



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 5, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the first Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held in the new Council Chambers at 5555 Perimeter Drive. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Rebecca Call, Lee Grimes, Mark Supelak, Kim Way

Commission members absent: Jane Fox

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 17 and July 8 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call swore in individuals intending to address the Commission on tonight's cases.

1 – 2. 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-025PP/21-026FP, Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

These applications are a request for the re-subdivision of a 6.69-acre parcel located within the Dublin City Center Subdivision into two parcels consisting of the following acreages: 1.58 acres and

5.11 acres. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located northeast of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a combined Preliminary and Final Plat. The site is located within the Bridge Street District north of West Dublin-Granville Road and west of Sawmill Road. The site is presently developed with an office building and parking lot. The site has frontage on three public streets – Banker Drive, Dublin Center Drive, and West Dublin-Granville Road, and has five access points. The request is for a re-subdivision of the Dublin Center plat, Reserve A, which is 6.69 acres in size. The proposed Preliminary Plat documents the existing conditions and proposes a re-subdivision into two parcels: 1.58 acres and 5.11 acres. It also memorializes existing cross access located forward of the building. Staff is recommending a condition to address the existing cross access necessary for this site to continue to function as it exists today. The Final Plat will be filed with the County. It reflects the lot lines and essential easements. Staff has reviewed the applications against the existing criteria and recommends the Commission forward the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions of approval to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak inquired if the scale of the parcel subdivision is comparable to other parcels within the area.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the cross easement would limit said parcels to the south side of the parking lot.

Ms. Martin responded that the intent of the Plat is to facilitate future development, whether it occurs within 6 months or five years. Because it is not clear at what point that development might occur, the plat establishes the lots but also addresses existing conditions and facilitates existing site circulation. The request is that the applicant work with staff to provide cross access to the tenant on Lot 2 to Dublin Center Drive and the tenant on Lot 1 to Banker Drive. The exact location of that access is yet to be determined; however, the zone of that access and flexibility thereof will be defined before the Plats are forwarded to City Council.

Mr. Supelak noted that Lot 1 appears to be restricted, so flexibility with the access will be important.

Ms. Call stated that on Lot 1, there is existing parking. Will that parking count toward the requirements for the current use on Lot 2?

Ms. Martin responded that at the time the lot was developed, it did count toward the parking requirements. Today's zoning requires fewer parking spaces, so Lot 2 will be able to meet their minimum required parking, exclusive of Lot 1.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the separate lots would have access to the appropriate utilities.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively; that has been thoroughly vetted by the Engineering Division.

Mr. Way stated that there appears to be a retention basin on the smaller lot, which he assumes presently services the entire site. That retention would need to be accommodated on the site with the building on Lot 2.

Ms. Martin responded that new development would need to address water quantity and quality and the conditions of Lot 2. Since open water areas and dry basins are not permitted within the Bridge Street District, it will likely require underground stormwater facilities.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, stated that he is the attorney for the applicant, Dublin 18 LLC. With him tonight is the owner, Mr. Robert Meyers and COO, Dan O'Hara. This group has owned this site for 2.5 years and has enhanced the existing building and landscaping. The re-subdivision is anticipated to enhance the marketing opportunities of the under-utilized portions of the site. They will work with staff on the cross access, which will be noted on the plats. A future development plan will define that access, which the Commission will review.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Supelak inquired if, other than re-subdivision, there are no specific marketing plans at this point.

Mr. Underhill responded affirmatively. There has been some interest from various parties, but for confidentiality purposes, he cannot reveal the parties. There are no specific plans.

Ms. Call inquired if the property owners have a particular use in mind.

Robert Meyers, 136 Stanberry Avenue, Bexley, Ohio, property owner, stated that there is an anticipated use. They have been in discussions with a lead prospect, which is a professional medical use.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the proposed re-subdivisions, and has no further questions.

Mr. Grimes stated that he is also supportive.

Mr. Supelak stated that his only concern is that the easement agreement be written with the preferred flexibility for the parcels. That should be included as a condition.

Ms. Call requested that the condition be displayed and inquired if the applicant had any concerns with the requirement to work with staff to provide those easements for the re-subdivided parcels.

Mr. Underhill responded that the staff report also addresses this requirement. With that clarification, they have no objection. The Commission will be reviewing any future development plan for this site along with the proposed cross access. These meeting minutes and the staff report will reflect the expectations for this site. The plat notes will provide that assurance.

