



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 6, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD-SRN – Bridge Park, Block A
17-012MSP** **6520 & 6540 Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 2)**
- 2. PUD - Riviera, Sections 4-1 & 4-2
17-016FDP/FP** **8205 Avery Road
Minor Text Modification (Approved 7 – 0)
Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Final Plat (Approved 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:27 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Chris Brown, Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, Bob Miller, Amy Salay, and Deb Mitchell. City representatives present were: John Reiner, Vice Mayor; Phil Hartmann, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Aaron Stanford, Matt Earman, Shawn Krawetzki, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Victoria Newell stated there are two Commissioners up for reappointment: Cathy De Rosa and Bob Miller. She introduced and welcomed the City's Vice Mayor, John Reiner, to perform the Oath of Office. The Chair congratulated Ms. De Rosa and Mr. Miller for serving on this Commission.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to adjourn to an Executive Session for administrative business. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to reconvene the meeting. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to re-elect Chris Brown to serve as Vice Chair for the Planning and Zoning Commission. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)



Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to re-elect Victoria Newell to serve as Chair for the Planning and Zoning Commission. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the February 16, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the Riviera case this evening was eligible for the Consent Agenda but it was pulled at the request of the Commissioners. She determined the cases would be heard in the order they were published in the agenda.

**1. BSD-SRN – Bridge Park, Block A
17-012MSP**

**6520 & 6540 Riverside Drive
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is an amendment to an approved Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park, Block A for wall signs for the AC Hotel. She said the site is at the intersection of East Bridge Street and Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

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

Lori Burchett said the case tonight focuses on the north and south locations for the two Building ID Wall signs. She reported the applicant has removed the hotel bar sign proposed for the upper story, west-facing elevation from this application. She explained there are two options: 1) for a 144-square-foot ID sign with a frame around the letters; and 2) ID signs without the frame around the letters at 100 square feet for the south elevation and 70 square feet for the north elevation.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant stated the renderings did not accurately represent the color and character of the signs at the PZC meeting on March 16, 2017, and the colors are more similar and less drastic than the renderings portrayed so renderings have been revised for a more accurate representation. She presented Option 1 on the screen (with the frame) that is intended for the north elevation. She explained the rendering on the left was submitted as part of the package reviewed by the Commission at their previous meeting and the rendering on the right depicts a more true color against the paneling on the hotel. She added these are 144 square feet in size for both the north and south elevations. She then presented the south elevation revised rendering (with the frame). She presented Option 2 for both the north and south elevations with the old renderings on the left and the color corrected renderings on the right. She added the north elevation size is intended at 70 square feet and the one for the south would be 100 square feet in size.

Ms. Burchett reported the ART prefers and recommends the Option 2 version without the frame. She said they reviewed the application against the Master Sign Plan criteria and finds the proposal consistent. In addition, she stated the ART also finds the proposal consistent with the BSD Sign Guidelines in that it contributes to the vibrancy of the area, is pedestrian focused, and assists with navigation and

identification. She concluded her presentation by stating she and the applicant are available for questions.

Earl Lee, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street Columbus, Ohio, passed the sample sign material around to the Commission.

Amy Salay asked how the signs would be illuminated. Mr. Lee answered the signs would be internally illuminated with a perforated face. He explained that in the daytime, one could not tell there was any difference; the sign would appear as a monolithic, metal-framed sign but at night, the light from inside would be dialed up or dialed down for appropriate brightness that would appear through the perforations so it looks like it has face-lit letters.

Ms. Salay referred to the Master Sign Plan criteria #3 stating it does not meet the criteria as the sign is not unique but just large and high.

Ms. Burchett explained the ART and staff reviewed these signs against what was permitted generally with AC Marriott Hotels and how this varies from a corporate logo that we generally see. She said it is at the discretion of the PZC to really judge the criteria.

Ms. Salay said with the Dublin Northwest Marriott signs in mind, she inquired as to the size and if the circular logo is back-lit. She recalled it was 75 square feet permitted for freeway visibility. Chris Brown recalled that sign is 80 square feet in size.

