



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

MAY 5, 2016

AGENDA

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Deer Run, Subarea A
15-120FDP/PP/FP | Deer Run Drive
Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 0)
Preliminary and Final Plats (Approved 4 – 0) |
| 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C
16-028MSP | Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0) |

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Deborah Mitchell, and Stephen Stidhem. Victoria Newell and Cathy De Rosa were absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Philip Hartmann, Tim Lecklider, Logan Stang, Nichole Martin, Aaron Stanford, Alan Perkins, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the April 7, 2016, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said certain cases on tonight's agenda may be approved by consent. He stated Case 1 – Deer Run is eligible for consent tonight. He asked if anyone from the public intended to speak with regard to Case 1. He determined the case should be removed from the consent agenda and reviewed in its entirety.

Mr. Brown said the cases would be heard in the published order from the agenda and recorded in the minutes as such. He recused himself from the first case as there was a conflict of interest. He stated Commissioner Miller would run this portion of the meeting.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Deer Run, Subarea A
15-120FDP/PP/FP | Deer Run Drive
Final Development Plan/Preliminary and Final Plats |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Bob Miller said the following application is a proposal for the subdivision and development of four, single-family lots and streets as part of the Deer Run Subdivision in Subarea A of the Deer Run Planned Unit Development District. He said the site is on the east side of Dublin Road and 300 feet north of Memorial Drive. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Miller swore in anyone intending to address the Commission regarding this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and explained the PUD consists of three Subareas – A, B, and C. He noted that only Subarea A is associated with this application, located on the north, adjacent to the Kerry Glen subdivision. He presented the proposed Site Plan and explained Subarea A includes the plating of four single-family properties and the extension of a private drive. Two of the proposed lots he said are already developed with single-family homes leaving the remaining land to the east, along the river, available for the additional two lots. He said the development contains a single access point from Dublin Road that is located in Subarea B, which contains a gated entry feature. He said the homes are custom built and will require review and approval by a Design Committee created by the homeowners association. He stated the site is heavily wooded and Deer Run runs through the southern portion of Subarea A and has a large floodplain that extends into both Subareas A and B.

Mr. Stang presented the Tree Protection/Removal Plan. Due to the wooded nature of the site, he said the development was approved for a Tree Waiver holding the developer liable for replacing any tree removed that the diameter is greater than 18 inches and trees removed from common open space or rear yards that are between 6 inches and 18 inches in diameter. He said this proposal outlines the trees impacted by the extension of Deer Run Drive; and tree removal from the two remaining properties will be reviewed at the building permit stage. Based on the Tree Waiver and this proposal, he stated, the applicant is required to replace a total of 258 caliper inches.

Mr. Stang presented the Landscape Plan that outlined a total replacement of 82.5 caliper inches due to site constraints. He reported the applicant will be required to pay a Fee-in-Lieu of replacement for the remaining inches, prior to filing for building permits.

Mr. Stang presented the Preliminary and Final Plats for the four lots. He noted the plat outlined the private access and utility easement where Deer Run Drive is located and where all utility services are provided to the existing and proposed properties. He explained a reserve is located on the west side of the site, adjacent to Dublin Road that provides common open space for the development and is a requirement of the development text. He said this reserve along with the private drive will be maintained by a homeowners association that will consist of Subareas A and B. Subarea C has a separate HOA he said.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to submitting for building permitting.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Bob Miller inquired about the gate that is fairly close to Dublin Road and if there was any discussion about potential stacking. He indicated with four houses, he did not anticipate a problem. Mr. Stang said stacking outside the gate has not been a concern as it is far enough away from the right-of-way, per Engineering.

Aaron Stanford explained for that type of use and intensity it was not a concern, similar to the situation at the southern edge of Deer Run.

Steve Stidhem suggested that more than the four lots would feed off that gated entry. Mr. Stang said Subarea B can only have 5 lots so a total of 9 lots would use that gate.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about sidewalks. Mr. Stang said sidewalks are not a requirement for a private drive.

Mr. Miller invited the public to speak with regard to this case.

Susan Linwood, 5033 Glenaire Drive, said her house is located right next to this site in the Kerry Glen Subdivision. She asked how many trees would be cut down as she was concerned about the noise and dust that would generate. She said it will also change her view off of her patio.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed Site Plan again to locate her house specifically. He explained the majority of work would occur east of her property. He said there will still be a buffer right behind her house.

Roger Curry, 10820 Edgewood Drive, asked the Commission if they had seen the property.