Mr. Boggs stated that he concurs with Mr. Underhill. They will be able to identify a solution that will protect the existing use on the site and accommodate the manner in which it may develop in the future. The Commission is requested to make recommendations to City Council; Council will make the final decision on the plats. The conditions require the access conditions be clarified before proceeding to City Council.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is merit to preserving the access flexibility for both parties. With that, he is comfortable with supporting the plats.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned about the easement restrictions for the second, smaller lot. With the condition, he is comfortable with the request.

Mr. Schneier stated that given the fact that the Commission is making a recommendation, but Council will also review it and make the decision, and given the fact, that the Commission will be reviewing any future development plan, he has no objections.

Mr. Supelak inquired if Lot 1 would be required to address the water quality and quantity for both parcels.

Ms. Martin responded that the new development on the parcel will need to address the stormwater functionality component. She would anticipate there will be more than one location on the site to do so.

Ms. Rauch stated that her understanding is also that the new development would have to mitigate the stormwater needs for their particular parcel.

Commissioners emphasized the concern that Lot 2 should not bear the mitigation responsibility for both lots.

Mr. Way stated that the plan seems to indicate that Lot 1 presently has the retention responsibility for the entire site. Once Lot 1 is developed, however, would Lot 2 have the stormwater retention responsibility for that lot only. He does not believe Lot 1 is large enough to handle the needs for Lot 2, as well.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would like to move forward with the application at this point.

Mr. Underhill responded that it is important for them to move forward with the current prospect, but they can attempt to obtain better information and resolve the issue before the plats proceed to City Council for approval. This owner will continue to own Lot 2 and the building. As such, they will work with the new prospect and ensure the issue is addressed fully.

Mr. Underhill stated that if there is a need to revise something with the plats, it can be identified and addressed as part of the development plan process. He is in favor of putting less on a plat than more, as it provides the flexibility to make changes over time. He believes the engineering issues will be satisfactorily addressed during the development plan review process.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would concur that the engineering issues for both lots will be addressed during the development plan process. Engineering is not present at this time, so he is reluctant to condition a plat recommendation regarding stormwater issues.

Ms. Rauch responded that this has been a collaborative process. Those issues will be adequately addressed when there is a proposed development to review.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

- 1) Prior City Council review, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, the applicant update the preliminary plat to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation.
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Final Plat with two conditions:

- 1) Prior to submission to City Council for review, the applicant update the final plat to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation.
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

OTHER

3. 2035 Dublin Framework

An overview of the Dublin 2035 Framework visioning process and a facilitated discussion with the Commission to provide transformative ideas for the future of the City of Dublin.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the 2035 Dublin Framework Visioning Process at this point. This effort is responsive to direction given by City Council at their 2020 Goal Setting session. The intent is to identify visionary, transformative ideas to direct the City's development toward 2035. Following an introductory workshop, milestone one involved Council's four committees offering and considering "big ideas" regarding four themes: quality of life, infrastructure, land use and economic development. Milestone 2 involved expert and public engagement, and community stakeholders and public feedback have been solicited. Tonight, Commission members will offer their "big ideas." Adoption of the plan is anticipated early 2022, after which implementation will follow.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Mr. Schneier inquired if there was a "City government" category.

Ms. Rauch responded that item would fall under quality of life.

Mr. Schneier stated that one big idea would be to radically change City government.

Ms. Rauch invited him to elaborate.

Mr. Schneier stated that a big idea would be something out of the box. For instance, Houston, Texas does not have zoning. What if Dublin's participatory form of government was deemed not to be the most effective to achieve City objectives? Would we have a City Council or might the City merge with the Franklin, Delaware or Union counties? Perhaps we might have a New England town hall type of meeting, where everyone who attends the meeting votes. He is not advocating for anything, but we tend to believe that what we do is what we should do. Should we re-examine our

City government? He has no specific point of view, but it might be interesting to examine the status quo.

Ms. Call stated that her comment is that the Dublin City Schools area and the City's jurisdiction essentially cover the same area, some of which falls within different counties – Franklin, Union or Delaware. Is there any opportunity to change that? Could Dublin fall only within one county? On some matters, City of Dublin residents might have contradictory positions based on the county in which they lie.

Mr. Schneier noted that New York City Schools are governed by New York City Council. In our case, for what reason is there both a Dublin Board of Education and a City Council?