Mr. Lee asked if the Commission has seen the typical brand standard for this AC Hotel. Ms. Salay said she did a Google search and found it to be large and aqua blue. Mr. Lee agreed the applicant did not want to put up such a bold sign for this area. He explained they have scaled back what they would have done per their documents – branding to provide thinner letters; clean, crisper appearance; and a contrast between the building and the actual letter face closer together for more subtlety while still staying within their brand. He noted the AC Marriott would not allow them to stray too far from their branding design.

Cathy De Rosa referred to a rendering in the Commission's packet that showed scale somewhat and asked if Staff could state how large the sign should be to still be effective. Ms. Burchett said the applicant provided a chart as part of the sign package.

Mr. Lee answered, realistically, the sign is undersized, given the revised subtlety of color. He said they ran the numbers and the outcome is due to the contrast being less, which makes the sign not as strong. He said one will be able to make out the "AC" but the other letters will be less distinguishable. Ms. De Rosa asked if there is latitude for the size of "AC" from where it is today because the letters are still pretty large. Mr. Lee replied he would certainly not go any smaller because of the thin width of the letters but based on the architecture, he would not go any larger, either. He explained the other letters in the sign will be most visible at night.

Ms. Salay said she drove south on Riverside Drive and did not see how any sign would be seen on the north elevation no matter how large it was, given the position of the building to the road, etc.

Deborah Mitchell reported she had several students drive by going north and south on Riverside Drive to look at that building in context while considering different approaches; the experiment was to distinguish wayfinding and they found it is a very distinctive building in relation to those adjacent. She added that students noticed there was a visible difference between traveling northbound versus southbound. She said she had students state the building would not need a sign because it is so distinctive, which is not the only criteria to consider. She indicated the typical need for wayfinding was not applicable given the unique area/situation.

Ms. Salay said when the Commission has considered large and high hotel wall signs in the past, it has always involved freeway frontage and now we have this different area in our city that happens to be much more pedestrian oriented. She concluded a sign of this size and height is not wayfinding but more of just a billboard and suggested the signs be brought down to the auto and pedestrian levels.

Mr. Brown said he did some research and found that 8 of the 12 renderings in the previous packets had signs and they were 257 square feet; he is glad they are not proposing that size because it is extremely large. He said he likes that the applicant made the signs more subtle but still does not like the box frame around the letters.

Mr. Brown said he appreciates the need for wayfinding but this new neighborhood is designed to bring a "sense of place", which means having landmarks. He said the Commission and our community will all know what the AC Marriott is but strangers and guests to our city do not. He indicated we are trying to build a landmark. He recalled it has been said that this building could be famous. If people do not know what the building is, he said it will not be famous because they will not know how to refer to it. He noted this is inherently a guest establishment and everything we are building in the Bridge Park Development is to attract people to the restaurants, night-life, community, park, and pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Brown agreed with Ms. Salay that this is a billboard as an advertisement for AC Hotel Marriott but it is not a bad thing for a business to be able to identify themselves and be a proud member of the community and part of the neighborhood. He suggested that everything the Commission is doing is a balance and they need to also consider consistency. The Crawford Hoying sign is up in Bridge Park he reported and it is a billboard as well as Mesh Fitness. In a way, he suggested that every sign is a billboard in a sense for that business to build an identity to inherently build upon their success. He indicated his view of signs has changed since serving on the Commission to where now he prefers smaller and more subtle signs but every business the city tries to attract and retain in this community, needs a way to identify and become a landmark entity within the community. If someone is building a wonderful featured prominent building that we all say "is really cool that we are getting that" he stated, the business should be proud of it and state what they are. He said he would rather hear people say "wow, that's a hotel and not an office building and that is where I want to stay next time!" He said they are going to frequent the restaurants in the area, will be out in the street, walking in the park, and visiting Old Dublin. He reiterated that we are trying to create a "sense of place" and he is all for the sign without the box frame.

