



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 5, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Way at 6:30 PM at 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed attendees and noted that the meeting could be joined in person or accessed via livestream on the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Way led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Gary Alexander, Jamey Chinnock, Kathy Harter, Kim Way
Hilary Damaser arrived at 6:38 PM and Jason Deschler arrived at 7:12 PM.

Staff members present: Bassem Bitar, Thaddeus Boggs, Cameron Burrell, and Tina Wawskiewicz

Also present: Mark Wood and Tyler Puhl, The Wood Companies

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Garvin seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the January 15 and January 22, 2026 meetings.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes;.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

Mr. Way explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when platting and property rezoning is under consideration, with Council receiving recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has final decision-making responsibility.

He outlined the meeting procedures: applicants present first, followed by staff analysis and recommendation, Commission questions, public comment, then Commission deliberation. No new agenda items would be introduced after 10:30 PM. Speakers were asked to use the microphone and keep comments to 3 minutes.

Anyone intending to address the Commission was sworn in by Mr. Way.

CASE REVIEW

Case #25-090AFDP

Vista Church Pickleball Courts – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with a text modifications to allow outdoor recreational courts. The 6.63-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Vista Community Church.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Harter seconded tabling of Case #25-090AFDP

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

Case #25-093PDP

Monterey Square – Preliminary Development Plan

Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood, and is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Wood, 3055 Glenwood Parkway, Columbus, thanked the Commission and expressed excitement about sharing updates to their Monterey Village development plan. He stated that their goal was to advance a development that would be both a destination-worthy development and a prized community asset for Dublin residents. He described the vision as a high-character, pedestrian-focused community gathering spot featuring sophisticated yet approachable retail, where he would want to spend time with his family and friends.

Tyler Puhl, President, Wood Company, 2536 West Lane Avenue, Columbus, explained their goal was not to create just another commercial development but a true village center that always felt like it should have been in Dublin. He emphasized the organizing idea was envisioning the public space as a community gathering space, layered with first-class architecture and historic materials familiar to visitors, shoppers, and residents.

Mr. Puhl detailed the project, stating they were proposing 140,000 square feet broken down into small buildings to create a built-over-time feeling. He explained the development would intentionally transition from a two-story atmosphere along Bridge Street down to the square, then flow to one-story backs of buildings F and E2 into the residential neighborhood. He highlighted they were dedicating or making non-developable almost three-quarters of an acre, demonstrating their commitment to working with Dublin.

He described their vision for Monterey Drive as a neighborhood main street that Dublin does not really have, different from High Street which has significant vehicular traffic. He noted parking would be secondary but usable, with the project designed to grow into future connections toward Corbins Mill. He explained they had added more second-floor space per the Commission's previous feedback, with buildings A, B, and C along Bridge Street intended for office space serving small users and professional services. The garage design had changed from two stories to three stories, creating opportunities for second-floor office or retail/restaurant uses.

Mr. Puhl outlined changes from the Concept Plan, including elimination of the service road behind the garage to create an 18-foot buffer zone for tree protection near the cemetery, increased height and second-floor use along Bridge Street, expansion of Monterey Drive's right-of-way from 50 to 60 feet, addition of a pedestrian cut-through in building E, false second stories around the square, and nearly 200 percent increase in pedestrian space in the square by removing the roadway.

He presented various renderings showing the two-story expression with white brick and white stucco materials in the style of Palisades Village in California, transitioning to more historic materials on the back of the site. He highlighted special features including decorative stairways with tile risers and interesting railings, similar to Highland Park Village in Dallas. The streetscape would feature concrete curbs without pavers on the roadway but with brick pavers along sidewalks matching the Dublin church frontage.

Mr. Puhl emphasized the central green space as the anchor of the project, with the code minimum of 2,500 square feet being exceeded by ten times. He expressed concern that adhering too closely to code requirements might push them toward a one-story pitched roof outlet mall, which nobody would want. He stressed their willingness to invest in creating a lasting environment focused on architectural quality, open space, and pedestrian-focused walkability.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation. He explained that this is a part of a multi-step review process. He noted the Commission had seen a Concept Plan in June during the non-binding feedback stage, and this Preliminary Development Plan requires determination and approval but is not the final step. Following approval, the project would move to Final Development Plan stage with Preliminary and Final Plats.