Mr. Miller responded the property is awesome and a beautiful piece of property without a doubt.

Mr. Curry indicated it is a forest that contains upwards of five mega trees and this is unique. He said he was concerned about the trees that would possibly replace these mega trees.

Mr. Stang restated the applicant is responsible for replacing 258 caliper inches based on the Tree Waiver and the Code requirements.

Mr. Curry said he and his wife enjoy the property and the wildlife that appear. He said this property is special and historic. He said Dublin is green and this should be preserved. He said this property could include a canoe livery and walking paths because there are no places like it and asked the Commission to consider alternatives.

Jerry Ellis, 10815 Edgewood Drive, said the majority of his property abuts the driveway extension. He noted the scale of the plans are very small and difficult to read but found the driveway will run through the drip line of his Chinquapin Oak, which is on the Dublin Register of trees and has the green tag attached to it. He said some of the farmer's fence has grown into some of the bark on the south side. He said he is concerned about any roadway development in the vicinity of that tree that would be a 50-foot area under the drip line of the tree. He indicated the trunk of the tree is 11 feet in circumference and the drip line is out about 20 – 30 feet. He said at that location at the crest of the hill, that is where the driveway will begin to curve. He asked that the driveway be moved over. He said he and his wife have lived there for 29 years and enjoys the tree. He explained it produces little tiny acorns that the squirrels like to eat. He concluded it is a tree worth preserving.

Mr. Miller said he does not know of what tree Mr. Ellis is speaking of. Mr. Stang said he did not know the specifics of that tree either but the applicant has worked closely to preserve as much along that buffer as possible and to maneuver the road as far south as they can to preserve as many landmark and full-grown trees in the area as possible. He said the City's Zoning Inspectors will be out to the site monitoring the roadway extension to ensure the trees are being protected and cared for.

Mike Close, 7360 Bellaire Avenue, said he has lived there for 36 years and is as familiar with the property as anybody with the exception of the Vice Chair who is the property manager and that is why he had to recuse himself.

Mr. Close referred to the Planning Report with two conditions. He said the first is the correction of the Plats; that has already been done. He said the second is the payment of the tree preservation fee and he has that check in hand. He said obviously, they consent to the conditions. He indicated he understands where the neighbors are coming from. He said nobody will be touching the ravine where there might be Indian remains. He said when the elf lights are on down in the ravine at night, it is one of the most impressive sites he has ever seen in the City of Dublin. He said it was actually a tree farm originally and thought the Walter family had planted ±20,000 trees over time. He stated he has worked closely with Staff to preserve trees and is willing to make any adjustments they may need to make to ensure the trees are preserved. He said the more trees, the more value to the property. He emphasized that they work with Staff to consider drip lines, etc. that may be impacted during construction.

Mr. Close reminded the Commission that the function of the submission of the Final Development Plan is to merely ensure that it is in compliance with the Preliminary Development Plan and there have been no changes to that plan. He said any changes that have been made have been requested by the City.

Amy Salay asked Mr. Stang to point out Mr. Ellis' house on the proposed Site Plan. Mr. Stang indicated that property was not called out on this plan but pointed to where the Ellis house is located.

Ms. Salay said she thought the road is far enough away from the Oak tree in question to which Mr. Stang agreed.

Ms. Salay said she was concerned about preserving the tree line on the north side. She said she would hate for any neighbor adjacent to construction to lose a tree. She suggested an on-site meeting with construction folks, the City Forrester, and the neighbors would go a long way.

Mr. Close said that is exactly what the applicant did for Subarea C.

Ms. Salay said she would appreciate having that meeting written as a condition to which Mr. Close agreed.

Mr. Stidhem indicated the road might need to be moved to accommodate trees. Mr. Close said that is not unusual. He said the applicant may be back for a minor adjustment to the Final Development Plan anyway when the buyers decide how they want their houses situated.

Mr. Miller asked Ms. Husak to write in a condition.

Mr. Miller reported he walked the property on Sunday, walked all the way back by the river and found the property to be spectacular.

Mr. Close clarified that the property does not go all the way down to the river as the City owns that portion.

Mr. Miller closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Stang presented the second condition that was added to the Final Development Plan:

That the applicant and Staff work with adjacent residents to field locate tree protection fencing and coordinate minimizing the impacts on trees adjacent to existing properties.

Mr. Miller called for comments from the Commission.

Mr. Stidhem said he noticed that the City had land there. He stated he appreciated the public comments. He said the City does a tremendous job with parks and open space.

