



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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 23, 2014

AGENDA

1. **NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace Centre – Real Estate Office**
13-122CU **7533 Sawmill Road**
(Approved 6-0) **Conditional Use**
2. **Ohio University College of Health Sciences and Professions**
13-119WID-DP **Post Road & Industrial Parkway**
(Approved 6-0) **Development Plan Review**
3. **Metro Center – Crowne Plaza Hotel – Architectural Modifications**
13-123AFDP **600 Metro Place North**
(Approved 6-0) **Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Krumb, John Hardt, Joe Budde and Victoria Newell. Warren Fishman was absent. City representatives present were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Dan Phillabaum, Claudia Husak, Rachel Ray, Barb Cox, Kristin Yorke, Alan Perkins, Dana McDaniel, Colleen Gilger, Flora Rogers, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to accept the documents into the record as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Kroger Marketplace Centre and the Crowne Plaza Hotel applications were on the consent agenda. She asked if anyone would like to pull either case. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined the order of the cases, hearing the two consent agenda cases first, in numerical order, followed by the Ohio University case. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. **NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace Centre – Real Estate Office**
13-122CU **7533 Sawmill Road**
Conditional Use

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a tenant space to be used as a real estate brokerage office within an existing shopping center in Subarea 5A of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development District. The site is located on the north side of Hard Road, west of the intersection with Sawmill Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to this case including Jackson Reynolds, Smith and Hale, LLC [37 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio]; representing the applicant, Nick Vollman, Sawmill Hard Center, LLC; and City representatives.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a presentation would not be needed since the case is on the consent agenda. She asked if anyone was present from the public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote – Conditional Use

Richard Taylor moved, John Hardt seconded, to approve this Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with one condition:

That the proposed use not be permitted until City Council approval of Ordinance 09-14 and the passing of the required 30-day referendum period.

Jackson Reynolds agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Claudia Husak asked to give credit to Marie Downie, Planning Assistant, as the case manager.

2. Ohio University College of Health Sciences and Professions

13-119WID-DP

Post Road & Industrial Parkway Development Plan Review

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for an approximately 87,000-square-foot, three-story educational building, parking lot, and associated site improvements as part of Ohio University Dublin Campus. The site is located on the south side of Post Road, west of Eiterman Road.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to this case including Paul Ghidotti, Daimler Group; Greg Chillog, Edge Group; and City representatives.

Dan Phillabaum described the site as being approximately 61 acres, located in the West Innovation District, which is part of Subarea One of an area that is part of an Economic Development Agreement between the City and Ohio University for the development of educational and research facilities.

Mr. Phillabaum thanked the applicant for their responsiveness to the direction from the Administrative Review Team (ART). He noted that this project was being reviewed under an ambitious time frame in large part to meet the timing for accreditation for a University program being brought to this campus. He complimented the applicant on their efforts, which enabled the list of conditions imposed by the ART to be reduced to those included in the report to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). He noted that procedurally, Innovation District projects are typically approved by the ART unless specific aspects of the application do not meet an applicable Code provision. He said in those situations, the applicant is required to request Site Plan approvals for those aspects from the PZC. He explained the other scenario that can bring Innovation District applications to the PZC for review is a 'kick up' provision for projects determined by the ART to have the potential for significant community impact and that would benefit from additional public review. This is the provision that brought the application to the PZC in December as an Informal for review and feedback on the architecture and site plan.

Mr. Phillabaum referred to the PZC feedback received in December, noting that the Commission was very positive on the proposed architecture but the Commission did express concerns about the parking lot layout, which the applicant acknowledged was still a work in progress.. He said the Commission suggested breaking the lot down into smaller pods of parking with landscaping to reduce the perception of a large sea of asphalt. An additional concern was that pedestrian connectivity between the parking lot, the proposed Phase 1 building, and the campus as a whole be improved.

