

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION  
BUSINESS MEETING  
February 21, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**     **Amanda Edwards  
Doria Daniels  
Peter Paino  
John Gargan  
Jeffrey Clapper**

**STAFF PRESENT:**        **Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer  
Bridget Susel, Community Development Director  
Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director  
Sheila Uzl, Transcriptionist**

**I.     Call To Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

**II.    Roll Call:**

Ms. Edwards, Mr. Paino, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Gargan and Mr. Clapper were present.

**III.   Reading of the Preamble**

The Planning Commission operates in accordance with the provisions of the Kent City Charter, the Kent Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations, all of which establish the powers and duties of the Commission. Members of the Planning Commission are appointed by Kent City Council and serve without compensation. Certain cases such as Conditional Zoning Certificates, Special Zoning Permits, Overlay District Projects and Zoning Amendment require Public Hearings before the Planning Commission. During the Public Hearing, any person wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be provided the opportunity. Once the Public Hearing is closed, it shall be the discretion of the Chair whether to allow any additional public comment. Cases such as Site Plan Reviews and Subdivision Projects do not require a Public Hearing. However, the Chair will allow public comment on each case as it is taken on the agenda. In each instance where the Commission receives public comments or conducts a Public Hearing, those persons wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be required to do so under oath or positive affirmation. The oath or affirmation shall be administered to all who wish to speak at the beginning of the Planning Commission Meeting. Once a decision has been made by the Planning Commission on a case, the Case is closed for the commission, as there is no provision to reopen a case. With the exception of cases falling under the Subdivision Code, any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City's Board of Zoning Appeals in accordance with the Chapter 1109

of the Zoning Code. Anyone interested in appealing a decision of the Planning Commission is advised to seek private legal counsel.

**IV. Oath of Office**

Mr. Fink swore in Jeffrey Clapper, the newly appointed member to the Planning Commission. "Do you solemnly swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States, Constitution of the State of Ohio, the Charter and Ordinances of the City of Kent and do hereby swear to faithfully, honestly and impartially discharge the duties of this office as a member of the Planning Commission of the City of Kent, Ohio for as long you shall continue in office. Mr. Clapper replied "I do".

**V. Administration of Oath**

Mr. Fink instructed those members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to rise and raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the Oath, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do." The participants responded, "I do."

**VI. Correspondence**

The commissioners received a copy of a photo from the Record Courier, correspondence from the City Staff and code updates

**VI. Old Business**

**A.     PC15-021     EAST MAIN STREET LOFTS  
                                 1700 Holly Drive  
                                 Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review**

**The applicant is requesting a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval in order to construct a multi-family residential complex. The subject property is zoned R-4 Multi-Family Residential and C-R: Commercial High Density Residential District.**

Ms. Edwards asked the applicants to present the project.

Ryan Pearson (231 Spring Street, Columbus, OH) stated he was at the meeting representing Hallmark. He said they were others with him who will be happy to answer any questions. He said they have been before the Planning Commission a few times so

everyone is probably familiar with the project. He referred to drawings he displayed that show what is on the site. There are two houses; one is being lived in and one is a vacant house. He said the drawings show Holly Drive as it currently exists from Horning Drive. He indicated an emergency access to Holly Park Apartments as well as a pedestrian connection to the university easement shown on the drawing. He said in the lower section of the drawing there are some wet conditions on the site. That area is relatively flat and marshy forcing water to the east down the property line. He said they have received variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals except for the one variance they requested in which they requested 0.8 parking spaces per bed. He said they changed the units and added five (5) parking spaces. He said they reduced the number of one bedroom units and increased the number of two bedroom units so now they are meeting the code with 184 parking spaces for 184 beds. He said the plan is relatively the same but they have adjusted the Holly Drive sidewalk connection between Holly Park Apartments and Horning Road at the request of the Traffic Engineer. He said there will be two four story buildings. He said the shortest side is the one that will be facing the neighbors to the south. This site is adjacent to Franklin Township to the east. The site is adjacent to an R-4: Multi-family Residential District and a C-R: Commercial High Density Residential District in the City of Kent. He said they are asking for a Conditional Zoning Certificate. He said they have been working on this for two years. He said they have been very responsive and have worked with the staff and provided the information that has been requested.