Mr. Miller said when he was on the property, there were a couple of guys fly fishing on the river. He noted when he came down the hill, the view was like what could be found in a movie.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to submitting for building permitting; and
- 2) That the applicant and Staff work with adjacent residents to field-locate tree protection fencing and coordinate minimizing the impacts on trees adjacent to existing properties.

Mr. Close agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to recommended approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensure any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C 16-028MSP

Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Master Sign Plan

The Vice Chair, Mr. Brown, said the following application is a proposal for an amendment to a previously approved Master Sign Plan to include parking garage signs for a new 8.2-acre, mixed-use development east of Riverside Drive, ±430 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street and south of the intersection with (future) Bridge Park Avenue. He said this is a request for review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Vice Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission regarding this case.

Nichole Martin said the applicant has a presentation of their own but would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Joell Angel-Chumbley, 1176 Overlook Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45238, said with the two options, she wanted to give a background on the changes since they last presented to the PZC. She said there is a primary Parking Marquee sign on Longshore Street at the C4/C5 buildings and on Banker Drive on buildings B4/B5, and secondary Parking Marquee signs to coordinate.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley presented the sign location map to note they will be showing a video of the approach on Longshore Street from a car view.

Chris Brown noted the biggest concern before was the overall size of the PARK sign so he suggested she dwell on that during her presentation.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley said they reduced the size of the primary Parking Marquee signs from 150 square feet to 100 square feet. She said the secondary Parking Marquee signs were reduced from 42 square feet to 32 square feet on the one option and from 42 square feet to 28 square feet on the other. She said they have eliminated the text "PARK" and focused on the circle "P".

Ms. Angel-Chumbley indicated they added whimsy to the design. She presented the interior of the parking garage to show the graphic package; the pattern was inspired by the (future) pedestrian cable bridge. She said the grid represents a typographic view of Dublin and the triangles represent the assets of the City. She said Bridge Park is an integrated neighborhood inside of downtown so the graphic system developed with Crawford Hoying and the City for the parking experience reflects the design. She said the interior pattern is reflected in the exterior pattern linking the inside to the outside.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley presented design option #1, which is also the recommended design of the ART. She pointed out the primary and secondary signs that differ in size/scale. She noted the circle "P" is the primary message, especially when illuminated at night with LED lighting. She said lighting has been added so the word "Longshore" can be read from a distance. She said they performed research to show how much light would actually be radiated from the interior of the parking garage and discovered there is a lot more shadowing than anticipated so they believe it is important to light the signs as much as they are.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley presented design option #2, where the lighting is more contained to the face of the sign. She noted there is less pattern and the design is more about the identification of the circle "P" and the text "Longshore". She said the pattern is more secondary in this option. She described the sign as being a wedge coming off the edge of the building. She said there is no edge light on this design but will be lit front and back, illuminating the blue vertical striping that is seen in the daylight.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley presented the city-wide comprehensive wayfinding system that they are connecting back to aesthetically. She presented the new design for the façade of the parking garage along with the family of other signs to show the relationship within the whole comprehensive wayfinding system.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley presented the video and pointed out the signs approaching the Longshore Street garage. She said the series of wayfinding signs will align with the other architectural elements in the streetscape.

Mr. Brown inquired about light pollution for the apartments across the street. Ms. Angel-Chumbley said the light will not be really bright; it will be more of an edge glow and the fabricator can adjust the amount of light.

At the conclusion of the applicant's presentation, Ms. Martin asked to go through the ART's recommendation.

Ms. Martin reported that the ART's recommendation is design #1. She explained the way design #2 would play out in the environment is not necessarily the way it is depicted on the screen. She said design #2 is rather dark and the way the streets are oriented and the shadows that are going to be cast by the garage, both during the day and at night, the ART determined that design #1 is most appropriate. She

said there are strengths to each design but #1 really incorporated both the city-wide wayfinding, the Bridge Park wayfinding, and the placemaking element.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an approved MSP containing all approved signs for Blocks B and C to Planning, prior to sign permitting including an updated General Regulations Matrix, sign location elevations, and approved parking garage marquee signs; and
- 2) That the applicant provide additional lighting for the interior of the primary sign in design #1.