Mr. Bitar described the site location on both sides of Monterey Drive south of Bridge Street, including a City-owned parcel at the southeast corner where a gas station once stood. The proposal includes trading the City-owned parcel for land at the southeast corner for future cemetery expansion. He explained the various zoning districts surrounding the site, with the cemetery to the east in Historic Public zoning, three parcels fronting Corbins Mill in the Bridge Street Commercial District; and the southern cemetery portion in Bridge Street Public.

He reviewed the future land use designation as Mixed-Use Village, intended to create a pedestrian-oriented district respectful of the adjacent Historic District, with principal uses being office, retail, civic, single-family commercial, and food establishments. Supporting uses includes multi-family, with the form being one to three stories, emphasizing open space and walkability with parking as secondary.

Mr. Bitar reviewed the feedback from the Concept Plan review, noting the Commission had supported the overall layout and open space and appreciated the communication with neighbors. Concerns had been raised about the primarily retail/restaurant focus, which led to the addition of office components. Traffic and connectivity concerns had also been discussed, including the potential need for a signal at the Bridge Street and Monterey Drive intersection.

He detailed changes, including a traffic study that indicates a signal would be warranted; the 18-foot buffer on the east side with no curb cuts to preserve trees and respect the cemetery, and adjustments to street characteristics. He acknowledged staff's preference would have been for the parking structure on the west side but understands the site geometry challenges. The east-west connector is now designated as a public street rather than private, and streetscape elements differ slightly from Bridge Street District standards but remain consistent with the surrounding Historic District.

Mr. Bitar reviewed compliance with plans and code requirements, noting all proposed uses were permitted within the Historic Transition Neighborhood. Parking calculations indicate compliance with code requirements pending finalization of a parking plan at Final Development Plan stage. He identified several potential waivers including block length and perimeter exceeding limits; required building zone requirements for building E1; minimum front property line coverage falling slightly short for buildings E2 and F; lot coverage exceeding limits especially on the east side; parking structure setback concerns; and pedestrian way spacing requirements.

He discussed open space provisions, with the town square meeting plaza open space type requirements and exceeding minimum open space size. The code's promotion of connectivity among open spaces was achieved through pedestrian ways creating connections from Bridge Street through the development to the park.

Regarding landscaping and tree preservation, Mr. Bitar noted many healthy trees on site would need removal to create the urban streetscape, but code promotes preserving as many as possible. He encouraged examining opportunities to preserve more trees, especially along the west property line where pavement comes within feet of the property line and underground storage tanks might affect critical root zones. He noted there is a minimum 10-foot buffer requirement for the single-family residential structure on the southwest corner.

For building types and architecture, Mr. Bitar explained the historic Mixed-Use building type had minimum requirements of one and a half stories and maximum of two and a half, with the proposed buildings along Bridge Street and east side meeting the requirements except for the smaller components. Buildings around the square would technically require height waivers, as they are one story with false second floors. Most buildings exceed the maximum 12-foot, first-story ceiling height with proposed 16-foot ceilings, which requires waivers.

He expressed staff concerns about the proposed buildings around the square having significant unused upper floor space and recommends the applicant consider creating usable space, either for office or limited residential units to provide evening activity and different peak parking hours. He noted there are concerns about blank walls on building backs and suggested additional articulation beyond the proposed ivy treatments.

Regarding materials, Mr. Bitar noted the Historic Mixed-Use building type lists brick, stone, and wood siding as primary materials with specific percentages required. The applicant has proposed additional materials that might be appropriate pending further detail review.