Ms. Daniels asked what changes have been made to the Traffic Study.

Mr. Pearson replied the changes made were based on working with the City's Traffic Engineer and their Traffic Engineer. He said an 8-foot sidewalk has been added. He said the radius at Holy Drive and Horning Drive has been changed and crosswalks have been added. He said there is now a 20-foot emergency drive for the Fire Department. He said the pedestrian walk has been angled for better pedestrian movement. He said the compactor will be in the rear yard with an 8-foot fence.

Mr. Paino asked if Holly Drive is a public or a private drive.

Mr. Pearson replied Holly Drive is a private drive.

Rick Kirk (150 East Broad, Columbus, OH) stated he is the CEO for On Campus Communities. He said they have been working on this project for two years. He said they previously built a project called University Edge. He said a number of things were added to the project such as adding a fence. He said they wanted to be good neighbors and have been responsible developers. He said they asked the neighbors what they wanted to which they replied cut it in half so they did. He said they have done everything they could to accommodate the neighbors. He said this is a reasonable request.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicant if he wanted to present the Traffic Study to the Planning Commission.

Doug Bender (5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH) stated they did an updated traffic impact report based on comments received from the City staff. He said included in the report is a new intersection at Loop Road as well some of the site issues that have been mentioned. He said the Holly Drive intersection and how it will handle pedestrians and bicycles has been an issue and they have since updated that and addressed the issue. He said the intersections will be adequate at the opening of the project but there might be some concerns twenty years out for the five intersections studied for this site; Main Street at Horning Drive, Main Street at Sixth, Horning Drive at Holly Drive, Horning Drive at Loop Road, and Horning Drive at Rhodes Road. He said Loop Road was added since the last meeting and there were some concerns so they did study that. They did eight hours of counting and one of the concerns was for pedestrians in an all-way stop situation. He said as a result of counting, that did not meet all the way stop criteria and the City of Kent is aware of that and will continue to monitor that for potential changes in the future. He said there will be no changes to the Loop Road intersection because changes are not warranted.

Mr. Gargan asked if they had considered the proposed University Oaks units which will have a parking lot next to Holly Drive.

Mr. Bender replied no. It was not included in the Traffic Study.

Mr. Paino asked if there were any improvements that need to be made per their Traffic Study.

Mr. Bender replied Holly Drive and Horning Road intersection has crosswalks.

Mr. Paino asked about the pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Mr. Bender replied there will be a wider sidewalk, a second crosswalk will be added on the east leg of the intersection and one across Holly Drive and better access to get to the crosswalks. He said the City of Kent's planned improvements include signs that will encourage motorists to drive slowly through that section and natural lights. The signs will be small reboundable that will have a picture of a crosswalk and a pedestrian. These signs will rebound and come back up if they are hit and will be located on the center line.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Edwards told the audience that comments would be limited to two minutes.

Mick Rogers (5885 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated that the Traffic Study does not address the pedestrian, bicycle or skate board issues. Students cross the road at any place on the road. He said that no one at this meeting thinks that this project is a good idea. He said they do not need more traffic in the area.

Maureen Gartland (5885 Horning Road, Kent, OH) referred to a display board she brought to the meeting. She referred to the display and showed where her house is located and showed the ten developments that are already in the area with an estimation of 3000 beds. She called the area a city within a city. She said young people dramatically change the neighborhood and the density of it. She said there is a lot of extra trash and noise as well as petty crime. The neighborhood has already been negatively affected. She said there were already traffic problems and that no one goes the speed limit of 25 mph. She said her home and her neighbor's homes were burglarized and cars have been broken into. She said it is a bad idea to add another development. She said the load on Horning Road is ridiculous. She said the Kent Housing Study indicates that there is no need for more. Residents are worried about the blight. She called Campus Pointe who told her that they are at 60% occupancy. She asked the commissioners to vote no on this development.

Cheryl Hostler (5899 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated she lives right across where this development will be. She said there is a traffic concern. She said the only option is to walk on the street which is risky and putting additional cars on the road will make it worse. She said it is not even safe to get mail. She said it will be harder to get in and out of her drive. Her biggest fear is the density which could result in strangers using a short cut and walking through her yard. She said the crime rate has gone up. She said houses in the area have been vandalized and robbed. She said looking down the line there will be a lot of maintenance and it could possibly be sold in time. She felt it was going to be a problem.