Mr. Miller asked the applicant which design they preferred. Ms. Angel-Chumbley answered there are strengths to both designs. She indicated the first design will be a little bit more obvious during the daytime and will have more vibrancy at night due to the lighting of the parking garage. The second design she said the circle "P" would be seen from a distance more than anything else about the sign. She said if the circle "P" is what you want to focus on, design #2 is best but if you want to pull the pattern from the interior to the exterior, it helps tie the city system with the Bridge Park experience, therefore design #1 is the choice. She indicated the graphics planned for the inside of the garages are really cool to welcome the visitor to the garage. She said they want the garage to be an experience, in spite of it being a garage and the beautiful murals should help with that also building on the grid pattern for the City. She said the ART's recommended choice is probably the applicant's preference.

Deborah Mitchell said design #1 is great from a branding perspective. She indicated that everything that Ms. Angel-Chumbley said, she immediately picked up upon. She reiterated that she is a big fan of design #1.

Mr. Stidhem said he asked for feedback in his workplace and it was a 50/50 split. He said even additional designs were suggested. He said the second design is easier to see if he is not a frequent visitor of the area. He inquired about the LED lighting; it can be really harsh.

Blake Kishler, 807 Broadway Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202, said the light will be diffused.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, added context to the signs.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about color coding. Ms. Angel-Chumbley said even from the outside, one can see the colored levels. She said blue is the parking color but it is also the Bridge Park brand color. She said the first level will be the blue level as the welcome level. She indicated a lot of thought went into developing the brand out as a connective element to the existing city brand and experience. She said they talked about Bridge Park being a neighborhood asset to the City, part of a mosaic of a broader experience. She said the iconic (future) pedestrian bridge was an inspiration.

Mr. Stidhem said his concern was which entrance he should enter. He said if one is not familiar with the area and might have been turned around by shopping etc, will one be able to identify which garage they came out of.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley said the outside will be identified through nomenclature so on the canopy of the garage there will be 18-inch letters that state "Longshore Street" along the canopy so at street level it will be visible in/out as well as the vertical marquee sign. She said the garages will not be differentiated by color but instead by nomenclature.

Mr. Stidhem said he was impressed with all the thought that went into this proposal. He said it was a great idea to tie-in with the design of the (future) pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Salay inquired about the lighting that was added for design #1. Ms. Martin explained there was discussion at the ART with respect to how the two sign packages were similar/different, and strengths/weaknesses of each. She said Engineering had noted that it was critical that people be able to identify which garage they were coming in/out of. She said the two garages straddle two of the same streets so they are both located in between Mooney Street and Longshore Street. She emphasized the visibility of the name for each garage was important. She said due to the light study, it was determined that not enough light would be cast onto the sign from the interior deck of the parking garage, hence the request for additional lighting.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley said the applicant built on the ART's recommendation before presenting to the PZC this evening.

Ms. Salay stated she really likes design #1, especially the way it is being illuminated at night with the triangles lit and likes the lighting on the side as long as it is subdued. She agrees the parking garage needs to be identified but she does not want it to be blinding if one is in their office or adjacent residence. She said she was excited about this sign package and she does not get excited about signs very much.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley stated the goal is to make sure that the sign integrates well with the architecture and the applicant does not want it to be about the sign but by the holistic building and if the signs fit thoughtfully with other elements in the streetscape.

Ms. Mitchell said she thought the sign package that was a functioning element is very artful and welcoming.

Mr. Brown described the sign package as sophisticated and eclectic.

Mr. Miller said he likes design #1 and thanked the applicant for their diligence because the PZC slowed down the process.

Mr. Brown said he liked design #1 much better. He said he has to memorize why the grid and the triangles exist so he can explain it to all the guests. He noted it was interesting that the triangles act like arrows pointing down to the entrance but our (future) iconic bridge is kind of an up arrow design.

Mr. Brown asked if any of the Commissioners had any issues with the sizes as they have dwelled on that a lot in the past.

Ms. Salay said she believes they got it right.

Mr. Brown said adequate lighting is needed for safety but at the same time, if one looks up from a street level into the lights shining down, it becomes glaring. He said he hopes the interior lighting of the garages are carefully placed with consideration of that so lighting does not read heavily from the street.

Mr. Starr reported extensive photometric tests have been conducted and they have met the Code; they are not excessive in any way. He said they have debated painting the ceiling white because it could make the garage feel bigger and safer but they have not landed on that yet; that would make it brighter from the outside as well.

Mr. Brown suggested it is important to have a dynamic element on the outside of the garage. He said he comes from the Indianapolis area where they incorporated banners. He said Dublin has annual festivals

etc. where we get concerned about signs. He said a garage engages the street. He encouraged adding banners for the Memorial Tournament or the Irish Festival to add life and vitality.