Mr. Bitar concluded that staff believes the 15 criteria for Preliminary Development Plan review were either met or would be met with conditions and future waivers and recommends approval with 10 conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin asked staff to clarify areas considered "too busy" architecturally. Mr. Bitar explained the concern was about exterior buildings and interior buildings working together cohesively, particularly regarding future signage and individual building entrances. Mr. Garvin asked about treatment at the dead-end by building C where the southern street had been removed. Mr. Puhl acknowledged this needed attention for the cemetery border. Regarding articulated roofs, Mr. Puhl stated that variation in roof types added interest to the project. When asked about ivy on the cemetery-facing garage side, Mr. Puhl clarified the garage would be masonry on all four sides with ivy intended for the retail building backs.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the different architectural approaches on the Bridge Street and Monterey Drive elevations was intentional. Mr. Puhl confirmed it was purposeful, with Monterey Drive featuring more identifiable historical building types, while Bridge Street would have a fresh, white California-inspired theme. Mr. Alexander asked about creating continuity around buildings and consistent fenestration. Mr. Puhl explained concerns about retailers covering windows with black coverings in back-of-house areas, preferring solid building materials unless retailers specifically wanted customer-facing rear entrances. When asked about alternatives to ivy for breaking up flat surfaces, Mr. Puhl said they were in early stages but welcomed suggestions.

Ms. Harter asked about proposed wood shingles and whether they were similar to those being replaced elsewhere in the City. Mr. Bitar confirmed wood shingles were proposed particularly for building H, noting Dublin has other locations where people now want to replace them. She inquired about the learning curve for on-street parking along Bridge Street. Mr. Bitar explained this would be part of the corridor study with careful vetting if implemented. Ms. Harter asked about straight-in parking efficiency versus other configurations. Mr. Bitar confirmed perpendicular parking was most efficient for the site, with parallel requiring more space and diagonal necessitating one-way circulation.

Regarding the Bridge Street cemetery sidewalk improvements, Mr. Bitar confirmed this would be part of the study including streetscape elements and planters. Ms. Harter asked about public access to the decorative stairway. Mr. Puhl explained it would be open to the public as the best pathway to the second-level garage, with a door to second-floor office space allowing workers to access ground-floor amenities. She confirmed no phasing was planned, with Mr. Puhl stating that they want to deliver every building at once for a proper grand opening. Ms. Harter noted the importance of continuing neighbor outreach and suggested reaching out to nearby businesses like Kroger.

Mr. Chinnock expressed concern about the timing of Route 161 and Bridge Street improvements relative to creating a pedestrian-eager community area without safe access. Ms. Wawszkiewicz from Transportation Mobility confirmed they would coordinate phasing and support all transportation modes along the corridor despite pinch points like the cemetery. She noted the goal was creating a holistic corridor rather than an island.

Mr. Chinnock asked about tree preservation along the cemetery buffer. Mr. Bitar clarified some trees would be removed per the preservation plan, but they wanted to maximize what could be saved. Regarding mansard roofs, Mr. Bitar explained staff was simply noting code provisions about dormers when mansard roofs face streets, not recommending for or against waivers at this stage. Mr. Chinnock asked about building access vision, particularly for buildings A and B. Mr. Puhl explained they wanted two real entrances - active Bridge Street frontages and convenient parking access, similar to their Short North buildings. Regarding the heavy retail weighting, Mr. Puhl believed Columbus was under-retailed with no new shopping built in 30 years. He felt the west side of Route 315 needed retail other than Bridge Park's 95 percent restaurant mix. They intended to control results by never selling, over-investing upfront, and managing intensively.

When asked about limiting hours, Mr. Puhl noted all their Short North leases restrict operations past 11:00 PM or midnight except one establishment 100 feet up. Food sales must comprise at least 50 percent of total sales, as they want to avoid becoming their own bad neighbor.

Ms. Damaser asked about the vision for the transitions to the park uses on the south. Mr. Puhl acknowledged difficulty determining existing conditions due to invasive honeysuckle but asked the Commission to consider the totality of circumstances including the 18-foot east buffer, dozens of new trees, and central green space. He noted the two west-side properties were zoned for redevelopment, making large permanent setbacks potentially problematic in 20 years.

Regarding plaza trees, Mr. Puhl explained they were working with landscape architects to source mature trees from nurseries, budgeting for the largest possible to avoid twig-like plantings. Ms. Damaser questioned the modern California look next to the church and historic buildings. Mr. Puhl stated that they saw the design as creating something new and different for Central Ohio, avoiding color monotony with fresh white materials and pitched roofs, referencing Palisades Village as having historic character inside despite a modern exterior.