Mr. Phillabaum presented a more refined version of the design plans shown previously that meet the contemporary architectural requirements of the Innovation Districts. He commended the applicant for effectively addressing all of the architectural character requirements of the Code as well as the architectural intent described in the EAZ Plan.

Mr. Phillabaum referred to the overall site plan to discuss the parking location and other issues. He said the building and parking were generally in the same location as presented previously. He said the parking lot has been subdivided into smaller pods with landscape islands.

Mr. Phillabaum described the location of the proposed stormwater detention basins as being along Post Road and the larger basin to the south near a future roadway intersection. He said staff is not generally supportive of the use of dry detention basins as opposed to retention ponds, but in this instance, these facilities are proposed to be temporary to allow for flexibility in the development of an overall campus Master Plan. He said that as the campus continues to develop, it is possible that buildings would occupy these locations and that redesigned and relocated stormwater facilities would be required. He said in order to complete Phase 1 to meet Ohio University's accelerated timeline; staff is supportive of these facilities in this manner. He said staff has also discussed opportunities for a consolidated, regional stormwater facility in the vicinity.

Mr. Phillabaum made note of the pedestrian and bike path connections to the existing areas as well as the expansion of the campus green that provide multiple connections from the parking lot to the future buildings.

Mr. Phillabaum showed a side-by-side comparison to highlight the changes that addressed the concerns regarding the parking lot layout. He reported that at the direction of the ART, an additional 10-foot wide landscape island was created at the west side of the parking lot to further break down the parking area into smaller pods and reduce the visual impact of parking along Industrial Parkway. He said the applicant is also incorporating naturalized mounds of varying heights with clustered landscaping along the Industrial Parkway frontage to screen the parking areas from the right-of-way.

Mr. Phillabaum said one of the conditions of the Development Plan was related to required building setbacks for the side and rear yards. He said the applicant has agreed to combine the two parcels to resolve the issue of not meeting the required 75-foot setback and any future building and pavement setback conflicts, prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Mr. Phillabaum said a condition related to the Tree Preservation and Landscape Plan condition was recommended by the ART. He said there is a shortfall of 105 replacement trees for which the applicant is proposing to pay fees in lieu of replacement. He said the ART has suggested adding trees to other parts of the campus and would like to work with them to bring that number down as well as discussing options to replace additional trees with future phases of the Master Plan. He said the other aspect of the condition relates to some of the plant selections. He reported that City staff has provided suggestions for alternate tree and shrub species, based on the growth habit, hardiness, and tree/leaf litter associated with a few of the proposed species as well as a desire for increased diversity in the plant palette.

Mr. Phillabaum said the last condition is for a revised site Lighting Plan to be provided prior to issuance of site permits, and reflecting the revisions to the new parking lot layout.

Mr. Phillabaum said the applicant requests Site Plan approval to not comply with the Open Space Plantings requirement. He said this provision requires that one two-inch tree be planted per 1,000 square feet of pervious site area. He calculated that if this site were developed to the maximum permitted level of impervious area, 12 acres of Open Space would remain and require that 523, two-inch trees be planted in addition to trees required for other code requirements. He stated that the site could not accommodate or ensure survival of all of those trees. He said City staff has discussed this provision internally and may need to do more analysis on the practicality of it. He said in this case, the requirement conflicts with the objective to create a large campus of multiple buildings surrounding an open campus green on a very large parcel.

Mr. Phillabaum said the proposed Parking Location is another Site Plan request as the West Innovation District requires parking be located at the rear or side of buildings with limited visitor parking permitted in front of the buildings. He emphasized the objective of preserving the interior of the site for the creation of a campus green which required parking be pushed to the periphery in more potentially visible locations. He said that ART is supportive of this arrangement based on the changes to the parking lot layout, which effectively screen and subdivide the parking lot, minimizing its visibility from Industrial Parkway.

