



Delaware County Regional Planning Commission

109 North Sandusky Street Delaware, Ohio 43015
740-833-2260 fax 740-833-2259
www.dcrpc.org

Scott B. Sanders, AICP
Executive Director

MINUTES

Thursday, July 30, 2009 at 7:00 PM
Delaware Hayes Services Building,
140 N. Sandusky Street, Room G 35, Delaware, Ohio 43015

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

- Call to order
- Roll Call
- Approval of June 25, 2009 RPC Minutes
- Executive Committee Minutes of July 22, 2009
- Statement of Policy

II. VARIANCES *(none)*

III. ZONING MAP/TEXT AMENDMENTS

10-09 ZON Liberty Twp. Zoning Commission – text amendments – sign code
11-09 ZON David & Jane Ann Weade – Berkshire Twp. – 2.417 acres from A-1 to FR-1
12-09 ZON Tom Bernardo – Genoa Twp. – 1.5 acres – PD-3

IV. SUBDIVISION PROJECTS

Preliminary

		Township	Lots/Acres
19-02.2.A	Alum Crossing, Section 2, Phase A (revised)	Orange	19 lots / 10.09 acres

Preliminary/Final *(none)*

Final

03-09	Premwood	Liberty	04 lots / 05.364 acres
09-02.5.A	Glen Oak, Section 5, Phase A	Orange	22 lots / 11.67 acres

T=TABLED, W=WITHDRAWN

V. EXTENSIONS

06-07	Sorrento at Highland Lakes (Formerly known as Preserve at Highland Lakes)	Genoa	01 lot / 30.57 acres
-------	--	-------	----------------------

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- Meeting room

VII. POLICY / EDUCATION DISCUSSION *(none)*

VIII. RPC STAFF AND MEMBER NEWS *(none)*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

▪ **Call to Order**

Chairwoman Foust called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

▪ **Roll Call**

Representatives: Jeff George, Rick Sedlacek, Fred Fowler, Todd Hanks, Ken O’Brien, Steve Burke, Sharon Hough, Joe Clase, Dave Stites, Holly Foust, Marvin Miller, Lloyd Shoaf, Tom Brown, Bonnie Newland, Mike Datillo and Doug Price. *Alternates:* Paul Clay, David Leitch, Tiffany Jenkins, Doug Riedel, Tom Farahay, and Charlie Callender. *Staff:* Scott Sanders, Da-Wei Liou and Stephanie Matlack.

▪ **Approval of the June 25, 2009 RPC Minutes**

Mr. O’Brien made a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Shoaf seconded the motion. VOTE: Majority For, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstained (Mr. Hanks). Motion carried.

▪ **July 22, 2009 Executive Committee Minutes**

1. **Call to order**

Chairwoman Foust called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Present: Holly Foust, Dick Gladman, Ken O’Brien, Steve Burke and Lloyd Shoaf. Staff present: Scott Sanders and Stephanie Matlack.

2. **Approval of Executive Committee Minutes from June 17, 2009**

Mr. Gladman made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 17, 2009 meeting. Mr. O’Brien seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

3. **New Business**

a. Financial / Activity Reports for June 2009

REGIONAL PLANNING RECEIPTS		JUNE	YTD TOTAL
General Fees (Lot Split)	(4201)	\$410.00	\$1,640.00
Fees A (Site Review)	(4202)		\$400.00
Insp. Fees (Lot Line Transfer)	(4203)	\$500.00	\$900.00
Membership Fees	(4204)		\$231,851.00
Planning Surcharge (Twp. Plan. Assist.)	(4205)	\$4,343.68	\$9,159.04
Assoc. Membership	(4206)		\$0.00
General Sales	(4220)	\$132.80	\$621.05
Charges for Serv. A (Prel. Appl.)	(4230)		\$11,341.80
Charges for Serv. B (Final. Appl.)	(4231)		\$10,280.30
Charges for Serv. C (Ext. Fee)	(4232)	\$450.00	\$450.00
Charges for Serv. D (Table Fee)	(4233)	\$400.00	\$800.00
Charges for Serv. E (Appeal/Var.)	(4234)		\$600.00
Charges for Serv. F (Planned District Zoning)	(4235)		\$600.00
OTHER DEPT. RECEIPTS			
Health Dept. Fees	(4242)		\$960.00
Soil & Water Fees	(4243)		\$750.00
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE			
Other Reimbursements	(4720)		\$2,404.00
Other Reimbursements A			\$0.00