Mary Organ (5876 Horning Road, Kent, OH), provided staff and the commissioners a picture from the Record Courier. She had four men standing behind her who represented buildings that will replace the trees shown in the photograph. She said she was squatting down to half of their height to represent the height of the homes. She said this is representative of what the residents on Horning Road are facing. She asked the audience to stand. She said she represented the residents. She said the 60 residents feel like they are being overshadowed by the developer's project. She said the developers do not live here in Kent. The developers might say they want to be good neighbors but at University Edge they passed off management to another big corporation. She asked for humanity sake and common sense to listen to the long term residents. She said there will be problems including noise, light, traffic, crime and evasion of privacy. She said those 6 to 8 foot fences will not protect from prying eyes overlooking the houses. She said technically this development could be built and that the developers have jumped through all the hoops. If the Planning Commission approves the project, practically and

in reality, the residents will be overshadowed as well as an increase in multiple issues. The property will remain once it has been built. She said the City of Kent invested a lot of money in the comprehensive Housing Study in which it is stated that if the quantity of multi-family housing continues at its current pace, it will far exceed the demand even with the consideration of the recent growth and enrollment at the Kent State campus. This conclusion was made even before the Presbyterian Church project that has 384 beds. She asked the Planning Commission to listen to the residents of the City of Kent.

Phyllis Spangler (5870 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated she has lived there for 50 years and it breaks her heart with what is happening. She said traffic is so dangerous. She said there are people walking, skate boarding or pushing baby carriages. She said it was a bad idea to add more cars on Horning Road.

Jeri Geldenhuys (5896 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated that the width of Holly Drive was given a variance which resulted in small front yards. She said the buildings will be built close to the property lines which are being treated as side yards and she objects to that.

Dennis Krupa, 5868 Rhodes Road, Kent, Ohio, stated he also owns a house on Horning Road. He raised four points: the Traffic Study, Franklin Township precedent, alternatives do exist, and property rights on a two way street. He said the Traffic Study has some conflicting terms in uses. It refers to multi-family and also refers to student housing. The developers said that they will market the units to professionals but the matrix seems to be calibrated for student behavior habits. A student population is a highly mobile one. He said students will figure out other ways to get to and from locations. He said this development will have a substantial impact and will be an encroachment on the neighborhood. He said there will be an overbearing density next to an R-1 neighborhood resulting in intrusive issues. There are other alternatives for this area resulting with better land utilization to attract a diverse population such as an Assistant Living complex. The Housing Study was completed more than a year ago and has been a benchmark study. He said property rights are a two way street and he knew the proposed development owners have rights but so do the residents.

Michelle Touve-Holland ( 896 Horning Road, Kent, OH) showed where her house is located in relation to the proposed project. She said eyes will be looking at her children playing in the backyard. She said the state patrol has pulled over multiple people for speeding violations in the past month. The speeding traffic is terrifying when waiting for a bus in the dark. She said there will be an increase in traffic. She said the existing trees will be removed that will impact the environment. She said she will be 80 years old before newly planted trees will be as tall as the existing ones. She said that long term tree canopy issues should be considered.

Nancy Pizzino (4640 Creekside Drive, Kent, OH) was one of the property owners and was offended by the comment made that it was just a paycheck. Her father invested in the property over 50 years ago in the R-4 zone because it was near the university. He wanted to build something of quality for the City of Kent but unfortunately he passed away. She said this is not student housing. She said she and her family did what the Market Study said, and found a company that would build a quality project. She said they are very passionate about this project. The City of Kent has this area zoned for this project. She said they like what the developer has proposed and they have met everything that the City of Kent has asked them to do.

