there is language that should be removed because it will not relate to the BSC.

Mr. Taylor said on page two, item B, site plan, paragraph one; he asked which code this refers too.

Ms. Rauch said it would be the existing Zoning Code.

Mr. Hale said there is a provision in the BSC that states if you have an undeveloped PUD, which is what this is, the default code is not the BSC it is the current code.

Jennifer Readler said it does need to be clarified.

Mr. Taylor said at the time this project is approved by City Council the BSC may have been approved, we need to make sure we know what we are referencing.

Mr. Taylor said in the PUD text page 2, paragraph B, subparagraph 2 the very last line; the review criteria for the Final Development Plan (FDP) that we are required to go by states that the FDP is reviewed in the context of the relationship of the Preliminary Development Plan. He said this proposes to relate the site plan to the text. He said there are going to be alterations and corrections to make the site plan work from the journey from preliminary to final but he does not believe allowing the developer to change the site plans correct. He asked to remove the line.

Mr. Taylor said on page 6, paragraph 3, General Matters, last line; our review criteria require us to review it on terms of compatibility and compliance with the Preliminary Development Plan. He said he would like to remove the line.

Ms. Krumb said on page 5, Materials, there is not a percentage listed.

Mr. Hale said 75% is okay.

Ms. Krumb said on page 4, number 5, Street Trees; it does not say that the applicant is going to provide the trees. She asked whose responsibility it is to replace the trees.

Mr. Hale said it has to do with who is going to build the road.

Ms. Rauch said it is a condition that all of the trees removed need to be replaced by the developer.

Mr. Zimmerman said the gate houses should be lowered.

Mr. Hardt said 16 feet is larger than he would like to see them, perhaps 12–14 feet might be a little more modest.

Mr. Zimmerman said to use the same material throughout. He said he does not want the gates to stand out as a feature.

Ms. Kramb said this is a proposed six-foot tall wall, putting a gate around the building makes it look like a fortress.

Mr. Langworthy said it is a condition to work out to the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Zimmerman said in 2008 we discussed how it would be a similar stone wall.

Mr. Hardt said writing a condition will help solve this issue.

Mr. Langworthy said the condition can be modified.

Mr. Hardt said the architecture is very nice and comparable to other Dublin buildings. He said there are items about this project specific to this site that he cannot get past, the site configuration being automobile focused, lack of pedestrian orientation and so forth. He said he does not think the BSC applies to this parcel, it has not been adopted. He said there was a mention in the Staff Report that states this site falls within the Sawmill/161 area of the Community Plan, the description is a lot like the language of the BSC. He said for that reason, it is not something he can support in this location of the city.

Ms. Kramb said she agrees with Mr. Hardt, it is not engaging the street. She said there is no attempt to make the facility look engaging to the street or match the buildings that would surround the building. She said there are large parking lots on both sides of it. She said it does not fit the vision.

Mr. Taylor said this is a very high quality project that we would like to see in Dublin, but we do not know how to make it fit within this context. He said he would suggest taking one more shot at this to see what can be done to make it appropriate.

Mr. Vrable said this location had been described as a transitional piece in the next vision. He said the typography of this land creates a lot of hurdles. He said the site has been reduced from nine to six acres. He said it was their understanding that there had would be a perimeter wall, it can be remove if necessary. He said the building has moved from a 160 foot setback to 60 feet.

Mr. Vrable said he has completed a Certificate of Need application, listing this as the location, per the Ohio Department of Health the location cannot be changed. He said if this is not approved by April 1, the application will be lost. He said this project will create around 150 jobs for this community.

Mr. Taylor said we all appreciate you bringing this project here; the hard deadline is about the rezoning.

Mr. Vrable said the rezoning and the right to build the property.

Mr. Hardt asked whether a Final Development Plan was needed by then.

Mr. Vrable said no.

Mr. Taylor said this application is extraordinarily detailed for a Preliminary Development Plan, he suggested revising it and bringing back something not as detailed.

Mr. Langworthy said the problem will be time.

Mr. Milligan said we need a decision.

Mr. Taylor said we can vote and it will go to City Council, but we cannot do anything about the timing.

Mr. Milligan said he would like a favorable vote, if he needs to meet a multitude of conditions to do so he will be happy to. He said the use and topography need to be considered, Tuller Ridge is 42 feet above the north-south road.