Ms. De Rosa asked to consider the height. She reported she has driven up and down that stretch of road as well and if the sign is for wayfinding, what is the thought of lowering the height of those signs. Mr. Lee answered there are many different purposes for signs. He said he has been doing this for 22 years and explained the sign works at a wayfinding level that is nowhere near the base of the hotel. He asked the Commission to consider how many times they have found themselves in their car at a base of a hotel in downtown Columbus where they would not be looking for a sign on top of the building because the roof of the car is blocking the sightline. He said this sign is actually for acknowledgement that the hotel is here from a distance. He said it is a way to say it is a viable entity to use in the Dublin area. He said if the sign is not there and one never goes through that roundabout, they might not know that it even exists so they would never go there; they would go to the Marriott by the freeway because that is the only one they ever saw. He emphasized that is the premise for why the sign is proposed where it is. He said if the sign were to be lowered, it would be hidden by the surrounding development driving from the north to the south and currently it gets confusing as to what is what in the area because the condominiums look like they could be hotels. He added a sign like this is not needed in the roundabout, it is more for the distance driver and serves as a place marker and not a wayfinding element 500 feet away from the door.

The Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell stated she is definitely not in favor of the sign with the box around it. She said the location of the sign complements the architectural style of the building. She indicated she is struggling because of the residential property across the street and the amount of residents in Historic Dublin that will have a very clear view of this sign but there needs to be equity amongst all of our businesses and also considered the Marriott by the freeway.

Claudia Husak confirmed the "M" on the existing Marriott sign is 25 square feet with the text "Marriott" behind it, which is 35 square feet so in total it is 60 square feet in size and is 65 feet high.

Ms. Newell continued that when one is driving down the freeway, that sign is highly visible. She said the sign proposed is still going to be visible at a smaller size in the day and also at night when illuminated, especially when the proposed sign is not going to be viewed from the freeway; it will be viewed coming down SR 161, across the bridge at Bridge Street along Riverside Drive, and equally in close proximity to residential properties.

Ms. Newell referred to the criteria the signs need to be reviewed with and one of the reasons for allowing flexibility with signs in this area is also associated with the creativity associated with signs. She said the proposed sign is not quite meeting the appropriate creativity level when the applicant is trying to hang onto the corporate logo. She encouraged the applicant to come up with a better compromise. She restated she would accept the height because it fits here with the architecture.

Mr. Brown referred to the original records which proposed the sign at 257 square feet and now proposed at 100 square feet, which architecturally did not significantly impact it. He indicated the decrease in size did not diminish the overall look of the building so possibly the sign could be decreased another 20%. He restated how "hotel" text is not needed. Mr. Lee affirmed the text is the brand logo. He added that through this process with Dublin, AC Marriott is trying to figure out how to best represent themselves and the brand is in flux right now.

Mr. Lee tried to put the "M" from the other Marriott in perspective with the "A" in the proposed sign. He stated this new building is higher, the letter "A" in the proposed sign is thinner and smaller than the "M" for the other hotel.

Ms. Newell asked staff what the square footage of the proposed sign was without the box around it. She recalled Mr. Lee said the text "Hotels" is not always used so when one of the words is dropped out of that sign, the way it is measured, the sign is back closer in square footage without having to adjust the size of the "AC".

Ms. Salay asked if the sign read "AC Dublin", if the sign would get smaller. Mr. Stidhem said he questioned that because he was struck by the hotel in Barcelona, Spain where the sign reads "AC Barcelona". Ms. De Rosa noted the sign at the roundabout contains text "AC Dublin". Mr. Lee confirmed they have established that text for other signs at the base of the building; they do not follow their logo standard for their brand standards.

Allison Srail, 6640 Riverside Drive, said she is here on behalf of Crawford Hoying Development Partners. She noted on this sign in particular, we have strayed away from their brand in terms of color and thickness and she said she is concerned that if they go back to AC Marriott again, trying to take even more away from the brand that Marriott is not going to be happy. She said the compromise for removing the box and condensing the lettering is as far as Crawford Hoying can push Marriott. She affirmed AC Dublin was used at the ground level but she is not sure that is an option for at the top of the building.