Howard Lowry (5873 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated the traffic is a big issue. He said he has been a resident in the area for 30 years and his wife's family has been there 30 years prior to that so they have time invested in the area. He said he is a small business owner in the City of Kent as many other residents are so they have a double interest in what is being done in the City of Kent. He said he has watched the high rise buildings being built and the encroachment into the neighborhoods. He said there is a certain point where it has to be said "enough is enough". He said distance learning is becoming a bigger thing so there will not be as many people moving to Kent. He said the Presbyterian Church project should not have been approved. He said the term "ad-nausea" is a term that has been applied to this project. He said the traffic is an issue so when trying to get to a destination he has to go east and south to get to a place in the west. Drivers take the path of the least resistance when trying to get some place and do not go toward the university. He said Loop Road and the other end of Horning Road will be further impacted by the project. He said he and his family have invested in the community but this project is an inhibitor to the community. He said the day might come when he decides to get out of the area before his property value drops further.

Paul Organ (5876 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated that their house is close to the project. He said the builders did cut the project in half but there is less land also. He said the project is now taller which results in not being cut in half.

Joe Palak (1974 Brookview Drive, Franklin Township) stated he represented his mother who lives at 5900 Horning Road, Kent, Ohio. He said she is 95 ½ years old and has lived in the house at this location since her husband built it 63 years ago. He said he agreed with most of what has been said by the other people especially regarding the traffic. He said he works at Kent State University and drives in that area to get to the university. He said a housing study was done and it has been determined that the enrollment has decreased at Kent State University. He asked if the project was approved, if there could be a stipulation that it could never be turned into low income housing.

Karin Hickin, 5861 Hornig Road, Kent, Ohio, stated that the bike path/lanes on both sides of the road are difficult because the traffic is going very fast and it is a poorly lit

road. She said the area is almost like living in the country. The increased traffic on Horning Road will only get worse.

Joe Volcuko (5908 Horning Road, Kent, OH) asked about the reasoning of the December 8<sup>th</sup> date that the MHT agency studied shows which was a low volume date and cold and below freezing. He asked why only standard metrics were used when the amount being measured on the campus has a much different reality. He requested an unbiased study of the traffic at the peak hours by the City of Kent. He said it appeared that everyone has received incomplete information so it would be impossible to make a decision based on partial studies or disproportionally representation. He passed out the original plans to the commissioners. He referred to page 2 and said it shows two story units. He asked Mr. Paino if he felt this original plan would be more appealing to professors and professional students.

Mr. Fink interjected and said that Mr. Paino is not obligated to answer any questions.

Mr. Volcuko passed out pictures from the current Edge Development on Lake Road that showed the number of cars on the property which has had an impact on traffic as this proposed project will have as well. He also passed out pictures of high density student housing across Kent State campus as well as the neighborhood in question. He continued to read a statement regarding the project and the concern of the residents. He said it is the duty of the residents to see that the codified ordinances are upheld. He said the residents want a mutually beneficial solution that is harmonious with the neighborhood and would like to find a long term compromise with the property owners. He said they have to look at it by who is adding value.

Keith Benjamin stated he is a Franklin Township trustee and lives on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said this project is an ethical issue. It is an issue of should we do it versus can we do it. He said the tricky part of the proposal is the conditional part. He recommended that the Planning Commission deny this request based on this. He said Franklin Township will be impacted. He said Franklin Township and the City of Kent should get together about zoning. He said there has to be a way than putting an R-4 next to an R-1. He said there are a lot of concerns when this occurs. He said the township and the city have worked together on a lot of good things and they could continue to work together to come up with something more compatible.

Ms. Edwards closed the Public Comments.

Mr. Bender stated the City of Kent set up the parameters for the Traffic Study and that has been reviewed for a number of times. He said they have listened and responded to the concerns and have added an intersection. He said he is required to take an ethics class to get his Professional Engineering License and has to take it every two years. The traffic study is based on two hours in the morning and two hours in the evening at all

five intersections. From that, they pick the one hour that is the maximum hour for volume so that a typical situation is represented. From that one hour a peak hour is applied that says that 15 minutes is probably higher than an hour long average so that 15 minute period is bumped up to about 10% and applied for the full hour. This is a legitimate study and how the traffic process is done. This is an unbiased opinion. He said he had to meet the City of Kent's requirements in the Traffic Study. The most recent Traffic Study was done January 31st. He said the four intersections were counted in September during peak hours after school which also included pedestrians. The last intersection was done before finals because final time seems to be an off time. He said they did try to get the traffic done fairly quickly. He recommended the residents talk to the County Engineer about getting Solar Power speed flashing signs.

Mick Rogers asked who pays for the traffic study.