Mr. Phillabaum said the last Site Plan review is for a Parking Adjustment. He said the current plan proposes 397 spaces. He explained that the precise number of spaces required cannot be determined as the future users of the second and third floors are unknown at this time. He said that if it is assumed that all floors of the building will be similarly used for educational purposes, 2XX spaces would be required. He said the Innovation Districts do not permit more parking than is required by use, without approval of a Parking Adjustment. He said the applicant provided documentation of their parking needs in the form of a table which shows their current parking ratios at other satellite campuses.

Mr. Phillabaum concluded that the review standards for the Development Plan and Site Plan are met with conditions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Phillabaum for his presentation and invited the applicant to step forward.

Paul Ghidotti, [6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, Ohio] of the Daimler Group, and on behalf of the Ohio University, the landowner. Mr. Ghidotti said how remarkable the planning staff had been, willing to meet multiple times since presenting to the PZC in December, and commended their efforts. He noted the quick timeline while being mindful of master planning and future road alignments, doing the best they can with the information they have, with the key being getting the first floor completed so Ohio University can meet their November deadline for the first part of accreditation of the Physician Assistant Program.

Mr. Ghidotti thanked the Commission for their feedback in December and summarized that parking and stormwater management were the primary challenges that they have been working to address with the ART. He emphasized the need for dry basins to be viewed as temporary basins as they may be great locations for future building footprints.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have greatly considered the building layout and the most prominent location for the building, treating Post Road and the current roundabout as the front door, positioning this towards the roundabout along with the future sister building proposed for the next phase. He explained that with the existing buildings and parking, the site is decreased and placing on road fronts is a challenge as they desire a campus atmosphere with future buildings that surround an oval.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the Commissioners how they wanted to address the conditions and it was determined to discuss them collectively.

Amy Kramb first stated that she liked the building the first time the applicant came in and still does. She said there had been improvement in the design of the parking lot since December. She noted that the landscape plan provided to the Commission looked different than the rendering on the slide, which Mr. Phillabaum addressed. She asked if there was room for two trees and still allow for the walking path in the islands running through the center of the parking lot.

Greg Chillog, Edge Group, [330 W. Spring St., Columbus, Ohio, 43212] said the island was large enough. Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when she scaled the drawing, it appeared to be about 12-feet wide, which Mr. Chillog responded it was larger than that.

Ms. Kramb would defer to others but it did not appear to be able to accommodate two trees with a sidewalk down the center of it, according to the plan she was referring to. She said she wants to make sure there is enough space for pedestrians. She expressed her appreciation for the islands that break up the "field". She questioned the phasing of the Pedestrian Connections Plan.

Mr. Chillog explained which portions were existing paths, which paths would be built with this phase, and highlighted two paths that were expected in a future phase.

Ms. Kramb asked how the bike path connection from the bike parking area was made to the existing bike path along Post Road. Mr. Phillabaum said there was no direct path connection due to several site constraints, but the expectation was that cyclists could use the private drive aisle from Post Road to access the path to the bicycle parking area.

Ms. Kramb asked why there were no connections to the existing lab and about driveways. Mr. Chillog clarified that it was a service area and not where students would be going in and out.

Ms. Kramb expressed her concern for the Tree Replacement condition; she asked if the trees could be replaced sooner rather than later. Mr. Phillabaum suggested they could put a time limit for the provision of additional trees. Ms. Kramb stated she did not want to leave it open ended. Mr. Phillabaum assured her there would be a deadline.

Ms. Kramb asked about the intent for future buildings in the dry basins. Mr. Ghidotti confirmed that would be a great location for another prominent building on Post Road. He said it was a dry pond vs a wet pond more for feasibility than aesthetics. Ms. Kramb said she understood the purpose; she wanted to see provisions on how it would be handled and how long it can be in that state. She cannot imagine the area looking very nice if in ten years from now, there was not a building on it.