Ms. Newell said she is not trying to control how the signs are branded. She said she agreed with Mr. Brown in that a businesses should be proud to display themselves.

Mr. Lee explained from a design sense, what is in the square footage has to be considered. He said they are not just trying to get a bigger sign but for it to be legible and to balance what is actually going to be on the building from a field/actual surface area standpoint as well as what the architecture calls for.

Mr. Stidhem asked for confirmation on the sizes for each of the south and north signs. He asked Mr. Lee if he was trying to maintain the ratio coverage. Mr. Lee said they are also trying to size it up per the location of the windows and where the breaks for the metal panels are going to be; a lot of alignment had to be considered as well as making it aesthetically pleasing. Realistically, he said he most cares about whether the "AC" is visible.

Mr. Brown said he has never disputed the negative space versus what is on the actual sign. He explained that since more creative signs are what is expected for Bridge Street, the Commission is here to judge every sign on how it actually presents itself and not just on technical dimensions.

Ms. Newell said she agrees 100%; the second option is more discreet than the first option. She added she is having to compare this to another Marriott Hotel that struggled with signage in our community albeit a while ago, none the less, we have other hotels that have faced the same issues. She emphasized how much she loved the building and how happy she is to have it here. She indicated it is going to be a great amenity within the city of Dublin but she wants everything equal between businesses. In this instance, she said it would be unfair to the other business to grant more square footage to this hotel for their signs.

Mr. Brown said that was a valid point. He said he has considered the lighting levels for the sign on the north side that is adjacent to apartments. He asked if a condition of approval could be added so the applicant works with staff on the lighting levels once the sign is in place.

Ms. Newell asked if this sign proposed has LED lighting. Mr. Lee confirmed all signs in this package are dimmable and if this sign is too bright, it will look like a laser beam due to the thin letters. He reiterated that the sign can be 'dialed up' or 'dialed down' depending on the effect desired.

Ms. Newell said she was happy to hear that because some of the LED lighting they have worked with has really been intense when over illuminated and they become hard to look at and could become temporarily blinding. Mr. Lee said he intends for this sign to have more indirect lighting because it will be coming through a perforated piece of metal and a frosted white acrylic lens. He added perforated metal will cut down almost 50% of the light.

Ms. De Rosa referred to the AC Barcelona picture that was included in the Commission's packet. Ms. Srail asked if Ms. De Rosa was going to request a similar sign that states AC Dublin. Ms. De Rosa referred back to the discussion about the Marriott still deciding how to define their brands. She said she is not advocating for a sign of this size but it is just different and has character. Ms. Srail remarked she thought this was the Marriott's first hotel. She said now one of the elements they have started to define is that their top sign on a building is their logo. While they are still being playful with how it is expressed, she said they are leaning more towards this box sign and we have already tried to take away from that.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the "AC Dublin" sign was explored with Marriott. Mr. Lee answered they did not explore it with them because by looking at one of their last hotels, the direction they are going with their brand is the clean box.

Ms. Mitchell indicated she did not see Marriott ever permitting a logo that did not state Marriott.

Mr. Stidhem said he is a loyal Marriott guy and the box says more that it is Marriott to him than without. He said he likes the way this looks on the north side because it is 70 square feet in size. He said he could get behind this proposal if the south version was also 70 square feet or something considerably smaller

than it is right now. If the sign at 70 square feet on the north side is big enough, he noted then it should be big enough on the south side, too. He explained that if he is walking around Shanghai, China and needs to find his Marriott, he is looking up to find it. He realizes there is a difference between there and Dublin, Ohio. He suggested that the sign not be as pronounced.

Mr. Brown said he concurs to have signs without the box and at 70 square feet each.