Ms. Krumb said Tuller Ridge and the east-west road are going to be the new main roads. She said there is going to be less traffic on that road eventually. She said there are four roads and they cannot all be addressed, but we need this building to be present on two of those four roads so it is not hiding behind parking lots.

Mr. Milligan said the building has been redesigned to square up the ends to front on the major roads. He said a double corridor scheme, which would have all windows parallel to the road, will not work for this project. He said the primary access is not going to be pedestrian, there will need to be a lot of vehicular access. He said the slopes are not compliant and are steeper than Americans with Disabilities Act will allow. He said there were parks proposed on the east and west corners.

Mr. Hale said the zoning will need to be passed as an emergency to get everything done in time.

Ms. Readler said Dublin has not passed zoning as an emergency.

Mr. Langworthy said it can be done in two readings, but we will need a vote tonight.

Mr. Milligan said they are happy to create parks on the property, he said staff told him it would not be desired. He said we have been trying to be very flexible.

Mr. Taylor asked if it would be possible to rotate the building 45 degrees on the site and put the entrance on the southwest corner, this would bring two sides of the building closer to the street.

Mr. Milligan said that was how the previous plan was.

Mr. Hardt asked what the logic is to not have the on-street parking count towards the parking count.

Mr. Langworthy said it is a public street so anyone can park there, it can be counted towards the parking requirement it just cannot be dedicated to one user.

Mr. Hardt said if that were counted towards their parking requirements then the parking on the site can be reduced substantially.

Mr. Milligan said the parking on the front is where visitors and staff will access the building; the on-street parking is not suitable because it is too steep.

Ms. Krumb asked if it is possible to rotate the building a little more and have the access off the north-south road so the parking is more on the side and not the main street.

Mr. Milligan said with the slope that would put the entrance at the basement level, which will not work. He said if the desire is to put the parking on the northeast corner they will do it.

Ms. Kramb said she wants the building to have more of a presence on the south east corner on the two prominent streets.

Mr. Milligan said if we take the loop out it will be more prominent on that corner.

Ms. Kramb said that would meet the plan.

Mr. Taylor said if he could rotate the building to be parallel with the two north-south roads and jam it up against the east-west road as much as possible it would help. He said it brings as much of the building as possible, without redesign, close to the street.

Mr. Milligan asked if this can be voted upon tonight with flexibility.

Mr. Hardt said a condition should be made that will allow them to rotate the building.

Mr. Hale said you can require us to rotate the building so the main entry is at the corner, and we will do that. He said you condition it and we will come back with a site plan for your review. He said we will come back after it is zoned, after the preliminary.

Mr. Langworthy said it is a major change with the grades and stormwater; it is not as simple of twisting the building.

Mr. Vrable said if the building is twisted the service area will be visible from Riverside Drive. He said we can make it face the corner. He said we have already reduced it 100 feet.

Mr. Langworthy said as a civic building it has a setback requirement.

Mr. Hardt said the BSC and Community Plan highlight the interaction with the street, the only way to accomplish that is to have the building touch the sidewalk. He said due to the complexity of the site that may not happen. He asked if there is latitude to reduce the paving between the building and the street.

Mr. Milligan said not on the front because we need flat handicap accessible pavement for visitors. He said if we can have the parking on the street dedicated for this facilities use, we are happy to eliminate some of the parking; we need parking for shift changes. He said the on-street parking will be counted for everyone, but not everyone can use it.

Mr. Hardt said this brings us back to rotating the building.

Mr. Milligan said the grades are difficult.

Mr. Taylor said we can live with the shape of the building; we just need to get it as close to the main streets as we can.

Mr. Langworthy asked if we made it a Final Development Plan condition.

Mr. Zimmerman said if the building is rotated we will see loading area on Riverside Drive.

Ms. Kramb said requiring the developer to rotate the building may not be the answer. She asked to see less pavement.

Mr. Hardt said this building is on the eastern and southern road, it is already against the eastern road. He said given the amount of parking needed and grades it cannot get any closer to the sidewalk.

Mr. Taylor suggested that the goal is to get the building as close to the south and east road as possible.

Mr. Zimmerman asked how the look of the building will change if the radius is changed.

Mr. Taylor said we cannot make this building have three straight faces that line up against the street; we can have the access of the building more aligned with the street than it is now.

Ms. Kramb said the six-foot wall is a barrier and shortening it to a three-foot wall will hide the parking lot while bringing something to the street, especially since the building cannot come up to the street.

