MEETING MINUTES
Planning Commission
Tuesday, March 20, 2019 – Special Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Chair Julie Oyster asked for a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was taken, and the following members were present: Ms. Julie Oyster, Mr. Larry Titus and Mr. Jim Rauck. Mr. Mike Linder and Dr. John Dubos were not in attendance. Others present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Kendra Spergel, Development Planner; Stephen Smith, Frost Brown Todd; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; Mr. Mike Boso, Chief Building Official; and Mary Havener, Development Assistant.

ITEM #1 – Brown's Farm – Lot Split **PID #201901300005**

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is proposing to subdivide the Brown's Farm site into two new properties. The split would divide the site per the boundaries of each subarea, placing each on its own lot, with Subarea A proposed on the 32.14-acre piece and Subarea B on the 36.40-acre piece. Two different TIF agreements have been drafted for the site and the proposed split will help with the coordination and finalization of the agreements for the Franklin County Auditor's Office and State of Ohio processes, by separating the portions of the proposed development in their own tax parcel per the proposed usage of each side (multi-family in Subarea A and single-family in Subarea B).

After review and consideration, the Development Department recommended Planning Commission approve the lot split as submitted.

Mr. Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale, was present to speak to the item and answer any questions. He stated that this Lot Split was being done for TIF purposes only, as one portion of the parcel is under a residential TIF and one is under a commercial TIF. They need to be split with separate tax ID numbers and legal descriptions.

Mr. Rauck asked is the details of the TIF agreements had been worked out. Mr. Rauch stated that they were in the process of finalizing all of the details and were close to being done.

There being no further questions, Mr. Titus moved to approve the Lot Split as submitted. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #2 – City of Grove City Thoroughfare Map

Ms. Shields presented the proposed Thoroughfare Map. She stated that this map was an update to the current 2008 map and includes new roadways built since 2008, recently approved, but not yet installed roads (such as in Beulah or the Farmstead development) and future planned roadways as noted in the GroveCity2050 Community Plan.

The Thoroughfare map is an important aspect in the Development Review process as it identifies major corridors and characteristics for each. The proposed map integrates language from the GroveCity2050 Community Plan, which highlights the importance of the context and character of roadways.

Many recent PUD developments have included deviations from standards to create the desired character for the area and the proposed map reflects the desire for greater flexibility and roadway design.

The Development Department recommended that Planning Commission recommend approval of the Thoroughfare Map to City Council as submitted and since this is just a draft, any comments or suggestions would be welcomed.

Mr. Mike Keller, EMH & T, was present to give a brief overview of some of the changes on the proposed map. He stated that this wasn't a list of construction projects, but merely a way to plan not only the location of future roadways, but what they anticipate the capacity of those roads to be. In the process of preparing this map, a few key things were adjusted. The first thing was to provide flexibility regarding the character of the roadways while preserving the functionality and aesthetics. They also made sure that they had the appropriate right-of-way width, making sure that it would support the infrastructure/utilities that would be required. The potential location of traffic control (both signals and roundabouts) was also added on this proposed map. Mr. Keller demonstrated roadways that were on the 2008 Thoroughfare Map that were no longer considered thoroughfare roadways. He then demonstrated where there were some alignments along the roadways that were added or modified.

Mr. Titus asked Mr. Keller his opinion related to the anticipated growth along 104. Mr. Keller stated that they have identified that road to be 2-3 lanes, under developed conditions. They are currently working with the City to do a corridor study for an overall plan. In regards to traffic, Mr. Keller stated that the capacity is there for two lanes, and three for access management at intersections. At this time, they do not see the entire road turning into a three-lane road.

Mr. Rauck stated that he would like the Thoroughfare Map to depict intersections that would benefit from having turn lanes. He also asked about the potential roundabout at Borror Road and at 665 and if we have much input on those since they are on a state route. Mr. Keller stated that the Borror Road location is slightly offset, so a traditional signal wouldn't line up properly. Due to the potential redevelopment on the northwest corner, there would be the potential to acquire land and realign that intersection and have it function as a roundabout. From the City's perspective, this would serve two purposes. It would control speed and provide a safer intersection at that location. In respect to the intersection at 665, he stated that ODOT was looking at that intersection and was supposed to get back to them with their recommendation.

