

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission
Minutes of Regular Meeting
October 2, 2014**

I. Chairman Holtgreive called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Cotter, Dailey, Friedrich, Hoenig, Holtgreive, Kostrzewa, Lents, Ranzenberger, Verleger.

Absent: None

Staff: Bean, Mrdeza.

II. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Dailey, to approve agenda.

Motion approved.

III. Approval of Minutes:

A. September 4, 2014 Joint Meeting

Motion by Lents, support by Kostrzewa to approve minutes from the September 4, 2014 Joint Meeting as submitted.

Motion approved.

B. September 4, 2014 Regular Meeting

Chairman Holtgreive noted a misspelled word on page 17.

Motion by Lents, support by Kostrzewa to approve the minutes from the regular meeting with the noted correction.

Motion approved.

IV. Zoning Board of Appeals Report for September.

Commissioner Lents reported that the Zoning Board of Appeals did not meet in September.

V. Public Hearings:

None Scheduled.

VI. Public Comments:

Chairman Holtgreive opened the floor for public comments. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Comments was closed.

VII. Site Plan Reviews

None Scheduled.

VIII. Unfinished Business:

A. A. SUP-14-10 - 911 S. Main - Joseph Olivieri.

Bean reminded the Board the applicant is requesting permission to demolish the existing rooming dwelling which currently is licensed for 8 occupants and replace it with a two-unit rooming dwelling with a total of nine occupants (five in one unit and four in the other unit).

Bean noted that the Public Hearing was held at last month's meeting; however, the applicant was not in attendance to answer questions and the case was subsequently postponed. The property is zoned M-2 and is surrounded by M-2 zoning and rooming dwellings.

Joe Olivieri, applicant, addressed the Board, offering to answer questions.

Chairman Holtgreive asked who owned the property. Mr. Olivieri responded that the property is owned by his cousin, Derek Naas, however, he noted that he would be managing the property.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that the concerns from last month included the mature trees on the property and whether they would be saved. Mr. Olivieri responded that there is a large tree in the front on the north side of the property that should be okay. In addition, he feels the ones on the south lot line can be saved. He noted that the two along the alley have been trimmed extensively by Consumers Power to clear the lines and are no longer visually pleasing and will be removed. Mr. Olivieri noted that he too prefers to save as many trees as possible, not only for the aesthetics, but noted there is a significant cost involved for each tree that is removed.

Commissioner Kostrzewa commented that he is pleased that the applicant appreciates and values the trees.

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Verleger that with the approval of the requested variance in case ZBA-02-2014, it is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the request for SUP-14-10 from Joe Olivieri for the property located at 911 S. Main to allow the construction of a 3,519 square foot two-unit rooming dwelling along with redesigned parking and landscape improvements, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all site plan review requirements.

2. The applicant shall comply with the attached ZBA requirements that pertain to the variance granted for the proposed plan in case ZBA 02-2014.

Motion approved.

Site Plan Review SPR-14-16. Chairman Holtgreive noted that unless there was further discussion on the site plan he would entertain a motion.

Motion by Verleger, support by Ranzenberger, that with the approval of the requested variance in case ZBA-02-2014, it is recommended that the Planning Commission approve case SPR-14-16 to allow construction of a 3,519 square foot two-unit rooming dwelling as well as parking and site improvements at 911 S. Main Street based on the site plan and schematic design drawings prepared by Olivieri Builders with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Public Safety (DPS) and the Division of Public Works (DPW).
2. The applicant shall submit a photometric plan for any proposed lighting.

Motion approved.

IX. New Business:

A. Memo to Consider Revised Neighborhood Goals and Setting a Public Hearing for November 6, 2014 for Updated Master Plan.