Other Misc. Revenue (GIS maps)	(4730)		\$322.40
Misc. Non Revenue Receipts	(4733)		
Sale of Fixed Assets	(4804)		\$1,421.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS		\$6,236.48	\$274,500.59

Balance after receipts **\$164,219.77**
 Expenditures **- \$ 25,093.68**
 End of June balance **\$139,126.09**

Mr. Gladman made a motion to approve the financial reports as presented. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

- b. July RPC Preliminary Agenda – includes 3 rezoning/text amendments, 2 preliminary, 1 final and 1 extension.
- c. Director's Report
 - 1.) Contract billing to date:

Twp.	Contract amount	Free hours remaining	Billed to date	Remaining on contract
Berlin (comp.plan)	\$10,000.00	0	\$3,634.70	\$6,365.30
Genoa (zon.code)	\$10,000.00	55	\$1454.55	\$8,545.45
Kingston (zon.code)	\$8,000.00	0	\$1,580.20	\$6,419.80
Orange (comp.plan)	\$18,000.00	45.82	\$3,010.99	\$14,989.01

Mr. Sanders explained that he is continuing monthly meetings with Berlin, Orange and Kingston Townships on their contracts.

- d. Meeting room discussion – Mr. Sanders explained that all remaining 2009 meetings as of October or November will take place in the conference room at the Board of Elections offices at the Willis Building (formerly known as Hall Furniture store) on US 23 North. The meeting room at the Hayes building (G35) will be converted to offices and no longer available. This will be announced at the next RPC meeting and posted on the RPC website.

4. Old Business (none)

5. Other Business

- a.) Plat signatures – Mr. Sanders stated that other Planning Commissions sign final plats without waiting for the Commission meeting and consent agenda as long as there are no significant conditions placed on the preliminary agenda. This enables the plat to be recorded sooner than waiting the 3 weeks after submittal to attend a Commission meeting. If the DCRPC wishes to consider this, an amendment would need to be made to the Subdivision Regulations and a motion would be required at the time of preliminary approval allowing the Director to sign the final plat prior to the Commission meeting. The Committee encouraged Mr. Sanders to explore this issue further.

6. Personnel (none)

7. Adjourn

At 9:30 a.m. Mr. Shoaf made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

The next regular Executive Committee meeting will be Wednesday, August 19, 2009 at 8:30 a.m. at 109 North Sandusky Street, Delaware, Ohio, 43015.

- **Statement of Policy**

As is the adopted policy of the Regional Planning Commission, all applicants will be granted an opportunity to make their formal presentation. The audience will then be granted an opportunity to speak, at which time the chair will allow questions from the members of the Commission. This policy was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission to provide for the orderly discussion of business scheduled for consideration. The Chairperson may limit repetitive debate.

II. VARIANCES (none)

III. ZONING MAP/TEXT AMENDMENTS

10-09 ZON Liberty Twp. Zoning Commission – text amendments – sign code

I. Introduction: Liberty Township Trustees initiated revisions to its zoning code on July 6, 2009. Particularly, these text changes are in Article XXII – Sign Regulations.

A full set of changes is on file at the Regional Planning Commission offices. Staff comments and suggestions are as follows:

- 22.02 D. – the title is strange. “Before Lawfully Erected” may be old language but doesn’t seem to make sense. What about “Existing Free Standing Signs Legal when Installed”?
- Also, the language notes removal of signs that are destroyed but not signs they are partially destroyed. Typically, codes include language that if a sign is non-conforming and 50% is destroyed, it can be removed.
- 22.034 G – Language is unclear whether it refers to frontage of the structure or road frontage (other codes use either although staff believes building frontage is preferred). Suggest using a term like “Front Building Face” and add “(the width of the front face of the useable structure from corner to corner)” or similar.
- This may also help clarify the “extension of a wall beyond the building itself” since the phrase “corner to corner” would specify that decorative extensions do not count.
- The calculations in the code are based on the number of “stories” but there is no definition of that. Suggest specifying that the second story has to be useable or habitable or refer to “number of floors” the building has.
- 22.034 H near the bottom, add an “a” at “identified by drawing *a* box or circle”
- 22.034 J start new sentence between “Zoning Code” and “except that words and or symbols” and delete the word “except” so that it is a standalone sentence.
- 22.034 needs to be changed to 22.05 and all the rest renumbered, but this report will use the numbers as they appear in the draft to avoid confusion.