Mr. Milligan suggested a 30-inch wall with an iron railing on top.

Mr. Taylor asked if the applicant agreed to those conditions. Mr. Hale agreed.

### **Motion and Vote # 1**

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of the Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan as this proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria with 7 conditions:

- 1) The following items will need to be addressed as part of the final development plan:
  - a) The submission of a more comprehensive tree survey and tree replacement plan that indicates how all the trees affected by the proposed improvements are mitigated.
  - b) The two oak trees identified along Tuller Road should be included on the comprehensive tree survey and mitigated.
  - c) Any trees removed along the west side of Tuller Ridge Drive must be replaced in accordance with the tree preservation requirements.
  - d) The plans should be revised to include top of wall heights to ensure the height requirement is met and to ensure all vehicular use areas incorporate the required screening.
  - e) The proposed plans should be revised to show the masonry piers located one per every 50 feet.
  - f) The applicant should continue to work with Engineering regarding the impacts of the wetland area based on the proposed improvements and address how it will be mitigated.
  - g) The applicant must verify with the City of Columbus and/or the Washington Township Fire Department the waterline located on Tuller Road has adequate capacity to handle the domestic and fire demand from this facility, until the proposed waterline improvements occur with the relocation of Riverside Drive.
  - h) The applicant should continue to work with the City to determine if the relocation of the existing sanitary sewer is necessary and what party will be responsible for the completion of these improvements.
  - i) The applicant will be required to conduct an access study as part of the final development plan process.
  - j) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Engineering to determine the final layout and design of the cycle tracks, sidewalks and other streetscape elements.
  - k) The proposed plans need to be revised to include required ADA accessible parking spaces.
  - l) The applicant will need to continue to work with Engineering to ensure the ground recharge methods are incorporated to meet the storm water management requirements and the water released from the site does not negatively impact the Scioto River or upstream facilities.
  - m) The applicant should continue to work with Planning and Engineering on the design and landscape materials for the stormwater facilities to ensure the desire for high quality stormwater management facilities and features is met with the final development plan.
  - n) The applicant work with Planning and Engineering to identify appropriate materials, installation methods and maintenance provisions regarding the pervious pavement proposed on site.

- o) Planning will continue to work with the applicant to finalize the plant material at the final development plan.
  - p) The two gatehouse features at the east/west street entry should be lowered or removed.
  - q) Allow the applicant the possibility to modify the site plan to reduce the amount of pavement located between the building and the street, and locate the building as close as possible to the east/west road and Tuller Ridge Drive at the final development plan stage.
  - r) The proposed masonry walls located along the East/West Road currently shown at six feet be reduced to three feet in height.
- 2) The development text should be revised according to the following, prior to review by City Council:
- a) State the height of the wall or hedge be 30 inches in height, as measured from the top of wall in the parking lot and require one tree per 40 feet.
  - b) Eliminate the provision exempting the replacement of the existing street trees along Tuller Ridge Drive.
  - c) Permit two main identification signs limited to 50 square feet each, and not to exceed six feet in height. The directional sign may display the name of the business but should be limited to three feet in height, as measured from established grade, and no more than four square feet.
  - d) Require 75% masonry materials on the building elevations.
  - e) Bicycle parking be provided on-site at one space per 20 parking spaces.
  - f) Remove statement regarding vision for proposal as it relates to Historic Dublin on pg 1.
  - g) Remove references within the text permitting deviations to the proposed plans at the final development plan (pg 2 and 6)
  - h) Require the applicant to provide street trees along roads built by the applicant
  - i) Clarify the Development Standards statement on page 2 to indicate conflicts with *Chapter 153*.
  - j) Prohibit Through the Wall Air Conditioning Units (PTACs)
- 3) The applicant will be responsible for the dedication of right-of-way along the proposed roadways, as well as the construction of the north/south road.
- 4) The construction of the east/west road by the City is contingent upon the applicant entering into a TIF agreement with the City.
- 5) Minor modifications to the turning radii in the rear parking lot to meet fire truck maneuvering requirements must be made prior to submitting for City Council.
- 6) The plans must be revised to identify the replacement trees within the landscape requirements section of the proposed landscape plans.
- 7) The final location, design and construction of the on-street parking spaces will be determined with the roadway improvements.

Ms. Krumb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

### **Motion and Vote #2**

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of the Preliminary Plat because it meets the review criteria of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Taylor asked if the applicant agreed to those conditions. Mr. Hale agreed.

