MEETING MINUTES
Planning Commission

March 8, 2022 – City Council Chambers with Webex Component

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Oyster asked for a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was taken, and the following members were present: Chair Julie Oyster, Mr. Jim Rauck, Mr. David Frea and Mr. Larry Titus. Mr. Mike Linder was absent. Staff members present: Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Dash Logan, Development Planner; Terry Barr, Development Planner; Hannah White, Development Assistant; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Nick Mill, EMHT Project Manager; Josh Reinicke, Service Superintendent; Mike Boso, Chief Building and Zoning Official; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator and Kota Warton, Permit Technician.

Organizational Items:

Chair Oyster noticed a quorum was present and asked for approval of the February 8, 2022, and February 22, 2022, Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Frea moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and both sets of minutes were approved 4-0.

Chair Oyster asked for a motion to remove Item #7 Autumn Grove Addition – Development Plan from the agenda, per the applicant's request. Mr. Frea moved to remove the item. Mr. Titus seconded the motion, and the item was removed from the agenda 4-0.

New Items:

ITEM #1 – Wright Graphic Design – Lot Split **PID #202202020009**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval to split 1.9 acres from a 2.79-acre tract of land on Seeds Road, currently owned by Tigerpoly Manufacturing. The applicant will be purchasing the 1.9-acre piece proposed to be split with the intent to build a new building for the future growth of Wright Graphic Design.

Mrs. Shields explained that the remaining 0.89-acre piece would continue to be owned by Tigerpoly Manufacturing and can be accessed from their property on Enterprise Parkway.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff recommends approval of the Lot Split, as submitted.

Mr. Chris Wright, Wright Graphic Design, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion from Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Titus moved to approve the Lot Split, as submitted.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 4-0.

ITEM #2 – Meadow Grove Estates North Section 9 – Plat **PID #202201310007**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated the applicant is requesting approval of a Plat for Section 9 of the Meadow Grove Estates North subdivision, east of Buckeye Parkway. This Plat continues the formalization and creation of lots, reserves and right-of-way for public streets, as shown on the original Development Plan for Meadow Grove Estates North, approved in 2006.

Mrs. Shields explained that the Plat includes 42 lots, one reserve and right-of way for five public roadways, four of which would be extensions of roads started in previous sections of the subdivision.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that all proposed lots meet the minimum width of either 80' or 90' and the minimum size of 10,000 square feet, and the lot and roadway configuration matches the approved Development Plan for Meadow Grove Estates North; therefore, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval as submitted.

Mr. Corey Theuerkauf, Rockford Homes, was present to speak on the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion from Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval of the Plat to City Council as submitted.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 4-0.

Item 3 – Farmstead Subarea H Phase 3 – Plat **PID# 202202080012**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Departments findings. She stated that the applicant was seeking approval of a Plat for Section 3 of Farmstead Subarea H, located west of Jackson Pike and South of Hawthorne Parkway. The Development Plan for Farmstead Subarea H was approved in 2020, following the zoning in 2018 for the larger Farmstead Development. This Plat continues the creation of lots, reserves, and right-of-way as was approved with the Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields explained that the plat would include 17 lots, one reserve, and right-of-way for one roadway extension, Honey Farm Way, and one new roadway, Queen Bee Place. Many easements proposed within the Farmstead Subarea H Phase 3 Plat have been approved with previous Plats for Farmstead Subarea H and all approved lots meet the standards and configuration set with the Development Plan.

Mrs. Shield concluded by recommending Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Plat as submitted.

Mr. Keith Smith, Civil & Environmental Consultants, was present to speak to the item.

Hearing no questions or discussion from Planning Commission or the public, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Plat as submitted.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 4-0.

Item 4 – Chick-fil-A – Development Plan (Amendment) **PID# 202112100073**

Mrs. Shield presented the Development Departments finding. She stated that the applicant was requesting to reconfigure the drive-thru and parking lot at the Chick-fil-A located at 1696 Stringtown Road. City Council approved the Development Plan for Chick-fil-A in October of 2004, which is regulated by the PUD-C zoning approved for Parkway Centre North in January of 2003.