Mr. Rauck asked again about the Borror Road intersection and if there would be a possibility to mark it as an intersection upgrade with turning lanes since the house to the southwest was so far back off of the road. Mr. Keller stated that this plan is just to show functionality of where traffic controls could be located. The goal is to show a roundabout at that intersection in the event that a development happens. Ms. Shields added that there is Transportation Improvements map in the GroveCity2050 plan which might be a more appropriate map to make these improvements, since it's more of a long-term planning guide. There are current roadways identified on that map and specific improvements that could be made in the future. This may be something that could be presented as a change to the Community Plan. The intent of this plan is to be a flowing document, updated annually, which is the purpose of the Implementation Committee.

Ms. Oyster asked if the roundabouts that have numerous semi-trucks utilizing them have an issue with wear and tear. Mr. Keller stated that they are basically designed to be larger, but they're engineered to withstand that type of traffic. All roundabouts are site-specific. Mr. Rauch brought up the Gantz Road and Brookham Drive roundabout that was used to resolve a truck-movement issue in that area.

Ms. Oyster asked if there were any plans to improve Hoover Road given the two developments that are planned to go in at Orders Road and south of the Church of the Nazarene. Mr. Keller stated that he didn't see any need to add lanes, it would be more of an issue related to intersection treatments.

Mr. Ryan Mitchell, 3636 Orders Road, asked if the zigzag along Haughn Road, south of Orders, would be addressed with the proposed development that is coming in. Mr. Keller stated that they looked at where the two developments would be and the traffic patterns and are going to try and take the movement away from those areas so they become more secondary access roads.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend the proposed Thoroughfare Map to City Council as submitted. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #3 – Discussion on Planning Commission Meeting Times

Ms. Oyster stated that it had been brought before Planning Commission to consider moving the meeting times to the evening in order to accommodate the schedule of more people that might be interested in attending.

Mr. Stephen Smith added that there was one of two ways in which this could be handled. One would be by a majority vote of the Planning Commission and the other would be by a vote from City Council to adopt this change.

Mr. Rauck stated that as a matter of record, he would prefer to have the meeting times remain the same as they are now.

Ms. Oyster presented an idea that when a development plan is being proposed, the developer could reach out to the area residents that would be impacted and have a discussion on their proposal. The feedback that is received could then be presented to Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Rauch stated that the Development Staff is always looking for ways to get the community more involved. To that end, he continued to state that Staff is going to start requiring applicants to post a notice on their properties of pending public hearings. A prototype of the sign was shown to the Planning Commission. He said that Staff has also been discussing the idea of developers holding public meetings to get the word out. Also, he wanted the Planning Commission to be aware that Staff has looked at all of the communities in the Columbus area, and Grove City is the only community that holds Planning Commission meetings during the day. All other communities hold their meetings at 6 p.m. or later.

Ms. Oyster stated that she has received an email from one of the other members of the Commission stating that they, too, would not like to see the meeting time moved. Given the overall consensus, the Planning Commission members would like the time to remain as is. She reiterated that holding public meetings prior to coming to Planning Commission would greatly assist with making recommendations. Mr. Smith stated that he would relay this information to Council.

Mr. Rauck asked if there could be spacing requirements for the signage that would be placed on the properties. Mr. Smith stated that a City representative would be responsible for placing the sign on the property and will make the determination of where it should go.

Ms. Oyster stated that she has been asked by a member of City Council if Planning Commission could have a joint meeting with Council in the near future to maintain communication and discuss some current items. Mr. Rauch added that Staff has been working on the new code, and Administration has given approval for Title One to be released. This part of code sets the parameters of how Planning Commission, BZA, Council and the Development Department conduct business. This meeting would offer a chance to discuss changes in the Zoning Code.

Having no additional items, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Mary T Havener

Mary Havener, Secretary

Julie Oyster

Julie Oyster, Chair