Mr. Stidhem said he likes design #1 as did Ms. Salay and Mr. Miller.

Ms. Mitchell said she loves the plan as it has come a long way and she never thought she would be so excited about parking signs.

Mr. Brown called for a motion to approve a Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an approved MSP containing all approved signs for Blocks B and C to Planning, prior to sign permitting including an updated General Regulations Matrix, sign location elevations, and approved parking garage marquee signs; and
- 2) That the applicant provide additional lighting for the interior of the primary sign in design #1.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with two conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Planning Items

Ms. Husak said, based on the work session City Council conducted in April for the Bridge Street developments going on (Riverside Park Master Plan) it is now the intent to have the Master Plan for the park be scheduled for adoption by Council as a resolution at their meeting on May 23rd. She said as part of that, we are going to have to amend the Community Plan afterwards to show land that currently is not shown as parkland in that area so that is something the Commission can expect to see. She said that would call for a recommendation to City Council to adopt the future land use map of the area plan in the Historic District to include additional land in the Master Plan for the park. She indicated then Council will start the review of the Basic Plan for parks pieces.

Ms. Husak said staff wrote a follow-up memo and materials to Council included in their packet which also answered the Commission's questions as a follow-up. She indicated as soon as Council has received that information, it will be shared with the Commission.

Communications

Ms. Husak said there is only one planning application for the PZC to review on May 19th, which is the next section of Riviera. She said Staff would like to use the available time for presentations: 1) Economic Development – by Rachel Ray in her new capacity as an Economic Administrator; and 2) Engineering – by Tina Wawzkiewicz to provide an overview of the street network in the Bridge Street District as well as safe biking in the City.

Ms. Husak said Greg Dale will provide training to all the Boards and Commissions as a consolidated evening on June 23rd. She said the training would be held at the 5800 building on Shier Rings Road to provide dinner and a more informal platform. She said Chair and Vice Chair training would be offered from 5:00 pm to 6:00 pm, dinner at 6:00 pm, and training provided by Mr. Dale would begin at 6:30 pm. She encouraged the Commission to suggest training ideas that could be incorporated.

Steve Stidhem said he would like to talk about more of the planning side and solar panels - how they can be incorporated into our planning as a City. He said he is seeing it on a few houses but it is the exception rather than the rule and it is one of the things he is passionate about.

Bob Miller asked if training with City Council was still slated for May 16th. He said on May 19th, he will be attending AIA and will not be available for that evening's training.

Amy Salay said City Council and the Commission used to get together several times a year to talk about a subject or the various development happening in the City but also to get better acquainted on a personal level. She suggested green initiatives could be discussed at a dinner beyond May 16th because that is one of Council's goals for 2016. She said there are two things she hopes to get accomplished on May 16th. She said one topic is the ART; Council wants to learn how their process works, what is working/what is not, and when it comes into play as it has been around for a few years. Mr. Papsidero confirmed the ART began in 2012. Ms. Salay said the second topic for May 16th is to discuss signs and architecture overall. Ms. Husak said she would coordinate the logistics with Anne Clarke as it would be held at City Hall and a dinner is included.

Chris Brown inquired about a broader issue - for every single-family residence built there is a net cost or gain of dollars. Ms. Salay said Council had discussed that topic and they prefer that the PZC not consider the economic development component when reviewing applications.

Mr. Brown said the other part of what Mr. Stidhem brought up was sustainability including types of materials and methods, etc., which is near and dear to his heart. He indicated there is a life-cycle cost to every building but recognizes that some buildings are not meant to last 200 years and some are not meant to last just 3 years but that is a case by case analysis of the structures.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about traffic and if Frantz and Post Roads could be included in the presentation by Engineering.

Vince Papsidero said along with the Intersection Study that is going to be starting soon there is also the Western Roads Alignment Study on the north side of Bridge Street and of course the Framework Study, which can all be part of that conversation.

Mr. Miller inquired about the cut-thru road in Riviera that is bothering him because the developer does not want it but it is going to happen. Phil Hartmann recommended that topic not be discussed this evening. Ms. Husak said it is going to get addressed in the materials provided to the Commission for the meeting on May 19th because the application for Section 3 includes that road that connects to Firenza, which was conditioned in the rezoning - that the connection not take place until the Hyland-Croy connection is in place.

Mr. Miller asked if that road could be eliminated at this stage. Ms. Husak answered no.

Mr. Brown called for any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.] He adjourned the meeting at 7:51 p.m. and said the next meeting for the Commission will be May 19, 2016.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 19, 2016.