Mrs. Shields explained that the applicant has indicated the need to reconfigure the drive-thru due to the number of customers and to alleviate parking lot conflict points between current spaces along the building and the stacking cars. The proposed reconfiguration will increase the number of stacking lanes from one to two lanes along the west side of the building. The two lanes will merge into one lane on the south side of the building as vehicles move towards the existing menu board / order kiosk. White pavement markings would help direct vehicles though the drive-thru and be used to delineate the two drive-thru lanes as well as the by-pass lane around the site. The proposed modification also allows room for additional landscaping on the west side of the building.

Mrs. Shields added that a new exhibit submitted by the applicant shows room for 26 cars to stack around the building and for six more in an overflow area on the east side, for an overall total of 32 cars before stacking potentially inhibits circulation around the site.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed amendment will be an improvement over existing conditions by adding a second stacking lane and formalizing circulation on the site, and therefore recommended that Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan Amendment, as submitted.

Mr. Hobbs Valley, InForm Studios, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Rauck recommended that traffic control assistance be provided during peak hours during the construction and transition phase of the reconfiguration. Mr. Valley was receptive to the idea.

Mr. Frea asked if the design was similar to the current configuration, with Staff assisting vehicle ordering and directing. Mr. Valley confirmed that the designs were very similar, the biggest difference being the added traffic wrapping around the north side of the building rather than double lane overflow continuing into the general lot. He explained that the intent of wrapping the vehicles was to bring all Chick-fil-A traffic onto Chick-fil-A's lot.

Mr. Frea then inquired about the vehicle stacking counts. Mr. Valley responded that the additional stacking around the building adds space for six more vehicles.

Mr. Frea added that there would need to be added direction and signage to direct people in the new configuration. Mr. Valley assured Mr. Frea of additional pavement striping and signs to delineate traffic flow.

Mr. Frea then shared a recommendation of adding a second order kiosk to further improve traffic and wait time. Mr. Valley informed Mr. Frea that Chick-fil-A staff would still be out at the lanes taking orders with IPads to expedite the ordering process. As peak hours pass the single kiosk could resume main ordering responsibility. He added that a second ordering kiosk could potentially be added in the future.

Hearing no further comments or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan Amendment, as submitted.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the item was approved 4-0

Item 5 – Beautiful Savior Evangelical Lutheran Church – Development Plan **PID# 202202220014**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Departments findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan for two building additions and associated site improvements at Beautiful Savior Lutheran Church at 2213 White Road. Following approval of the Development Plan, the project will move to final site engineering review and review of Building Permits.

Mrs. Shields noted that the applicant has indicated proposed additions will add three new classrooms, new restrooms, an enlarged narthex, and support rooms. Other site improvements included in the plans are the addition of an exterior canopy and parking lot modifications. Materials indicate that both additions would match the existing facility in finish materials and design to blend with the surrounding area.

Mrs. Shield explained that plans show landscape screening along the new parking spaces, oriented toward the residential area to the south and White Road to the north, however, the selected landscaping will not meet Code requirements to appropriately screen these parking spaces and will need to be replaced with a continuous 36" evergreen hedge running the entire length of the spaces.

Mrs. Shield concluded by stating that Staff believes the proposed additions and site improvements are appropriate and in character with the area by utilizing matching materials to the existing structure and by installing landscaping in new parking areas as well as around the perimeter of building additions. Staff recommended that Planning Commission make a recommendation to City Council of approval for the Development Plan, with the noted stipulation.

Mr. Robert Euans, Robert E. Euans Architects, Inc., was present to speak to the item and wished to clarify a supposed typo in the Staff Report. The Staff Report should reflect a 36" evergreen hedge addition (per the stipulation) and not a 36' evergreen hedge. He also wished to clarify the placement of the screening of parking spaces, also addressed in the stipulation.

Mrs. Shields confirmed that the evergreen hedge was to be 36" and that the screening was to run along the parking spaces, to screen them from the roadway.

Mr. Frea commented that it was wonderful to see another church in town growing and able to expand. He then questioned if there were any plans in the future to connect the parking lots on the south side to loop the drive around the building. Mr. Rauck also supported a connection.