Mr. Ghidotti reminded everyone that the EDA agreement with Ohio University requires that an overall Master Plan be completed and presented to the Commission, which was supposed to happen before this first phase. He recognized that they are proceeding out of order but expect the Master Plan will be complete this year.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there would be a discussion and vote when they receive the Master Plan. She said if that were the case, the Commission could focus in on this building and parking layout as part of the first phase. Mr. Langworthy said there was not a formal adoption process for an applicant's Master Plan; it would probably come to you for review and comment more than any formal adoption. He said once reviews and comments were incorporated into revisions, it would be used as a guide for the future development of the campus. Ms. Groomes asked if there would be a list of recommendations that the Commission would present and essentially, staff would be implementing those as best they could in a

final draft of the Site/Development Plan. Mr. Langworthy said he could drill down into this building but Ms. Groomes said the Commission's concerns were more with the big picture site.

Ms. Krumb concluded that the proposal looked great, but that it was difficult to envision how it will all build out in the future. She said she was fine with the parking adjustment.

Mr. Hardt said it was a decent application, heading in the right direction. He inquired about the parking that was being proposed, which was significantly larger than Code requires. He said the argument is that the quantity of parking spaces is needed for the use and noted the existing field of parking to the east that does not seem to be heavily used and asked if it was factored into the mathematics.

Mr. Ghidotti clarified that as part of the renovation process to the existing buildings, 120 existing parking spaces were being eliminated to create the campus green. He added that if this building were used as general or medical offices, they would typically park it at not less than 4.5 spaces per 1,000. He said Code requirements do not relate to a satellite campus/vocational school, most commuters coming to a school. He said that since they have not yet determined the use for the second and third floors of this building, they do not believe they have overstated their parking needs.

Mr. Hardt said he understood that argument was concerned with how future buildings will provide parking, and if they had considered an alternative to more surface parking, in their long-term plans.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if an analysis would come with the Master Plan. Mr. Ghidotti agreed they need to provide alternatives, which will be made with subsequent building phases.

Mr. Hardt said given the size of the campus and the availability of space, he does not support relief to the Tree Replacement requirement. He said the Open Space Trees requirement seemed excessive.

Mr. Hardt asked for confirmation that the loading space on the east side of the building was fully maneuverable. Mr. Ghidotti responded that Fire Marshal Perkins was comfortable with that area for maneuvering a ladder truck, so it should accommodate turning movements for most other trucks.

Mr. Hardt inquired about elevations that show banners and there were no mention of those in the report. Mr. Phillabaum said that signs are not being proposed with this application, but that Planning staff is working with OU on a Master Sign Plan for the campus and are expecting an application soon.

Mr. Taylor said he did not have anything to add to previous comments.

Ms. Newell said her comments were in the same areas as Ms. Krumb's. She said it did not make sense to her to not have a complete bike path connection up to Post Road. Mr. Ghidotti responded that there were grading issues and a water meter in that area that would not permit a direct connection. Ms. Newell did not feel this was appropriate for students and traffic to circulate around that campus as proposed. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that it did not need to be a straight line and proposed options be explored.

Ms. Newell commented on the dry basins having prominent locations next to street frontage and the landscape plan cuts off at those dry basins. She said a description of how those dry basins would be treated with plantings was necessary and that dry basins often become eyesores when they are not handled really well. She understood that they were being presenting as being temporary in nature but there was no determination of how long they would be temporary and would like to see those treated more sensitively in terms of landscaping like an amenity.

Ms. Newell said that with size of the campus and the very large, unlandscaped existing parking lot to the east, she was not supportive of paying fees in lieu of planting replacement trees as there were plenty of locations where these trees could be added. As to the Open Space Trees requirement, she said she could

not visualize that quantity of trees required by Code and is probably comfortable with a reduction, but asked what number of trees would be appropriate.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that further analysis of this provision was needed, but that the requirement may be more applicable to smaller sites with individual buildings as opposed to the creation of a large campus with multiple buildings.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated the rearrangement of the parking lot, but was concerned with the existing parking between the existing buildings and how that will be utilized. Mr. Ghidotti said there is a non-Ohio University tenant in that building with a lease through 2017; parking will continue to be shared. Ms. Newell asked if it could be limited from student parking as it is very difficult to circulate that lot. Mr. Ghidotti said there were continuing discussions related to parking and how as they are working thru the ground lease with OU, discussions about control over parking is an issue because OU wants to control parking and understands buildings will need to interrelate.