Mr. Deschler asked about repurposing trees with extended root bases. Mr. Puhl stated that that he understood it was expensive with less than a 50% success rate. Regarding mixed-use with potential

residential lofts, Mr. Puhl indicated they had not investigated that due to neighborhood promises against residential, noting residential needs a critical mass of 15-25 units with private parking, which would consume retail space.

On parking, Mr. Bitar confirmed preliminary review showed compliance with code allowances for shared parking and mixed uses. In response to Mr. Deschler's question, underground parking had been considered but rejected at over \$50,000 per space. Employees would ideally use top garage floors in least competitive spaces, though controlling the parking of restaurant employees remained challenging.

Regarding Corbins Mill access timing, Mr. Bitar explained the planned section would be built now as a public street rather than future conversion. Mr. Deschler raised concerns about school district coordination for student safety. Mr. Puhl acknowledged they should discuss this with the School District before construction, noting the development was designed to welcome children with deleted roads in the square for safety and planned amenities like ice cream shops.

Mr. Deschler asked about traffic signal impacts on already problematic Bridge Street rush hour traffic. Mr. Burrell explained they would fully coordinate signals for efficient operation with real-time phasing technology, treating all six corridor signals as one system. Ms. Wawszkiewicz clarified the proposed full traffic signal at Monterey Drive would include pedestrian walk signals on all three legs.

Mr. Way asked about cemetery boundary fencing. Mr. Bitar confirmed no current fencing existed except the historic stone wall along Bridge Street, with only trees marking other boundaries. Mr. Puhl confirmed people could move between the development and cemetery. He added that they view the cemetery as an asset. Mr. Way inquired about garage treatment facing the cemetery. Mr. Puhl explained ventilation requirements prevented covering openings but they could consider vines on columns. When asked about maintenance access without the former road, Mr. Puhl indicated that it could be managed effectively, avoiding maintenance paths that might damage the 15-foot critical root zone.

Regarding garage parapet height, Mr. Puhl confirmed it would be about four feet above the parking surface as a concrete crash wall, making parked cars difficult to see from the cemetery with tree coverage. Mr. Way asked why the north-south walkway jogged at building A. Mr. Puhl explained keeping building B as a single tenant restaurant required the shift to prevent the building becoming too large.

Regarding the west property line trees, Mr. Puhl confirmed most would be removed, explaining their need for parking spaces made even a six-foot buffer effectively 18 feet of lost space. He had met with the homeowner, promising a nice fence and protection from car headlights, but emphasized the properties that were in the Bridge Street District overlay were likely to redevelop. He asked the Commission to consider the totality of the plan including east side preservation, square trees, and other plantings.

Mr. Way asked about preserving two large 23-24-inch trees in the courtyard. Mr. Puhl expressed concerns about their critical root zones conflicting with necessary sidewalks and planters, preferring open lawn for programming possibilities. As 40-year Short North property owners thinking long-term, they wanted trees to grow and replace older ones properly over time. Mr. Way suggested having an arborist evaluate if preservation was possible with proper grades and root growth systems.

Mr. Alexander asked about sustainability practices. Mr. Puhl indicated that would be part of the next step, with engineers hired to explore options including cisterns for rainwater collection. Solar

panels had been considered for lowering tenant utility costs and increasing base rent potential, but no federal programs currently supported this. Flat roofs were designed to potentially accommodate future photovoltaics hidden behind pitched elements.

Public Comment

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin, spoke representing Waterford Village. She reported there was 74% community support per resident surveys. Respondent expressed appreciation for there being no residential component and for the maintenance of one-and-half story heights around the square to match their quaint, quiet community. While 88% favored the design, safety and traffic management concerns remained. Ms. Salva emphasized the need for a traffic light at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street for any development to proceed. She requested a secondary exit point to prevent cut-through traffic through their neighborhood to Frantz Road. She suggested a one-way exit through the wooded area behind the park down the large hill. Additional requests included physical deterrents around tennis courts next to the development, stone pillars identifying Waterford Village as a private community, and flashing crosswalk lights at Clover Court and Monterey Drive where residents access their neighborhood park. She expressed a desire for assurance from the developer that potential parking garage issues, like loitering or racing, would be addressed.