Mr. Miller said he has been quiet through this and to be fair to the applicant, they need to know where he stands. He said he is a very big fan of Option 2; signage is part of the character and personality of Bridge Park and he does not see this as a deterrent in any way, shape, or form. He said he believes it is part of the wayfinding system. He described two trips recently where he had GPS running in the car, and he wished he had the ability to visually pick off the hotel; it would have made their life a little easier. He said he could support this proposal at any sizes between 100 and 70 square feet.

Ms. Husak pointed out that the garage signs that were approved are at a maximum size of 100 square feet and the tenant wall signs for upper levels within the MSP approved for Bridge Park were at a maximum square footage of 80.

The Chair asked the applicant what the Commission should do this evening. She said the case could be tabled, the applicant could rethink the sign and come back with another option, or a formal vote could be taken this evening. She said if the decision is not to approve this, the applicant could not come back with this and the sign would have to fit within the current standards.

Mr. Brown said if 80 square feet is the standard then 80 on the south side would be fine and 70 for the north, with the adjustable lighting as a condition. Again, he said he is all for Option 2.

Mr. Stidhem said he would agree with that.

Ms. Newell said she thought the 80/70 option was a good suggestion with the condition.

Ms. De Rosa said she could get behind that.

Mr. Miller asked what the option is for the applicant if the Commission votes and there is a determination of "no". Ms. Husak answered the applicant could appeal that decision to City Council or they could file a new application and have it come back to the PZC.

Mr. Lee said this is a city we all want to be proud of and to be able to look at this and not feel like we made a mistake on anything in any way. He indicated the box or no box is his client's brand so he is a little biased on that but if the Commission believes the sign will be more beautiful without the box, he wants to know that.

Mr. Brown stated the architecture is very box-like and this sign without the box complements it; with the box around it, because of the architecture, or where it might work on some other buildings starts to fight some of those nice clean, crisp lines.

Ms. Newell said she agreed with that explanation.

Mr. Stidhem said he is pretty confident he is the only one that likes the box.

Mr. Miller said he really liked the box at the previous meeting but as he thought about this and the more he looks at the building, it seems better without the box and his reasoning is it is "in the eye of the beholder".

Mr. Lee clarified he would be comfortable with 70 square feet for the size of the sign proposed on the north side and 80 square feet on the south, and both designed without the box.

The Chair requested to see the conditions written.

Ms. Mitchell clarified she is not anti-signage; all the comments she made this evening have been in context with this building.

Ms. Burchett presented the conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the size of the Building ID sign on the south elevation to be 80 square feet; and
- 2) That the applicant work with staff after installation of the sign, to ensure lighting levels are appropriate for adjacent residents.

Mr. Lee agreed to the above conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Brown motioned, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with Option 2 for the hotel wall signs (Building ID sign without the frame at 80 square-feet on the south elevation and 70 square-feet on the north elevation) with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the size of the Building ID sign on the south elevation to be 80 square feet; and
- 2) That the applicant work with staff after installation of the sign, to ensure lighting levels are appropriate for adjacent residents.

*Earl Lee agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, no; Ms. Salay, no; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 – 2)

2. PUD - Riviera, Section 4-1 & 4-2 17-016FDP/FP

8205 Avery Road Final Development Plan/Final Plat

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposed subdivision and development of 48 single-family lots on 34.4 acres as part of Sections 4-1 and 4-2 of the Riviera Planned Unit Development. She said the site is on the west side of Avery Road, north of the intersection with Memorial Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Text Modification and a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 of which the Planning Commission is the final authority so the parties will need to be sworn in. She added this is also a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission in regard to the Final Development portion of this case.

Claudia Husak presented the last section of development for Riviera and noted the sections in the southern portion of the Riviera development, adjacent to the vacant 15 acres that were not included in the development that is near the high school. She explained Section 4, Part 1 contains 28 lots (138

through 185), a majority of which are located east and west of Timble Falls Drive in the western portion of the site. She stated Section 4, Part 2 contains 20 lots along the Corna Court cul-de-sac, west of Timble Falls Drive. Reserve N2 is included in this Section, which is approximately 15 acres of open space surrounding all lots in this Section and connects to Reserve N1.