Ms. Barone replied the developer pays for the traffic study.

Ryan Pearson stated that the height of the building is under the height requirement in the current zoning code. He said there has been a discussion of student housing versus general housing. Student housing projects is a general term for a development that has three or four bedrooms units that increases the density and geared towards under classmen. This project will have one and two apartments geared for faculty and graduate students. This is more of an upper class type of project. He said they are not trying to solve all the community's problems with traffic but they are addressing the pedestrian and bike connections. He said they are not asking for rezoning but are asking for a site plan review and Conditional Zoning Certificate as set forth in the zoning code. He said the plan before the commissioners meet the conditions of the code. They did get some variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Maureen Gartland (5885 Horning Road, Kent, OH) reminded everyone that in talking with the City of Kent, that the Horning Road portion that is owned by the City of Kent is a problematic area. There are no shoulders and the sight is bad. She did not think that this area would be addressed for another seven to ten years. She said it is a dangerous mess.

Michelle Touve-Holland (5896 Horning Road, Kent, OH) stated she is concerned that people will be riding bikes from this development which indicates to her that it will be a younger generation. If it was an older generation riding the bikes, there are safety hazards on the road because of the speed, blind spots, and the speeding. Riding on this road is a safety hazard.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Ms. Barone reviewed the staff report. She said the developer has been before the Planning Commission several times. The traffic study was completed and reviewed by the City of Kent's Traffic Engineer and City Engineer and they find the traffic study acceptable. No traffic movement improvements are required for opening day. The City of Kent does have plans coming up to upgrade Horning Road. The City of Kent is also going to put a light at Holly Drive where there is an existing cross walk on Horning Road. The site plan has been revised. The developer has made the emergency access road wider for this development and Holly Park so there will be a better flow in that area. She recommended that this condition be added to any motion that is made. She said the City of Kent does not want the crosswalk to be in the curve on Horning Road and Holly and wants another crosswalk added on the other side of the road. Signage will have to be put up about the crosswalks. She said staff finds that the proposed development as presented on the submitted application is in accordance with the standards established in the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Fink stated there is a conflicting ordinance regarding the fence. Fences cannot be higher than six feet but a fence has to be one foot higher than the compactor versus six feet. The most stringent requirement was determined to be an eight foot fence and would be better for the neighborhood. Section 1113.05(a) states that in the event that the Planning Commission feels that additional information is necessary in order to make its decision, it may instruct the applicant or the administration to conduct additional studies, or seek expert advice. The cost of such studies shall be borne by the applicant. He said the Planning Commission cannot consider the future of the site and whether it would become Section 8 Housing. He said a person who has been sworn in from the audience can questions.

Mr. Gargan asked what are the standards the commissioners must use for voting on a project.

Mr. Fink referred to the zoning code and said the following should be considered:

- (1) Shall be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the Land Use and Thoroughfare Plan (Comprehensive Development Plan) of current adoption;
- (2) Shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use shall not change the essential character of the same area;
- (3) Shall not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses;
- (4) Shall not be detrimental to property in the immediate vicinity or to the community as a whole;

(5) Shall be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of such use shall be able to provide adequately any such service including refuse disposal; and

(6) Shall have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public streets or roads.

He said there also has to be sufficient evidence to consider.

Mr. Gargan said this was a difficult project and that it was too dense. He felt this project was like putting 50 pound of sugar in a 25 pound sack. He asked how many trees would be moved.

Mr. Pearson replied they were not sure.

Mr. Gargan asked how the trash compactor worked.

Mr. Pearson replied that the residents will carry their trash to the compactor and then it is picked up twice per week.

Mr. Paino stated that the Franklin Township planners and local planners have done nothing to address these issues on Horning Road and these issues are not new. Every time a project is considered in this area there are issues. The increase in traffic has gone to the point of overload. He said one of the biggest issues is that there is a four story building that will overshadow single family residences. He asked why the buildings are on the residential side of the site and not on the Holly Park side? Why are the buildings on the north side rather than the south and the east side of the property?

Mr. Pearson replied that the initial plan started that way. The current plan is a little smaller and the rear yard is furthest from the front. He said the rear yard is setback. He said they asked for a minimum number of variances. He said it is hard for him to present a hardship to get a variance to reduce the setback in the back when the building could be put in per the code.