Keith Barnes, 279 Clover Court, Dublin, praised working with Tyler Puhl over several months, finding the Wood Companies credible, transparent, and incorporating neighborhood input. He believed the proposed plan would contribute to Dublin's uniqueness as an excellent transition into old Dublin. He reiterated traffic as the overriding resident concern, noting existing difficulty turning from Monterey Drive onto Bridge Street when traffic backs up to Frantz and Post roads.

Mr. Barnes explained Dublin's increasing popularity with many choosing the I-270 to Route 33/Bridge Street exit over the I-270/Sawmill Road exit, which contributes to cut-through traffic. He detailed Waterford's sidewalk situation with only partial coverage and a single sidewalk requiring children to cross at the largely-ignored four-way stop at Clover Court where near-misses with children have occurred frequently despite police attention.

He supported the exit-only plan through City property by the tennis courts, believing it would not infringe on the park while addressing safety concerns. He noted the current danger from Monterey Drive traffic passing the well-utilized community park with limited parking. Mr. Barnes praised the Wood Companies as quality investors who do not flip properties, maintain high-end tenants, and renovate remarkably, making them a good long-term community partner. He stated that they had been exceptionally transparent and incorporated neighborhood ideas.

Mike Skalak, 249 Olde Spring Lane, Dublin, explained that school children in their neighborhood get bused to school one quarter-mile away due to the crossing danger, preventing children from walking home and stopping at the nearby retail. He thanked Mr. Bitar for the traffic study residents had long requested. He opposes any residential at this location and noted any development would impact trees given the current overgrown honeysuckle condition. He prefers new plantings over attempting to save trees. He advocates for pedestrian-friendly design without fences and hedges that block the desired paths people naturally take.

Mary Ann Clarke, 146 Corbins Mill, Dublin, stated Dublin sorely lacks cute storefront shops that add community character. As a Corbins Mill resident, she understands the need for cut-through access but requests consideration of their narrow street with sidewalks close to traffic before sending more vehicles their way. She suggested making the exit right-turn only at the signal at Bridge

Street, and consideration of the older residents walking dogs and children at bus stops on a street not designed for the current traffic levels.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin expressed strong support, appreciating the project's fit with the Future Land Use and Envision Dublin Plan. He values matching the church's sidewalk style as a good transition to Kroger's setback. He stated that he felt concerns about the back parking row were addressed and pending property development made it difficult to plan around. He appreciates the added office as true mixed-use absent residential use. He supports future waivers for pedestrian ways, block lengths, and E1 setbacks. He is comfortable with all conditions as written.

Mr. Deschler inquired about eminent domain discussions for the Corbins Mill connection property. Mr. Boggs indicated that no conversations had occurred, nor was he aware of any plans for such. Mr. Deschler supported the project but shares traffic safety concerns, hoping for a favorable City resolution. He supports all 10 conditions and emphasized constant traffic concerns warrant updates on the latest projects.

Mr. Alexander stated that he strongly supported the project's unique focus on public space as primary rather than an afterthought. He appreciates the two-story wall definition around the space and well-integrated pathways to the central object building. He likes the mixed-use incorporation and two-story Bridge Street massing.

His reservations are that the Bridge Street elevations do not meet the Historic Transition District zoning standards nor Dublin's unique character with the proposed California styling. He supports keeping Condition 8 about perimeter building elevations needing attention. Otherwise, he supports the project.

Ms. Harter expressed her support for the project, appreciating the public engagement. She viewed it as a gateway that would slow traffic with schools, post office, and shopping creating appropriate feel. She emphasized the importance of walkability. She noted school classes visit the cemetery and this development would provide a nice area, exposing children to their beautiful community. She encouraged exploring window additions and art opportunities on blank walls, and considering noise impacts on neighbors from deliveries and operations.

Mr. Chinnock stated that this project is an example of the process working well with responsive applicants and supportive residents after multiple community comments. He thanked staff for their excellent work but emphasized the critical timing for Route 161 improvements including signals and safety features before proceeding too far. He appreciated the applicant being aware of vacant retail concerns given the amount proposed. Regarding Condition 8, he noted the unique site requiring attention to both interior and exterior perimeter elevations, especially the cemetery-facing garage.