Chairman Holtgreive referred to the memo from Alan Bean regarding the Master Plan update. Following the City Commission meeting on September 22, 2014, the City Commission returned the proposed updates to the Planning Commission with concerns regarding the proposed language and asked that the Planning Commission clarify for them how we are addressing the M-2 and the Residential areas.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that the Planning Commission has some options to consider:

- 1) Go back to the former language and not change anything;
- 2) Recommend approval of the revised language as outlined in the memo;
- 3) Choose something completely different.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that the concern was with the wording of whether conversions would be discouraged or whether we would encourage appropriate conversions. Chairman Holtgreive noted that he feels that part of the problem is trying to articulate an over-arching goal that addresses the entire city rather than a specific area and noted that clarification is important.

Chairman Holtgreive asked for feedback from the Commission on the proposed revised language received in the September 15, 2014 memo from Bean.

Bean noted that at the September 22, 2014 City Commission meeting there was feedback regarding the phrase "appropriate conversions". He noted that the overall discussion was that the introduction to the neighborhood goals section should address the fact that during the Open House held in April, there was support of the Neighborhood Goals and discussion that there is some protection for existing single family homes in area adjacent to the M-2 Zoning district and to ensure that existing single-family neighborhoods are protected and that any conversions of existing multi-family housing be addressed appropriately in the text.

Chairman Holtgreive read the proposed new language for General Goals for Neighborhoods, along with the proposed language for Strategies:

"Ensure that an appropriate mix of residential uses is available in the City by increasing the opportunities for owner-occupied housing while discouraging conversions and expansions of non-family rentals."

"Encourage the conversion of multiple-family units and rooming/boarded units in the R-1, R-2, R-3, and M-1 zoning districts to owner-occupied residential units."

"Investigate and develop ordinances and/or zoning provisions that allow the appropriate conversion and upgrading of non-family rentals in the M-2 zoning district."

Chairman Holtgreive noted that he feels this clearly indicates where we would want these conversions. He noted that there was not a discussion about how many people liked the language, it was tabled before it got that far. He also referred to the communication received from Commissioner Ling and asked the Board to keep that in mind as they move forward.

Commissioner Lents asked for clarification on which was the new edited version. Bean clarified that the proposed revision to Goal A follows the highlighted "Possible Goal A Revision" at the top of the third page of his memo dated 9/15/14.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that if there was no other discussion, he would entertain a motion. Commissioner Dailey asked what type of motion would be appropriate.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that the motion would be to accept the revisions as outlined in Alan Bean's September 15, 2014 memo: Revision to Goal A in "General Goals for Neighborhoods", the strategies outlined in 1 and 2, and the edits to the introductory paragraph to the "Neighborhoods" section.

Commissioner Dailey so moved, with support from Vice-Chair Cotter.

Commissioner Lents stated she appreciates the community members coming forward and questioned whether the revised strategies are an appropriate answer to the community's concerns. She referred to Commissioner Ling's comments, noting that one of the reasons the language was changed initially was to allow the redevelopments in other areas of the city, such as the Mt.

Pleasant Center, and further commented that this language may negate that. She indicated that she too wishes to protect the neighborhoods, but wondered if there may be language that would allow appropriate usage in new areas.

Chairman Holtgreive stated he feels that this edit allows both, noting that clearly there are more strings attached but feels that this will alleviate fears of inappropriate usage in the wrong district. He noted that it is a strategy and a guide but would not preclude development in other areas.

Mrdeza noted that in regards to the Mt. Pleasant Center, we don't have the preferred use determined at this time - we are still formulating that. In regards to other areas of the city - they are already zoned so we would know what the appropriate areas are. He noted that when we are certain what we want to see with the Mt. Pleasant Center property, we would determine the appropriate zoning for that area.

Commissioner Lents questioned whether it would be better to go back to the original language if we aren't actually solving anything. Chairman Holtgreive noted that we could but feels this language is better than it was from a planning standpoint, noting that this is just his opinion. He noted that the Board knows what is appropriate for the areas and this document would serve as a guide.

Commissioner Lents referred to Commissioner Ling's comment about not negatively impacting other areas and noted that this is one thing that we already have in our zoning ordinance - that a redevelopment cannot negatively impact surrounding areas and questioned whether this should also be included in the Master Plan language.