Mr. Euans answered that there was initial discussion to connect the lots behind the building but that it would require the demolition of several structures and therefore was not being pursued at this time.

Hearing no further comments or discussion, Mr. Titus moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan, with the following stipulation:

1. Screening of parking spaces adjacent to White Road and the residential properties to the south shall be comprised of a 36" evergreen hedgerow.

Mr. Frea seconded the motion, which was approved 4-0.

Item 6 – Tosoh Expansion– Development Plan **PID# 202202010006**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Departments findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan for an 81,679-square-foot addition to the existing Tosoh building at 3600 Gantz Road. The site was originally developed in 1991 and the facility has undergone multiple expansions since, with this newest expansion estimated to create 50 additional jobs.

Mrs. Shields noted that the proposed addition will be located on the east side of the building, next to expansion #3 completed in 2013. The addition will measure 81,679 square feet with a maximum height of 62 feet 6 inches, which exceeds the maximum permitted height of 35 feet in the IND-1 district. Materials indicate that the increased height is necessary due to the presses and crane needed for new manufacturing in the building. A variance would need to be obtained through the Board of Zoning Appeals to exceed the maximum permitted height. However, Staff is supportive of this variance noting the industrial context of the area and the fact that the addition is designed to match materials and architecture of the existing building. Materials also state that any rooftop mechanical units would be fully screened by the building parapet.

Mrs. Shield added that other site improvements include reconfiguring curb cuts and adding a new drive along the east property line to access the rear of the new addition.

Mrs. Shield concluded by stating that Staff is supportive of the proposed site modifications and building addition, including the noted variance to building height, as the addition is designed to be compatible to the existing building architecture and is interior to an industrial development, not visible from any residential area. Staff recommended that Planning Commission make a recommendation to City Council of approval for the Development Plan, as submitted.

Mr. Thomas Linzell, M+A Architects, was present to speak to the item.

Mr. Frea wished to clarify whether the addition was free-standing or not, as he felt the dotted lines on the plans to be confusing. Mr. Linzell answered that the addition was not free-standing.

Mr. Frea then asked if added parking was being considered. Mr. Linzell answered that added parking would be considered in the future but not at this time.

Hearing no further comments or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan, as submitted.

Mr. Titus seconded the motion, which was approved 4-0.

At this time, technological difficulties were occurring while trying to communicate with the applicant for Item #7 – Sharp Home – Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Frea made a motion to reorder the agenda to place Item #8 at the end of the agenda to allow time to troubleshoot the technical issues.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion, and the agenda re-ordering was approved, 4-0.

Item 8 – The Village at Scioto Meadows – Development Plan Amendment **PID# 202202020008**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Departments findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan Amendment for the Village at Scioto Meadows, to construct 64 residential units in 16 buildings on the vacant portion of Pondview Drive North, adjacent to the existing Scioto Meadows condominium community. The previously approved Development Plan included the same number of buildings and units as proposed with this application. However, this portion of the site was not built at the time the existing condominiums were constructed and has since been sold to a separate entity. While the property has since sold, the PUD zoning on the site, as well as the original Development Plan, remain valid.

Mrs. Shields explained that the original Development Plan showed buildings 38-41 to have rear-loaded garages off Pondview Dr. However, most of Pondview Dr. is on the existing condominium development's property. Because the applicant was unable to reach an agreement with the Scioto Meadows condominium association, the amendment proposes to rotate the four buildings to have garage access from Lakeview Dr. While the building architecture would match the existing structures, Staff does not believe that flipping the orientation of these buildings is appropriate to maintain the character established with the existing Village at Scioto Meadows development, and as was approved for the area with the original Development Plan.

Mrs. Shields further explained that because an agreement regarding access was not able to be reached, the applicant is proposing to install bollards across the width of the street to restrict access to the existing, privately owned roadways. Staff is not supportive of the lack of connectivity between the new development and the existing Village at Scioto Meadows condos. In addition to the safety concerns for emergency vehicle access, the GroveCity2050 Community Plan encourages neighborhoods to be well-connected by street and trail networks.