- 1) The preliminary plat must be revised, prior to submittal to City Council, to include all required plat information on the preliminary plat, including but not limited to any minor technical adjustments.

Ms. Krumb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes, Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

**5. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification  
11-020ADM**

**Administrative Request**

Dan Phillabaum stated that at the previous meeting, the Commission had requested that the building types, graphics, and tables be made consistent across all building types, and that the positions of the letters be corrected. He said that Planning is currently working on this for the next draft.

Richard Taylor asked if 'A' would then always refer to the same thing for each building type, and so forth.

Mr. Phillabaum said that was the intent.

Amy Krumb noted that on the Building Type Tables, under *RBZ Treatment*, the first word is always "Landscape;" and she asked what that was intended to mean.

Rachel Ray explained that in the landscape section of the Code, there are different RBZ treatment options, including "landscape," "patio," and "streetscape." She said that for single-family detached building types in particular, it means the RBZ is required to be treated with lawn and other landscaping, instead of all patio or sidewalk with fencing.

Mr. Taylor said that he would like the reference to the Residential Appearance Standards (153.190) to be struck from the Code.

Mr. Phillabaum said that Planning would check all of the cross references to make sure that the BSC Code addresses all of the relevant requirements in the Residential Appearance Standards, but he thought the overall reference could be eliminated.

Ms. Krumb asked about the difference between the façade requirements, since one references transparency, while the other references *general* transparency.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that one regulates transparency for building elevations with street frontage, while the other includes transparency requirements for non-street façades.

Ms. Krumb said that she thought the word "general" should be struck then, and the requirements should state *street frontage* and *non-street frontage transparency*.

Mr. Hardt said that on page 36, the last item on the left column, refers to occupied space 15 feet deep. He said that, with respect to single-family detached dwellings, it appears as though this is requiring the front room of a house to be 15 feet deep. He recalled that there had been some concern from the development community that indicated that this was deeper than it needed to be.

Mr. Phillabaum said that the depth for single-family *attached* building types, the required depth of occupied space had been reduced to 10 feet of depth in response to this concern.

Mr. Hardt asked Mr. Taylor if a 15-foot depth requirement for the front room of a house is typical.

Mr. Taylor said that as he understood the requirement, it would prohibit the home from being less than 15 feet deep before reaching the garage or back yard.

Ms. Ray said the requirement is primarily concerned with the location of the garage. She said that the 15-foot depth does not mean that a single room has to be 15 feet deep, it just needs to be occupied space in lieu of a garage or otherwise unoccupied storage or utility area.

Mr. Hardt asked what the depth has to do with the occupied space requirement.

Ms. Ray said the intent of the dimension was to allow enough space to allow activity to occur.

Mr. Taylor referred to number three, principal entrance location, and noted that a porch is required. He asked if a porch or stoop could be recessed and still be considered a porch or stoop entrance.

Mr. Phillabaum said the requirements are for open porches, and he referred to the language on page 31. He said there could be a roof over the porch or stoop, but it could not be enclosed by walls greater than 24 inches above the porch level.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that there are houses with steps out front that have recessed entrances, and the walls would end up being taller than 30 inches.

Steve Langworthy said it would be acceptable as long as it was not an entirely enclosed space.

Mr. Hardt said that he had a comment that applies to all of the building type graphics. He noted that there is a red area on each indicating "parking within building" that should instead be labeled "*permitted* parking within building," since parking is not *required* to be provided wherever the red area is shown.

Ms. Kramb said that on page 38, under building entrance, the requirement should read "*a minimum of one per unit*" for number of entrances. She said that, with respect to number four, vertical increments, the requirement is one for every two units or 40 feet. She asked if the requirement is intended to be *at least* every 40 feet, at a maximum.

Mr. Phillabaum confirmed that was the intent and agreed to modify the table.

Mr. Taylor referred to (b), Height, and stated suggested that height be required at "2.5 feet *above* the adjacent sidewalk elevation" rather than *from*.

Mr. Hardt referred to the apartment building type on page 40, and said that with respect to the façade materials, brick, stone, wood and fiber cement siding are permitted, which seems to require traditional building types. He suggested that glass be permitted as an additional primary building material.

Ms. Kramb referred to the loft building type and noted that the building entrance requirement states "where ground story dwelling units or tenant spaces are incorporated, one [entrance] per full 30 feet." She suggested that this be modified to "a minimum of every 30 feet."