Chairman Holtgreive commented that the process itself asks that question and noted that if we keep adding language, it makes it more difficult.

Vice-Chairman Cotter commented that if it does not have negative impacts, then it would be appropriate -if there were negative impacts, then it would not be appropriate.

Commissioner Lents commented that each person's version of "appropriate" could mean different things. Commissioner Dailey noted that is why this language is used.

Chairman Holtgreive stated there is a motion and a second on the table and asked for a roll call vote.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked that the motion be repeated.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that the motion would be to accept the revisions as outlined in Alan Bean's September 15, 2014 memo with the notes indicated earlier: Revision to Goal A in "General Goals for Neighborhoods", the strategies outlined in 1 and 2, and the edits to the introductory paragraph to the "Neighborhoods" section.

Commissioner Dailey noted that by making the motion he is implying that Alan's word "possible" strategy would actually change to "proposed" strategy.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that we would be recommending adoption of those two revisions as our recommendation to the City Commission.

Bean noted that per the Planning Act, in the adoption of the Master Plan, the City Commission either accepts or rejects the proposed changes and if they reject them, they give direction on what they want us to reconsider. He noted that is what we are doing - looking at what they want us to reconsider.

Bean further noted that now the process starts over and we need to schedule another public hearing on the revisions. It is suggested that the Planning Commission set the public hearing for their November 6th meeting.

Commissioner Kostrzewa noted that it isn't necessarily a done deal. Chairman Holtgreive acknowledged this, noting that it needs to go to the City Commission and be accepted.

Commissioner Lents asked if we had received any comments from other Commissioners or if Mrs. Ling's were the only ones received as she doesn't want to send this back to them and have it come back again.

Mrdeza noted that the City Commission also receives copies of the Planning Commission packet and therefore, have an opportunity to see what is being reviewed. He also questioned whether Commissioner Dailey would like to amend his motion to include setting a public hearing for November 6th or if the Commission wishes to make a separate motion for that.

Commissioner Dailey revised his motion to accept the revisions as outlined in Alan Bean's September 15, 2014 memo with the notes indicated earlier: Revision to General Goals A for Neighborhoods, the strategies outlined in 1 and 2, and the edits to the introductory paragraph to the "Neighborhoods" section, and to set a public hearing for the November 6, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Motion was seconded by Kostrzewa.

Roll call vote. All Ayes

Motion approved.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if following the public hearing, there may be additional edits to the language. Chairman Holtgreive noted that at the end of the public hearing, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to send the proposed language to the City Commission for their review and discussion.

Commissioner Dailey commented that any additional changes would require another public hearing.

B. Memo to consider setting a public hearing for December 4, 2014 for a Text Amendment to Codify the M-2 Redevelopment Procedures.

Bean referred to the memo in the packets, along with the proposed text from the "as is" portion from Mr. Piggott, noting that the Planning Commission is being asked to set a public hearing for their December 4th meeting for a text amendment to amend section 154.007 Nonconforming Lots and Uses, subsection C.

Commissioner Lents asked why we are setting the public hearing for December rather than November. Chairman Holtgreive noted that it was felt that holding public hearings on both of these subjects at the same meeting, may make the meetings too long.

Motion by Dailey, support by Kostrzewa that the Planning Commission set a public hearing for the December 4 meeting to consider a text amendment to the zoning ordinance that incorporates the "As Is" procedure for redevelopment in the M-2 zoning district.

Motion approved.

C. Sidewalk Construction Prioritization Policy.

Chairman Holtgreive referred to the memo from Nancy Ridley, along with the Sidewalk Policy that was included in Board packets, noting that the Commission is being asked to review the policy and determine if it is still relevant or if there are things that they should reconsider and revise. He questioned whether the reference to 147 miles of sidewalk included sidewalk on both sides of the streets.

Mrdeza responded that he wasn't sure but would get that answer for him.