Mr. Budde complimented the applicant and staff for the enormous undertaking of this case in such a short period of time. He noted that he had reviewed the minutes from the numerous ART meetings regarding this case and agreed with fellow Commissioner's comments tonight. He also appreciated the applicant working with staff and coming to the Commission with just three items in each category. He said he was looking forward to the Master Plan and that the sooner it was available the better they would all feel. Mr. Ghidotti said that the ART would have been more comfortable if they had a Master Plan as well.

Ms. Amorose Grooms noted the dry basins may or may not be temporary in nature; dry basins are intended to stay dry and did not see that detail in these drawings. She said some of our most unsightly areas in the City are dry basins that were not draining well. She said the dry basins need to be constructed properly in a manner that they can easily be cleaned out and maintained.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if it was the intention of the applicant to have all of the existing buildings on site remain long-term. Mr. Ghidotti answered yes. She said they need to consider how this proposed building relates to the other buildings. She said she was looking forward to parking lot resolutions in the Master Plan, which might need to include structured parking.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she was sympathetic to the density of trees that is currently required by the Open Space Tree code provision. She said there were many locations for replacement trees and was not willing to give an entire fee in lieu of replacement trees. She said hallmarks of a great college feel are the arboriculture and tree canopy.

Mr. Phillabaum said staff believes there will be opportunities to accommodate replacement trees as additional phases of the campus are developed.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said because of the timeframe of the Master Plan, it would be nice to set aside the replacement trees in an account for use in future phases, and determine a deadline within which the trees would need to be replaced. She said she did not want to hold up the decision tonight but does not want to make the wrong long-term decision.

Mr. Phillabaum said there had been internal discussions about how this approach could work, but that they hadn't had proper time to work out the details.

Ms. Amorose Grooms agreed it needed to be addressed. She asked that creative ways be thought of to integrate that condition but did not preclude us from moving forward this evening.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the drawings/renderings appear to reflect that foundation plantings were not included around several portions of the building, and suggested that Code requires foundation planting. Claudia Husak said the Code requires additional site landscaping as a function of the building coverage, but it does not necessarily have to be located around the foundation of the building. Mr. Chillog said there was limited foundation planting around the building, occurring on the northeast corner and southeast corner next to the sidewalks.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said her concern was that the building would have turf directly up to the brick of the building at one of our major gateway corners. She said she would like to see the transition from ground plane to building softened with plant material. She noted the site was very juniper heavy and recommended alternate plant selections be looked at due to the disease and insect issues. She also requested that a more diverse plant palette be considered in general to provide more interest around the campus and more areas for planting annuals as well. Mr. Chillog said there were no annuals considered at this point in time but that they could be included in future phases of development. She questioned the extensive use of grasses on west and south sides of the building and suggested that a broader range of plant material be incorporated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked how wide the parking island was for a double row of Gingko trees because it did not appear to be enough room. Mr. Chillog said he believed it was a total of 22 feet wide, which would allow for seven to eight feet on either side of the sidewalk. She said she prefers to see trees staggered as the canopies will conflict. Mr. Chillog said the intent was to create a connected tree canopy above that walkway.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was really excited about this project and OU bringing this to Dublin was a huge win-win for both. She said we have a long way to go and wants OU aware of that when they are going through the Master Plan.