Ms. Call stated that her second idea lies with the fact that a significant portion of the City population is aging. We also have a very well educated and well-traveled population. It would be wonderful if the City offered a virtual vacation center. A vacation center would not be limited to the aging population, however; it could offer opportunities for young couples.

Mr. Supelak stated that we all fulfilled the request to suggest transformative, big ideas. He likes the idea that a City futurist also provided ideas. Our future is data driven and inevitable. Moore's Law is the most well-known of the tech trajectories, although there are others. If that future is inevitable, what could Dublin meaningfully anticipate? What are the City's main activities that could be built upon and create more memories? Such considerations may be more realistic than extremely transformative ideas. Market research is real and valuable and should be included in this type of discussion. A big idea that is both inevitable and transformative is that it is possible that in 15 years, 100% of our energy could come from the sun, worldwide. How could that idea be built into our City? Because solar energy must be collected, battery technology would need to expand. Fortune 100 companies are aware of this. It is necessary to wrap the right expertise around an idea as we consider it.

Ms. Call stated that at this point, Council has requested the Commission to offer big ideas. It would fall within Council's purview to determine what expertise might be required. One practical, big idea would be to provide a gigabyte of internet to every home within the City. In Austin, TX and Provo, Utah, fiber is being laid to every home. Instead of Spectrum and WOW, Dublin residents could have Dublin internet.

Mr. Supelak stated that on City Council's website, three goals are currently listed, one of which is to become Smart City-oriented. The Dublin 2035 Plan is a fourth item being considered. Are the first three goals intended to be accomplished separately, or will the 2035 Plan encompass those?

Ms. Rauch stated that the website states Council's current major goals. The 2035 Plan is a visioning process. Broadband for all residents is already an item being studied.

Mr. Grimes stated that the material provided for this discussion revealed that City Council has already accumulated many big ideas. Dublin has the ability to use its resources in a very collaborative manner and demonstrate its leadership. The need is to distill the ideas. The big ideas selected should be a trough through which everything flows, engendering growth over time. There should be collaborative learning from Pre-K to lifelong learning. Universities and businesses should

be able to tap into a City-led effort that brings all the resources together and allows personal growth and community growth.

Mr. Way stated that he is a planner by profession, and he works with many communities going through a similar planning process. He has learned that there are no new ideas. Perhaps a big idea is not necessarily what Dublin needs, but a great idea. He would look at this from the perspective of what problems this community will be facing in the next 10 – 50 years, which should be addressed.

- Climate change might be an idea that Dublin should consider how to address – perhaps with electric cars?
- Health is a major item that permeates everything, from the individual to the environment. Healthy Communities includes 20 different categories.
- One of the challenges Dublin has is the growth within our region. By 2050, we anticipate a million new residents to move into the region, which includes Dublin. Dublin needs to determine how it will address density. Annexing more land is not the solution. Bridge Park is nearly completed; where does Dublin go next with density?
- A connected greenway is a great idea. Although Dublin has great parks and trails, not everything is connected. Dublin has significant Scioto River frontage, much of which is not accessible. How could that be part of a green connection?
- Another item is mobility. This City needs to consider other modes of transportation, aside from single-family cars. What other modes of transportation are there, besides bikes and walkability? Is there micro mobility? This item is interlinked with sustainability and health of the environment.
- Experiences. People are looking for the experience of the place; they are looking for authentic experiences.

To be successful in the next 30-50 years, Dublin needs to think about all of these issues.

Ms. Call suggested blurring the lines between government and education, such as by providing a community center that offers an educational sector. Incorporating virtual educational opportunities might be possible by collaborating with McGraw Hill, for example. Another idea is specialty high schools within Dublin, allowing students to pursue a specific track from middle school onward, wherein at least one of their classes follows that track. Beginning in middle school, schools in Germany provide education that acknowledges students' interests and aptitudes. A computer science major could be on an appropriate track from 7th grade onward. If in a couple of years, however, they want to switch to an alternative path, they can do so. Coordinating their high school efforts with their university experience could greatly reduce the cost of education for our residents. Merging government and education efforts could assist their educational pursuits.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with Mr. Supelak's point that it is important to build upon what Dublin has. With the many positive comments he has heard about Dublin's attributes, he has also heard residents' concerns about the results of high density, including heavier traffic and increased crime levels. While grandiose ideas, such as merging governments, could create a nightmare, on a smaller scale, there are many good ideas that build upon what Dublin has.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would condense his thoughts into a goal of creating more moments and memories in Dublin. If we do that, people will continue to love Dublin in perpetuity. He also would advocate for creating a Dublin presence. Dublin needs unique geographical gateways. The I270/US 33 gateway to Dublin is incomplete, although there is such an opportunity there. He believes it is

important for Dublin to lead the way in certain areas, such as providing every resident 1 GB of internet. Trends are changing for how work is accomplished. The pandemic proved hybrid work environments to be successful, and in many cases, more productive. He agrees with Ms. Call's suggestion of blurring the lines between government with education and health, for example.