Chairman Holtgreive commented tht one question to address is now that we have the non-motorized plan to use - does it make sense to always have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Also, does the Commission believe that the priorities are what they would still recommend to the City Commission.

Commissioner Lents commented that since the time this document was put together the school districts have undergone some changes and questioned whether that changes opinions. Discussion on ages of children walking to and from school ensued. Mrdeza noted that there are still designated school routes based on how the schools are currently being used.

Mrdeza provided some background noting that the City Commission is interested in looking at possible additional sidewalk construction. This year they focused on filling in gaps and the idea is to prioritize areas as they move forward. They are interested in considering new sidewalk construction in areas that currently have no sidewalks. The first part in their process is asking the Planning Commission to revisit the policy that they are using to help guide them in their decision making to determine whether the policy is still pertinent or if they would recommend changes. Mrdeza also noted that in addition to reviewing the policy, they would like the Planning Commission to weigh in on how the sidewalks are run. This year there were some

issues with losing trees; sidewalks intersecting driveways too close to the street, etc. Staff tried to accommodate some of these issues which resulted in sidewalks not always being a straight shot and the City Commission would like to know how the Planning Commission feels on accommodating the needs of specific sites or if the sidewalks should be a straight shot no matter what.

Commissioner Lents suggested that the policy should be adjusted to reflect that we now have the non-motorized transportation plan. Commissioner Ranzenberger agreed that the plans should be meshed as closely as possible. Both he and Commissioner Lents commented that the sidewalks do not need to be a straight shot and feel that protecting the trees and making jogs in the sidewalk as necessary is a good thing.

Commissioner Kostrzewa also noted he feels it is important to allow for crooks in sidewalks to go around mature trees; however noted that at intersections he feels that they need to be straight for safety purposes.

Chairman Holtgreive suggested reviewing the recommendations one by one to see if they are still relevant.

Under 1.c., it was determined that the city already plows the sidewalks within school zones; therefore, that recommendation could be removed.

The Board discussed the recommendation to sponsor an annual Walk to School and Walk to Work Day in the community. Although the Commission liked the idea, it was noted that budget and staff is not what it was ten years ago and therefore, this may not be as easy to implement. Commissioner Ranzenberger suggested it may be possible to partner with the schools on something like this, referring to a similar event in Shepherd that was well received, however Mrdeza noted it would require some serious planning and the cooperation of the police department etc. It was determined that this recommendation could be removed.

The Board agreed that recommendation number 3 to sponsor a Dan Burden workshop for the community could be taken off as this has already been done.

The Board reviewed the list of priorities and determined that they were okay with them as they are listed.

The Board discussed the written notification policy and after discussion determined that the three years was a good time frame to follow.

The Board reviewed the recommendation for a sidewalk committee to annually review and comment on future sidewalk construction. It was determined that rather than form an actual committee, that this could be something that the Planning Commission reviewed annually during a work session.

Bean was asked to put together a revision of the policy based on the discussion for review at the next regular meeting.

X. Other

- A. October 21, 2014 Special Meeting. Bean reported that the request is for a Site Plan Review for Coyne Oil to construct a new building.
- B. November 6, 2014 meeting. Bean reported that the Public Hearing for the Master Plan is the only thing thus far for the November meeting.
- C. Popeye's Sign.

Commissioner Dailey questioned the placement of the sign on the property of the new Popeye's Restaurant, commenting that he feels it may create a vision obstruction for vehicles entering Mission Street off High. Vice-Chair Cotter also noted that he questioned whether that was the location approved by the Planning Commission.

Mrdeza commented that the original site plan showed the sign closer to the corner, farther to the north, which definitely would have been a vision obstruction. Staff worked with the applicant to find a better location and noted that the applicant had some constraints based on the LED billboard that is on the property and the easement requirements for the Billboard Company. Mrdeza assured the Commission that what is there is what was ultimately approved.

XI. Adjournment:

Motion by Dailey, support by Friedrich to adjourn.

Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned 8:10 p.m.