Motion and Vote – Site Plan

John Hardt moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to approve the Site Plan because it complies with the applicable criteria, with respect to the following:

- 1) Open Space Plantings
- 2) Parking Locations
- 3) Parking Adjustments

The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other comments. [Hearing none.] She asked the applicant if he agreed to the six conditions as written, to which Mr. Ghidotti agreed.

Motion and Vote – Development Plan

John Hardt moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to approve the Development Plan Review application because it complies with the applicable criteria, with six conditions:

- 1) That the parcels present in this portion of Subarea One be combined to create a cohesive campus parcel, eliminate building side yard setback issues, and resolve potential future building and pavement setback conflicts, prior to issuance of occupancy permits;
- 2) That the Landscape Plan be revised consistent with the comments provided in the Planning Report and by the Commission, subject to Planning approval, prior to issuance of site permits;

- 3) That the applicant work with staff to address the Tree Preservation requirements as part of the Master Plan;
- 4) That the applicant submit a lighting plan meeting all applicable Code requirements, subject to Planning approval, prior to issuance of site permits;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to provide a bike path connection from the bicycle parking area on the site to the public path along Post Road; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to ensure that the proposed dry basins are constructed in a way that they can be properly maintained in accordance with the comments made by the Commission.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

3. Metro Center – Crowne Plaza Hotel – Architectural Modifications
13-123AFDP **600 Metro Place North**
Amended Final Development Plan

Chair Chris Amorose Grooms introduced this Amended Final Development Plan application requesting architectural modifications to the Crown Plaza Hotel and Conference Center within the Metro Center Planned Unit Development District. The site is located on the north side of Metro Place North, 750 feet east of the intersection with Upper Metro Place.

Ms. Amorose Grooms swore in those who intended to address the Commission in regards to the case, including Russ Garber, Andrews Architects; and City representatives.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said a presentation would not be needed. Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if anyone was present from the public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote – Amended Final Development Plan

Richard Taylor moved, Victoria Newell seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan because it complies with the applicable criteria, with one condition:

That the canvas awnings be eliminated from the proposal and removed from the building.

Russ Garber agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Grooms said there is a scheduling conflict on March 6, 2014 due to the State of the City and it has been requested the meeting date be changed to Wednesday, March 5, 2014.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved, Amy Kramb seconded, to change the meeting date.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Husak asked the Commissioners to let her know if anyone plans to attend the APA National Conference in Atlanta, Georgia and stated that early bird registration begins February 27, 2014.

Ms. Husak said the Architectural Review Board is scheduled to review an application for a new single-family home on South High Street. She said upcoming City Council items include the Kroger Marketplace expansion, the Park Center application for parking and sign modifications, which was previously tabled in August, and a second reading of the Tech Flex Code modification.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Mr. Hardt confirmed neon signs were not permitted in the Code and noted several businesses in town using LED signs in the window, which mimic neon signs. Steve Langworthy said the Code states neon signs or neon look alike signs are not permitted. He said Planning is discussing a suitable method to allow some lighting that the use of LED provides, while trying to avoid the neon aspect of it. He reported Planning is reviewing this topic as part of an overall Zoning Code review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted emails about the traffic studies in the Bridge Street Corridor. Ms. Husak said she placed what was received from Engineering in the Dropbox. Ms. Kramb asked if there was any update to the traffic studies. Mr. Langworthy said the only update is a visual model of the operation roundabout volumes. Ms. Kramb asked if the model was going to be rerun for peak hour traffic volumes. Mr. Langworthy said it was not. He explained the numbers ran initially are higher capacity numbers than what is proposed on the site, because the initial model considered maximum development and impact. Ms. Kramb questioned the preferred alternative. Ms. Kramb said the alternatives analysis recommends three different alternatives, which she would like to see the preferred. Ms. Kramb said the projected traffic numbers clearly cannot include a complete buildout of 7000 units in the district. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested Engineering present the traffic studies at a meeting with a lighter agenda.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other roundtable issues. Ms. Newell announced she could not attend the February 20, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 20, 2014