Ms. Husak said the tree replacement plan was approved as part of the first phase of development in Riviera so it includes all the tree replacements within the development. She recalled there was a lot of discussion regarding the intent of what is being replaced in terms of creating this natural habitat in City-owned reserves so that maintenance is minimized and there is reforestation taking place. She said in the tree replacement plan of the development text, there is a requirement of replacements to be 2.5-inch caliper minimum and given the number of trees that are required to be replaced and in the amount of time available, there is a shortage of 2.5-inch trees at the diversity that is expected. She explained the applicant cannot find trees at that size and species that were recommended to be planted. She said survivability for smaller caliper trees has been discussed with Parks and Open Space and determined 1.5 to 2-inch trees would be a good solution; therefore, the text would need to be modified to permit up to 25% of the required deciduous tree replacements to be trees that are smaller than 2.5 inches.

Ms. Husak presented the plat drawing for Section 4, Parts 1 and 2 and explained staff is requesting that the applicant work with them to provide some additional evergreen buffering to the rear of those lots to help with some screening from the high school.

Ms. Husak concluded approval is recommended for the Minor Text Modification, the Final Development Plan and the recommendation of approval to City Council for the Final Plat with conditions.

Chris Brown confirmed the total number of caliper inches is the same. He asked what species of trees are in short supply and what proportion of the replacement trees that is.

Ms. Husak said the percentage is 25%.

Matt Earman added that when they discussed this with the applicant, Parks requested a diversity of species. He said if too many of one species of trees is planted, the trees become vulnerable to a lot of things so to create the more natural wood lot, species diversity is enormous, which has also been expanded since the original submission. He said he could not recall exactly what the shortage is but the 2.5-inch caliper of tree is almost impossible to find in the hundreds we are considering here. He explained a smaller caliper tree will grow more rapidly in the beginning and will actually surpass those that are planted at the larger caliper, depending on the species. He said it is important to provide canopy coverage to keep the invasive species out. He affirmed they are trying to create a natural wooded lot that would not need to be mowed, etc.

The Chair asked the applicant if they wanted to make a formal presentation. Diane Marin, EMH&T, answered she was present just to answer any questions.

The Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this application.

Kelly Darrow, 6461 Greenstone Loop, inquired about the land between the high school and the houses. She asked who maintains that property. Ms. Husak answered the owner but since the lot is larger than an acre, it is not required to be mowed in its entirety.

The Chair closed the public portion of the meeting since nobody else wants to speak.

Ms. Husak reported staff visits this development 2 – 3 times per week and the developers have been very receptive and worked very carefully to ensure that everything is done per plan from what the PZC and

Council have approved given the political sensitivity in this area and staff has not received a single call from an adjacent resident once the building came down and that danger was gone.

Mr. Brown and Mr. Miller said they appreciated hearing that information.

Ms. De Rosa said the design and flow of the layout and the way the reserves co-mingle with the houses is quite lovely and it feels very nice with the natural forests and ponds, etc.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Miller seconded to approve the following Minor Text Modification:

1. Up to 25% of required deciduous replacement trees are permitted to be installed at sizes of 1.5 to 2.5 caliper inches.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to provide buffering along the rear of the lots on Corna Court; and
- 2) That the applicant clarify the proposed island within the Corna Court cul-de- sac, create a reserve to be maintained by the HOA, and coordinate any proposed landscaping with staff.

*Diane Marin, EMH&T, agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. Mitchell seconded to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Final Plat with the following condition:

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

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak introduced Shawn Krawetzki, new landscape architect for Parks and Recreation, and indicated he will most likely be the one that is presenting Parks' projects seeking approval from the PZC.

Ms. Husak said for the joint Work Session with City Council on April 17, packet materials should be delivered April 7.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:56 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 4, 2017.