Mrs. Shields concluded by stating that while most of the development will remain unchanged from the original Development Plan, the proposed modifications of flipping the building orientation of four structures and the blocking of access across roadways is counter to the intended character established with the PUD. The access modification is also counter to the 2050 principle regarding connectivity. Therefore, Staff recommended that Planning Commission make a recommendation to City Council of disapproval for the Development Plan Amendment, as submitted.

Ms. Connie Klema, C.J. Klema, was present to speak to the item.

Ms. Klema explained that the property owners purchased the land after meeting with the existing condo association and that the property owner had previous conversations with Staff affirming that a Development Plan that mirrored original designs would acceptable. She stated that agreements were then made with the condo association to share costs of street maintenance and share access through all streets. She said that it wasn't until after the purchase of the land that the condo association's attorney informed them that they no longer wanted shared access on roadways or property, as well as no access to utility easements. She explained that the only solution was to flip the four buildings and add the bollards.

Ms. Robin Strohm, Williams + Strohm, LLC, 2 Miranova Place, Columbus, spoke as the attorney for the condo association. She stated that the declaration provides no easement rights through the condo association's property and that the roadways, the grassy areas are reserved for those who would be actually developing the additional property as a successor developer. She stated that there is no assignment of rights from the original developers and there is nothing in the declaration that would provide easement rights, and therefore there were no easement rights to roadways. She added that the only easement rights that do exist are the storm and sewer drainage rights.

Ms. Strohm went on to explain that work with the property owner towards an agreement had taken place, but no agreement had been made. She stated that the condo association opposes the development for a variety of reasons:

- Traffic concerns; the residents of the new development using the private roadways of the condo association, leading to wear and tear of the roadways.
- Pedestrian issues; trespassing and liability issues from residents passing through private, condo association owned property, including the pond.
- Apartment v. owner occupied community; concern over market values

Mr. Titus asked if condos were considered for the new development. Ms. Klema stated that the owner wished to develop high-end apartments that would be the same exact unit as is there currently (the condos), and that even if they were to be condos, they would not be considered a part of the association.

Mr. Titus asked if it could be considered to have condos instead of apartments. Ms. Klema answered that the property owner has attempted to work with the association and offered substantial money to share in expenses and that it was determined by the association that they did want this development to be a part of their community. She also noted that the condo owners bought their properties with the knowledge that this plan would be developed, whether it was condos or not, as they are not required to be condos.

Ms. Strohm added that the condo owners probably bought with the expectation that the additional property would be developed into condominiums and be made a part of the Village at Scioto Meadows. She said that when the residents of the condos purchase their property, they would be provided a disclosure statement and declaration that contemplates this land being developed as condos at some point. Mr. Titus added that although that may be the case, this is a unique situation in which one developer started and a different one is completing.

Mr. Frea stated that he sees the residents concern and desire to have condos when that was the original plan, however, he feels it could be obstructionist on the part of the condo association to block any and all development. He reminded the group that although it is a difficult situation, we are neighbors and should be working together to find solutions to these kinds of problems. He stated that at this time, he would not be recommending approval and his suggestion would be to work together to find a solution to this impasse, perhaps using Staff as an intermediary to help negotiate.

Ms. Robin Cook, 679 Pondview Dr, Grove City, wished to speak to the matter. She stated that she vehemently opposed apartments in the area and that there would be no way to keep people out of their pond. She said as an owner of a condo in the area she is not opposed to the land being developed as condos but is opposed to apartments. She voiced other concerns including lack of public transportation in the area, no contributions to the condo-owned streets or pond, and that the residents felt as they are being bullied with the proposed development. She also noted concerns over calling the apartments the Villages at Scioto Meadows, as they are not a part of the existing development.

Ms. Teresa Morgan, 659 Pondview Dr., Grove City, wished to speak to the item. She stated that she did not have issue with development of condominiums but did oppose apartments. When she bought her condo, it was with the understanding that the remaining site would be developed as condos that would be a part of their community. She also noted concerns over property values and adding more garages off Pondview due to its narrow width.