Mr. Langworthy said that this change was specifically requested by a potential applicant because they were unclear if an entrance would be required if they only provided an additional 25 feet. He said that an additional entrance would only be required only when a full 30-foot increment had been provided. He preferred to leave the requirement as it was written.

Ms. Kramb referred to the building height requirements for the corridor building type on page 44, and asked why Riverside Drive and I-270 were the only two streets mentioned where an additional two stories could be permitted. She said that she reads the requirement, that corridor building types could be five and a half stories tall, unless they have frontage on Riverside Drive or I-270, and in that case, an additional two stories could be added as long as there is an eight foot setback.

Ms. Ray said that was correct, because the requirement was intended to allow views of the Scioto River along Riverside Drive. She noted that the proximity to I-270 was noted instead of Tuller Road because Tuller Road may not stay within its current alignment forever.

Mr. Taylor referred to the historic cottage commercial building type and asked how the 70-foot maximum building length or depth requirement was derived.

Mr. Phillabaum said that the consultants who initially drafted the Code took an inventory of the existing buildings in the Historic District, and that was how this building type was created.

Ms. Krumb referred to the parking structure requirements and pointed out that in the parking and loading requirements on page 83, the Code requirement states that the opening to parking garages can only be 24 feet wide if it is for a double entrance, and on the table, it states that entrances shall not exceed 30 feet.

Ms. Ray explained that the 24-foot width requirement is intended to be measured at the sidewalk, while the driveway itself could widen a little bit to 30 feet at the actual entrance to the building.

Mr. Hardt referred to the permitted façade materials and suggested adding glass to this building type in addition to brick and stone. He referred to the provision near the bottom of the right hand column that states that towers are permitted on parking garages at terminal vistas. He asked why a parking garage should be permitted at a terminal vista at all.

Ms. Ray noted that towers are permitted, but not required, and stated that parking structures could be located along a smaller local street.

Mr. Hard said he was not sure that he would even want a parking structure at a terminal vista.

Ms. Ray noted that parking structures are conditional uses, which require the Commission's approval.

Mr. Hardt asked if there has been any more thought about creating a separate building type for buildings with podium-style parking structures.

Mr. Phillabaum said there will be another building type for a podium apartment building, and Planning is currently working on the details for that building type to include in the next draft.

Mr. Taylor referred to the intent statements at the beginning of the Neighborhood Standards requirements, and thought that the wording was awkward. He confirmed with Mr. Langworthy that the requirements for the BSC Historic Residential District are identical to the requirements for the existing Historic Residential District, included the 50% lot coverage.

Ms. Krumb referred to the access provisions (153.063(C)(3)(c)) which states "Refer to 153.060 and 153.061 for existing and planned principal frontage streets within the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District and acceptable block access configurations." She said that she was not sure if *acceptable* is the correct word to use.

Justin Goodwin said that this is intended to refer to both the street network map and the diagram in lots and blocks that show typical alley configurations. He agreed to take a look at the wording.

Ms. Krumb suggested *potential* instead of *planned* principal frontage streets in the same paragraph.

Ms. Krumb asked why the commercial buildings are limited to Village Parkway and Sawmill Road.

Ms. Ray said this requirement references the commercial center building type, which is the lowest density building type that allows some outparcel development up front to meet the front property line coverage requirements. She said that Planning recommends limiting this building type to occur only along Sawmill Road to help transition into the Corridor and along Village Parkway.

Mr. Hardt referred to block length, which specifically lists 500 feet which is also mentioned in the table back in Lots and Blocks. He asked if this paragraph should just refer to the table.

Ms. Ray said that could be done.

Ms. Kramb asked if the maximum block length is 500 feet, then why is that not listed in Table 153.063-B?

Ms. Ray said the table shows the minimum required length for a shopping corridor, which is required to be at least 300 feet. She said shopping corridors are supposed to be the smaller more pedestrian oriented blocks where more mixed use development would occur. She explained that at least one 300-foot shopping corridor would be required in these neighborhood districts to make sure we are creating a critical mass of mixed use development in these neighborhood districts.

Ms. Kramb noted that if the development is over five acres, it requires a 600-foot shopping corridor. She said 600 feet exceeds the block length limit.

Ms. Ray said that the shopping corridor does not have to be continuous; it could cross streets and turn corners.