He considered the Bridge Street elevations excellent transitional designs between various building types rather than attempting to match Historic Dublin, since they are not adjacent to but near the Historic District.

Ms. Damaser stated that she saw the area transitioning from the Historic District side rather than from Bridge Park, with Kroger being so different no transition was needed. She appreciates the neighbor support, which demonstrates the groundwork invested. She will look to the City to address

traffic concerns and understands concerns about Monterey Drive becoming a through street. She reiterated the transition concerns for south and east sides into parkland areas.

Mr. Way expressed continued support, noting listening to neighbors was crucial after multiple unsuccessful previous development attempts at the site. He felt the 10 conditions covered all discussed items. Discussion ensued about whether conditions needed adjustment, with commissioners debating mandatory language in conditions 2, 3, and 4 about drive aisle width, buffer increases, and tree preservation.

Mr. Puhl expressed concerns about 22-foot drive aisles being too tight compared to Short North standards and dramatically changing site plans with mandatory 6.5-foot residential setbacks. After discussion, the Commission agreed to modify conditions 2, 3, and 4 to state the applicant shall work with staff rather than mandatory requirements, acknowledging emergency access needs and other constraints.

Discussion continued about mandatory language in condition 9 regarding blank walls. Mr. Garvin supported keeping it for requiring further articulation on the particularly blank south side. The Commission agreed the language was appropriate given the "or further articulation" option.

Mr. Way raised adding an 11th condition about coordinating with Dublin Arts Council for public art locations. Mr. Boggs suggested language about working with staff and Dublin Arts Council to identify public art locations for presentation at the Final Development Plan step. The Commission agreed to add this condition.

After final wording adjustments confirmed by legal counsel, the applicant confirmed acceptance of all 11 conditions.

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall continue to coordinate with City staff on finalizing the streetscape details of all streets, including the W Bridge Street/Monterey Drive intersection design and number of left-turn lanes, and the treatment along the south side of the new Neighborhood Street.
- 2) The applicant shall work with staff to explore reducing the width of the drive aisles.
- 3) The applicant shall work with staff to explore increasing the width of the buffer along the west side to allow screening of the adjacent single-family residential property and preservation of trees on both sides of the property line.
- 4) The applicant shall work with staff to explore providing a buffer along the south side of the site east of Monterey Drive to meet the required setback and provide screening for the cemetery expansion.
- 5) The applicant shall continue to work with the City Engineering staff on the design and configuration of the stormwater detention needed for the site for both public and private improvements to properly account for known capacity concerns in the existing storm sewer system.
- 6) The applicant shall explore all available alternatives to retain as many healthy/desirable trees as possible.
- 7) The applicant shall consider adding a true upper story above at least some of the buildings around the town square.
- 8) The buildings' massing, roof forms, facades, and design details shall be refined to further complement the interior layout and reflect traditional design patterns.
- 9) Fenestration or further articulation shall be added to all blank walls.

10) Additional design elements that provide a sensitive backdrop to the cemetery shall be added to the east and south facades of the parking structure.

11) The applicant shall work with staff and the Dublin Arts Council, as applicable, to identify location(s) for public art for inclusion in the Final Development Plan.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Bitar distributed information about training opportunities with various planning organizations, including American Planning Association and Urban Land Institute conferences. He requested quick responses for April conferences requiring early registration and hotel reservations. He noted the next scheduled meeting on February 19th had no applications. He asked whether commissioners preferred canceling the meeting or having staff presentations on current efforts like transportation mobility projects, Signature Trail updates, or other initiatives. The Premier Sports Complex was deemed premature for discussion with a Council work session scheduled two days before the February 19 PZC meeting.

Mr. Deschler and Mr. Garvin indicated conflicts that evening. Ms. Harter supported holding the meeting to stay updated on upcoming items. Mr. Chinnock suggested traffic updates be provided given the frequently expressed concerns. After polling, consensus was determined to proceed with the meeting if staff could prepare a sufficient agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council