Mr. Paino stated that if he had gotten a setback variance for the rear yard, there would not be one person from Holly Park here tonight. He said the building will be right next to single family houses. He again asked why the building could not be on the other side of the property.

Mr. Pearson stated they tried not to place the broad side of the building facing the residential houses. He said he could not present a hardship to get a variance in the rear yard.

Mr. Paino stated that he would not be so concerned if the traffic would go to East Main Street with Holly Drive for emergency access. This would be considered good planning. He said somehow Sheetz Drive should be used for this site so that traffic would go to East Main. He asked if there was only one front yard.

Ms. Barone replied yes, there is only one front yard and one rear yard.

Mr. Fink stated that a front yard is only that portion of the yard that directly abuts the street. The code defines that there is only one rear yard. The code is written with the idea that every property is a rectangle but in reality that is not how it is.

Mr. Paino stated that if something has to have a Conditional Zoning Certificate, it has to match the requirements of Section 1107.05. The first requirement is that project shall be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the Land Use and Thoroughfare Plan. He felt that it meets the first requirement. The second one is it shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use shall not change the essential character of the same area. He said this second requirement can be debated because of the residential character of the area and that it will abut residential. The next requirement is it shall not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses. He asked if the commissioners could consider Franklin Township.

Mr. Fink replied the zoning code does not address this issue. He said the City of Kent Planning Commission has to consider the City of Kent. He said he does not necessarily agree with this.

Mr. Paino felt it would disturb neighboring uses. He said the traffic and utilities requirements met the requirements. He said the City of Kent and Franklin Township should work together with the township leading the discussion.

Ms. Barone stated that the traffic is acceptable.

Ms. Susel stated the Traffic Study parameters were determined by the Kent City Engineer.

Ms. Daniels agreed with the comments made. She asked how many requirements have been met. She raised issue that it would be detriment and affect the surrounding area.

Mr. Clapper stated he was not familiar with all the previous plans because he is new to the commission. He said all the setbacks are up to code. His biggest concern was how it was going to affect the long term citizens.

Ms. Edwards stated that the Planning Commission has to determine the community's needs. She confirmed that there are concerns about the traffic twenty years down the road. She said enrollment has decreased by 5.7%. The Housing Study showed a trend of a decrease and that is a big concern because the whole dynamics could change. She was concerned with the location of the buildings.

Mr. Paino stated they were nice looking buildings. He did not object to the overall site plan. He did object to the building location because he felt they should be away from the residential area. He also felt the vehicular traffic should go to East Main Street. He thought that Franklin Township should work with the developer to make this possible. Projects need good planning and good design.

There were no other concerns or questions. Ms. Edwards asked for a motion.

**MOTION:**     *Mr. Paino moved in Case PC15-021, East Main Street Lofts, property located at 1700 Holly Park Drive, that the Planning approve a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan to construct a multi-family housing development. Subject to the following conditions:*

- 1) Review and approval of the technical plans.*
- 2) Implement suggestions from the ARB.*
- 3) Install rolled curb for the fire apparatus maneuverability.*
- 4) Include fire lanes and appropriate signage and striping.*

*Mr. Clapper seconded the motion. The motion failed 5 – 0.*

Mr. Flynn, attorney for the applicant, asked the commissioners to state the basis for their vote.

Mr. Gargan stated he felt it was detrimental to the surrounding area. He also used the Housing Study. He thought the traffic impact was under estimated.

Ms. Daniel's stated she considered Mr. Paino's recommendation to relocate the buildings.

#### **VIII. New Business**

None

**IX. Meeting Minutes**                      **November 15, 2016**

**Motion:**            *Mr. Gargan moved to approve the minutes of November 15, 2016 as submitted. Mr. Paino seconded the motion. The motion carried 3 – 0. (Ms. Daniels and Mr. Clapper abstained)*

**X. OTHER BUSINESS**

There will be no meetings in March.

The court hearing for Capstone for the preliminary injunction is scheduled for March 1, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

**XI. Adjournment**

**Motion:**            *Mr. Paino moved to adjourn. Ms. Daniels seconded the motion. The motion carried 5 – 0.*

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.