Mr. Hardt referred to the gateways on page 63 and stated that he would like to see something that requires gateways to be pedestrian scaled, since "gateways" can mean different things to different people.

Mr. Taylor stated that, with reference to the master sign plans, he preferred that the Planning and Zoning Commission *shall review* all master sign plans.

Ms. Kramb pointed to page 64, regarding street types, and asked if someone wanted to build a greenway on a non principal frontage street, why they should not be permitted to do so, because she read the requirement as stating that greenways are not permitted on non-principal frontage streets.

Ms. Ray said that the regulation was intended to require that any street that has frontage along a greenway shall be treated as a principal frontage street, regardless of whether it is specifically designated as a principal frontage street on the street network map, for the purposes of site and architectural design of adjacent development fronting along that portion of the same street. She agreed to reword the requirement so the intent was clearer.

Mr. Taylor noted that the Historic Transition Neighborhood District is the only district that encompasses two different zoning districts, with property to be zoned Historic Transition Neighborhood and Public. He said that the distinction between the two needs to be made clear.

Ms. Ray agreed and stated that the school site is currently recommended for zoning to the Public District based on its current use. She said if it were to redevelop, it would go into the Historic Transition District.

Ms. Kramb referred to the first part of the Indian Run Neighborhood District requirements and noted that "pursuant to" was used twice in the same sentence, and that the rest of the paragraph and the following paragraphs are fragmented and unclear.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to review the language, but indicated that it had been specifically requested by a property owner.

Mr. Taylor said that there are two places where there is a greenway fronted by a road against residential properties in the Indian Run Neighborhood. He asked how close the buildings could be to the residences of Indian Run Estates.

Mr. Langworthy said the exact distance will not be known until we know the final alignment of the road, but there could be a pocket of residential where the road allows for a greenway off to the side.

Mr. Taylor said the text states that if pervious pavement is used, the size of an outdoor patio can be increased for a restaurant. He pointed out that even if a patio were a good distance across the ravine, from the back of a residential property the potential noise from the patio could become an annoyance.

Mr. Langworthy said that section will be reviewed closely.

Ms. Kramb stated that she had provided Planning with notes about some of the open space requirements that are really definitions instead of requirements, and that Planning had agreed to look into the changes.

Mr. Taylor announced that since the Commission had reached the Site Development Standards, they would proceed no further with their review than the parking and loading requirements. He asked if any of the Commissioners had any specific questions or comments about this section.

Mr. Hardt said he did not have any major issues with this section. Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hardt.

Justin Goodwin pointed out that Planning would like to revise the required parking for hospitals in the parking table, because there is a wide variety of types of hospitals and assisted living that would all fit into this category. He said the requirement that is currently shown in the Code could even end up requiring more parking than would be appropriate. He suggested adding a separate category for specialty hospitals, but since Planning tried to keep the uses in the parking table consistent with the uses in the use table, Planning would probably recommend stating "per an approved parking plan" instead.

Mr. Hardt asked how the Code would differentiate between a hotel and an apartment building.

Mr. Langworthy said if a hotel were in a permitted district, it could potentially occur in an apartment building type; if both were permitted uses, we would not have to distinguish except for parking requirements.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that a hotel could be a denser use than an apartment building.

Ms. Ray stated that Planning would determine whether each use was permitted in the BSC district, and then it would be required to meet the building type and site development standards, which include parking and landscape requirements.

Mr. Langworthy said that in order to qualify as residential dwelling unit it would have to have housekeeping facilities, each one would have to have a kitchen, bath and other specific amenities.

Mr. Taylor announced that the next meeting on Tuesday, January 24, the Commission would review the site development standards and the review and approval procedures. He confirmed with Mr. Langworthy that a clean copy of the Code should be expected prior to the Commission meeting on Thursday, February 2.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any comments or questions up to this point that would need to be researched before the meeting on Tuesday, January 24.

Mr. Taylor stated that he had several concerns with the sign regulations as drafted, and he had provided Planning with some specific comments and suggested modifications that he would like to discuss at the next meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the Commission is still planning to vote on the Code and area rezoning on Thursday, February 2.

Mr. Langworthy said that was the schedule, and stated that he would like the code to be the first vote of the meeting, followed by the area rezoning. He said that if there are additional changes or suggestions that come up during the meeting on February 2, those changes can still be noted and will be provided to Council with the final draft.

Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 10:07 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.