Mr. Michael Stevens, 6304 Riverview Loop, Grove City, wished to speak to the item. He stated that he is a board member and treasurer of the condo association and was previously the president of the condo board. He said that there was never an agreement between the association and the developer, as the Board never took a vote on the agreement. He noted that they felt bullied and at one point received notification that they had to remove their water lines and that work was about to begin on the site. He also noted his concerns with trespassers, as they already have to run people out of the community. He noted that he has had an individual pull a knife on him and that now he carries a gun with him when walking around the complex.

Mr. Jeff Blume, 6372 Sleepy Meadow Blvd. E, Grove City, wished to speak to the item. He expressed concern relating to the fiscal impact the development may have. He noted that the association, now under the direction of Onyx Realty, has been very careful to make sure they are not overcharging fees to be fiscally responsible but that this proposed development would impact the existing homeowners particularly in terms of roads and utilities.

Ms. Crystal Stephenson, 650 Lakeview Dr. S, Grove City, wished to speak to the item. She stated her opposition to apartments and voiced concern over fiscal impacts, noting the increased traffic on their personally maintained roads.

Mr. Jeff Parker, 6340 Lakeview Dr. E, Grove City, wished to speak to the item. He stated a concern regarding the state of the roads and the impact more traffic may have. They have made improvements to their roads but the roads still need maintenance, so an increase in traffic will only make the situation worse. He felt that a cost sharing agreement, whether the development be apartments or condos, would help to fund road improvements and make sure that costs are fair.

Mr. Stephen Owen, 610 Lakeview Dr. S, Grove City, current board president of the Village at Scioto Meadows, wished to speak to the item. He expressed his opposition to apartments and the name of the proposed development. He also noted that he felt an agreement could be made and ideally the residents of the new development would be a part of the association, but that it shouldn't be apartments.

Ms. Klema responded by explaining that she understands the condo owners wanting more condos, but that the property is already zoned for these types of units, and that hopefully the feeling of not wanting apartments could be addressed between the parties sooner than later. She explained that at some point in the meetings between parties' communication was cut by the condo association. As a developer, they felt the only option forward was to move forward with the development as planned, but because they were not allowed to have access, flipped the buildings. She stated that no threats ever took place, and four different renditions were discussed with the association, but nothing was signed. She also explained that different cost sharing points were discussed and agreed upon in these meetings. She stated that the idea was to be a part of the community but as time went on it was clear that was not the intent of the association. She said that ideally, there would be no bollards in the plan, but it seemed to become necessary to restrict access to the property of the condo association. She stated that the goal is definitely not to walk away and not develop the property.

Ms. Klema then verified with Planning Commission that the developer could remove the bollards and not swap the building orientation and then follow the originally approved Development Plan and have the right to develop that plan. Mrs. Shields confirmed that that was correct.

Mr. Frea pointed out the word "apartment" does not appear in the Development Plan before Planning Commission, and as previously stated, this is not a zoning issue. He also expressed that he felt it distasteful to refer to one type of building unit or resident as some sort of lower class than the condominium owners. He implored both parties to recognize that they are neighbors and should be working together. He also pointed out that the sticking point with the current plan is the bollards and the orientation of units, and that it is likely the developer can revert to the original plan and move forward without seeking Planning Commission or City Council approval.

Hearing no further comments or discussion, Mr. Frea moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan Amendment, as submitted.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion. The motion was not approved, 0-4.

Item 7 – Sharp Home – Preliminary Development Plan **PID# 202201050002**

Mrs. Shields presented the Development Departments findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to rezone property at Franklin St. and Sunshine Park, from R2 to PUD-R to construct a new, residence. The property will need to be rezoned to PUD-R to allow for the construction of the home as proposed, noting setback requirements of code as well as the potential for a secondary dwelling unit in the future. The Preliminary Development Plan is the first step in the rezoning process for PUD districts.

Mrs. Shields explained that per City Code, lots zoned R-2 (Residential) are required to have a 30-foot front setback, 25-foot rear setback and a 6-foot side setback. As the subject parcel is a corner lot, it would be required to have a 30-foot setback from both Franklin St. and Sunshine Park Place.