Mr. Way echoed the need for creating regional gateways. There are four gateway areas of opportunity – Tuttle Crossing, SR 161, US33 and Sawmill Road. When he commented earlier on growth and density, he neglected to mention mixed use. Dublin needs to refrain from building more single-use places, and convert many existing single-use places into mixed-use environments. That will create more life and excitement. Work places, then, will not be dead at the end of the day, when workers go home. Including living and retail uses within the environment will create community.

Ms. Call stated that a recent discussion about converting the open area at the front of the Oak Park development into a use other than residential was reflective of this idea. Understanding the need for mixed use, perhaps the City could partner with developers to include a mixed-use component.

Mr. Fishman stated that in recent years, the City moved away from mixed use. While in the 1930s and 1940s, every neighborhood had a corner grocery store or other such uses, the move to an emphasis on subdivisions changed that.

Ms. Call stated that in the 1930s and 1940s, one head of a household remained at home, while the other typically took the one vehicle belonging to the family to work. Perhaps mixed use in a neighborhood could result in a cyclical pattern back to a need for one vehicle.

Mr. Fishman stated that he concurs with the point Mr. Supelak made about creating moments and memories and unique places in Dublin. The pedestrian bridge is one such element, which draws people to this community. In regard to the US33 gateway, he participated in an earlier committee discussion with a designer from New York about the potential for creating designs, such as shamrocks, in the concrete. He does not understand why none of those great ideas resulted.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees that the river is a great opportunity, in addition to the pedestrian bridge, which is a great draw. There are other river-related opportunities that could be pursued.

Ms. Call suggested adding landscaping to the bridge, in addition to the planters.

Mr. Way encouraged Commission members to check out the Rapid 5 project on the MORPC website. There are many ideas for the Scioto River through Dublin. It is an exciting regional initiative.

Ms. Call inquired if staff had any other items on which they would like to suggest or request feedback.

Ms. Rauch thanked the Commission for their input for the Dublin 2035 Plan, The big ideas offered are much appreciated.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the agenda item.

TRAINING

4. Dublin Community Plan

An overview of the Dublin Community Plan, which is a guiding policy document intended to provide a foundation for decision making and implementation over time.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt, new senior planner, introduced herself to the Commission. She noted that much of her professional experience was obtained in Colorado. Most recently, she served as Planning Director of Greenville, S.C. She presented an overview regarding Community Plans, Area Plans and Codes, describing the hierarchy and inter-relationships of those documents. The Community Plan is an overarching vision for the entire City. It is a non-binding policy document. It is not static but rolls with times and trends. A typical element in a Community Plan is a Future Land Use map, which provides suggested land uses. Another element it contains is a Thoroughfare Plan, which suggests anticipated road links and locations. The Community Plan includes multi-modal suggestions. It also includes Special Area Plans, which provide specific details for a certain geographic area of the City. Dublin has approximately 12 Special Area Plans. By comparison, the Zoning Code is specific and legally binding. Changes to the Zoning Code are recommended by the Commission and adopted by Council. The Zoning Code attempts to follow the guidelines of the Area Plans and the Community Plan. She reviewed one example of a Special Area Plan, the Dublin Corporate Area Plan for an area adjacent to Frantz Road. The overall planning process attempts to confirm that everything meshes and will achieve the stated vision of the Community Plan.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated the Community Plan attempts to achieve a balance between development and greenspaces. The City's Community Plan has existed for many years, and although it was revised on a couple of occasions, it has consistently emphasized open green spaces and low density. Maintaining a balance is essential. For instance, if Bridge Street were to become too encompassing, it would completely change the character of the City. That type of development has to be balanced with open areas, greenspace and larger lots in order to achieve the different areas desired by different people. People have often said they are attracted to Dublin for the attributes, which it currently and consistently has had. It is dangerous to emphasize more and more density. A balance of that with the open, green spaces and larger lots is critical.