Mrs. Shield further explained that the provided materials indicate the font of the home would be set back 22 feet from Sunshine Park Place and that the garage would be 24 feet or more from Franklin. Noting some discrepancy in plans, and that setbacks would need to be finalized during creation of a zoning text for the site, Staff is generally supportive of the proposed building placement as it would align with the setbacks of existing buildings along Franklin St. and Sunshine Park Place.

Mrs. Shields went on to add that the proposed home is to be two stories with 1,998 square feet of living space and a 721-square-foot attached garage. The house would front on Sunshine Park Place and have garage access from Franklin St. Based on the elevations provided, the structure would be 33'4.5" at roof peak, finished with white vertical board and batten siding, and a black standing seam metal roof.

Mrs. Shields stated that Staff had several concerns with the architecture of the home and its compatibility with the existing architecture and character of the surrounding neighborhood. Noting that the surrounding homes are primarily one to one and half stories, the height of the proposed home, combined with the lack of architectural elements to break up the massing create a structure that Staff believes to be out of character with the surrounding area. Additionally, Staff does not believe the garage fronting on Franklin St. is appropriate, noting that the dimensions of the lot are configured to feature Franklin St. as the primary frontage and very few homes on Franklin St. feature front-loaded attached garages.

Mrs. Shields explained that current materials indicate a proposed home with three bedrooms and three bathrooms. Plan sheets show a living room and kitchen on each floor of the proposed structure. If the intent of the applicant is to have two separate dwelling units in the future, this will need to be reflected in the zoning text for the site, as it would not be permitted under the R-2 zoning. Staff would be supportive of permitting two units on the property, with the expectation that the structure be designed with the appearance of a single-family home in character with other residences on Franklin St.

Mrs. Shield concluded, noting the architectural concerns to be further addressed in the PUD zoning text, to ensure an appropriate structure based on the character of the area and to ensure a high-quality development in line with goals for all infill development, and therefore, recommended that Planning Commission make a recommendation to City Council of approval for the Preliminary Development Plan, with the noted stipulations.

Mr. William Sharp, property owner, was present to speak to the item. He expressed that he had been working on plans for the home for over a year, trying to incorporate ideas from the surrounding area while still keeping a modern-farmhouse design. He stated that his intent is to make a nice dwelling for himself and his foster parents.

Mr. Frea wished to clarify ownership of the blacktop driveway on the eastern edge of the property. Mr. Sharp answered that it is actually inside his parcel and that agreements have been made with the neighboring parcel owner to remove the pavement and create more green space, as the neighbor will be adding new pavers in his driveway.

Mr. Frea commented that although the intent of the home is a worthy one, he finds the dual dwelling/duplex to be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood and in violations of GroveCity2050 principles as well as some setback restrictions and would be not be recommending approval. Mr. Titus agreed with Mr. Frea's concerns.

Mr. Sharp explained that he would be willing to accommodate Planning Commission and Staff concerns and brought up that his current living situation at 4016 Arbutus is a dwelling above a garage with a kitchen and bedroom. He was unsure of the approval of that dwelling but not his proposed plan. He then asked Planning Commission their thoughts on the rest of the current plan.

Chair Oyster answered that she liked the overall style of the home but felt that it would need some architectural elements to break up the mass of the structure.

Mr. Frea suggested utilizing some green space in the parcel to still accommodate his parents but also stay within the area norm of one and a half story homes.

Mr. Rauck commented that he appreciated Mr. Sharp's investment in the downtown community and the modern approach to infill on an empty lot.

Hearing no further comments or discussion, Mr. Rauck moved to recommend approval to City Council of the Development Plan Amendment, with the following stipulations:

1. Additional architectural elements shall be added to the building's Franklin Street and Sunshine Park Place frontages, such as a front porch or stoop, shutters, roofline variation, and appropriately sized windows.

2. The overall height of the structure shall be reduced to be more compatible with existing sing-family homes along Franklin Street.

Mr. Titus seconded the motion. The motion was not approved, 2-2.

There being no additional discussion, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 2:56 pm.

Hannah White, Development Assistant

Julie Oyster

Julie Oyster, Chair