Ms. Holt agreed that is essential to keep in mind the total vision.

Ms. Call stated that as she considers some of the recent applications considered by the Commission, when implemented, some of them are beautiful. There have been some more difficult reviews as the Commission attempted to achieve the desired overall balance. Staff does a good job preparing staff reports for the Commission's reviews; however, in many cases, we are also working off what we have seen implemented. When we consider possible revisions to area plans, it would be valuable to consider zoning implementations versus requirements. She would suggest that as the Commission considers area plan revisions, that it look at how implementations occurred across the City versus how those areas were zoned. It would be beneficial to the Commission in visualizing an area.

Ms. Rauch stated the City will soon be engaging a firm to conduct a housing study, which will review Dublin's housing, housing types and what would best meet the community's needs. There is a "feeling" created by a neighborhood. Dublin is known for its single-family residential "feel" and character. All those elements are important in determining the right balance for the City.

Mr. Way stated that other governing bodies with whom he has worked on this topic have requested field trips to possible areas of interest.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are good and bad examples of the different types of housing, including pocket neighborhoods. Rosemary Beach is a high density, single-family area that was very well planned, but there are also examples of the same type of development not done well. There is merit to looking at good case studies.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission could ask for more case studies and for field trips to sites or other communities, as well. Applicants also can be asked to provide more graphic information to help the Commission better understand their proposal. There are tools available that can help all the members better understand what would be approved.

Ms. Call noted that the Commission now has an education budget, and there is also an architect consultant available to assist the Commission. As Commission members find case studies that could be of value to review, it would be good to forward those to staff and for the staff also to forward any case studies available to the Commission. There is benefit in comparing ideation with implementation to provide ourselves with the necessary perspective and understanding of the broad strokes of the Community Plan and the results with the implementation of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Schneier stated that Dublin is known for its greenspace; it has a positive connotation within this community. However, Dublin also wants walkability, which is difficult to achieve in areas exceeding a certain proportion of greenspace. The opposite of greenspace is density. How can those inherent conflicts be reconciled? In looking at desired setbacks, there is a need to have a balance consistent with City goals, recognizing that it is often neighborhood specific. Different demographics of the community want different things, i.e. more greenspace, more restaurants or more density.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission has frequently discussed greenspace. There are experienced architects who know how to arrange the greenspace within a neighborhood to make it appear greater than it is. Muirfield, for example, has only 7.5-foot side setbacks, but with the large center islands within the streets, courts and front setbacks, it gives the impression of more greenspace. Muirfield's density is 1.25 units/acre. Although that is not very dense, it is counting the golf courses and open space, which are a green component. Therefore, it is possible to situate the greenspace so that a community is very walkable but also has the impression of openness and greenspace. The solution of balancing the two elements is not necessarily specific; it can be flexible.

Mr. Supelak agreed. Hilton Head is a good example of this. It is very green, yet dense and walkable. In comparison, Rosemary Beach is not very green, but is very dense and walkable. Although suburban neighborhoods also are very green and walkable, there is not one set of rules. Good design within a set of parameters can achieve the balance Dublin wants.

Mr. Fishman noted that the Muirfield deed was taken from Hilton Head; it is essentially the same deed – a bit of historical information.

Ms. Call stated that the Community Plan provides direction, and the Planning and Zoning Commission considers implementation thereof, including the zoning and individual development applications. The Commission appreciates this overview of the Community Plan.

Mr. Grimes stated that more nodes or micro-nodes are needed, which can be self-sufficient and focus points. Columbus, for example, has had Clintonville, Beechwood, Grandview, etc. These nodes, or areas, create a sense of community for those who reside there.

Ms. Call responded that one idea offered with the 2035 Framework Plan suggested micro or mini-villages.


Ms. Call thanked staff for the Community Plan overview.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch noted that:

- If there are communities to which the Commission would like to make a field trip for observation/educational purposes, please share those suggestions with staff. If it is not possible to travel there, staff can obtain some information about the development requirements for that community for the Commission's review.
- The August 19 PZC meeting has been canceled, as no cases will be ready for review at that time.
- Digital resources have been included in the Commission's Resources folder, including the City Code and links to the City Charter and Community Plan. Print copies can be provided, if needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council