- 22.04 B – There may be situations where a vehicular directional sign should include the name of the business or logo to avoid confusion. Maybe allow the business name in multi-tenant uses, or assume that such requests may go to the BZA.
- 22.04 E – should the Window Advertising Signs be limited to only a percentage of the window? Although the text limits the overall size, should someone be allowed to put a 20-s.f. sign in a 20-s.f. window? Suggest a percentage of coverage, 60%.
- 22.04 L – no reference to “per side” even though most historical markers have two sides and most of this code references two sides.
- 22.04 N – no reference to “per side” - many home occupation signs are two-sided but this is not specified in the code.
- 22.04 Q – A-frame signs are typically 3’ to 4’ high. Proposed language limits these to 2’ high. Also, should there be a note that these do not count against any other aggregate size limit for other signs at the same establishment?
- 22.05 A 3 – redundant, repeated in the first paragraph of this section.
- 22.05 A 8 – Earlier in the section, these signs are intended for “products or service” not on the site. These are permanent or temporary signs that may have temporary content. Although new permits are required each time a temporary sign changes, staff is not sure that is communicated here.
- 22.05 D – “one” needs a (1) after it to be consistent.
- 22.05 E – Is the one temporary wall-mounted sign in addition to the freestanding sign or instead of it? Suggest clarification.
- 22.05 H - “one” needs a (1) after it to be consistent.
- 22.05 H – this whole section really needs graphics to help people know how it works.
- 22.05 H 2) – If a sign is suspended from the underside of a canopy (which staff supports), then the intention is not to limit it to projecting within 3 feet of the building. This probably is not the intention, but it should clarify that “the 3-foot projection limit does not apply to signs suspended from the underside of a canopy”.
- Paragraph on the bottom of page 15 – This gets confusing. A graphic would be helpful.
- 22.05 I – Most, if not all of this section needs to be moved to the General Requirements. If moved, also check all of internal references to this section.
- 22.05 I – Also, there are some extra words in the first sentence – “supported on or by or suspended from”
- 22.05 I 1) – This section describes what counts as a second side (<45 degrees) and what counts toward the one-side total (>45 degrees). However, it gets wordy – a graphic would help here.

- 22.05 I 2) “Community of Use” begins to get used here to describe a multi-tenant or multi-use structure but it is unclear if the average applicant would understand this. Suggest adding some explanation or a different phrase, possibly “multi-tenant use” or similar.
- 22.06 – Staff does not understand the need for Conditionally-approved signs. Generally, Permitted signs have a number of conditions and these are generally available under the “permit required” section. If this is truly needed, confirm that the reference to 28.04 covers the process to be followed and the requirement of a fee.
- 22.06 A 1) – “one” needs a (1) after it.
- 22.07 G – this appears to be redundant and covered under 22.034 D.
- 22.07 I – May need to clarify what is meant by “advertising” and that it pertains to items or services that are being sold and not to the business name or logo.
- The proposed changes remove the limitation on the number of colors. Staff suggests leaving the limit in the code to three colors, unless the existing logo has more than three. There is also no reference to internally lit cabinet signs that use white as a background. Backgrounds should be required to be a dark color.

II. DCRPC Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends **Conditional Approval** for the proposed text amendments in the Liberty Township Zoning Resolution (sign code) to the DCRPC, the Liberty Township Zoning Commission and the Liberty Township Trustees, based on the comments and suggestions within this report.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend Conditional Approval of the proposed text amendments to the Liberty Township Zoning Resolution (sign code), subject to staff comments. Mr. Sedlacek seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

11-09 ZON David & Jane Ann Weade – Berkshire Twp. – 2.417 acres from A-1 to FR-1

I. Request

The applicants, David and Jane Ann Weade, are requesting a 2.417-acre rezoning from A-1 to FR-1 to allow one new residential lot.

II. Conditions

- Location:** 8174 Berkshire Road, Berkshire Township
- Present Zoning:** Agricultural (A-1)
- Proposed Zoning:** Farm Residential (FR-1)
- Present Use(s):** One single-family house
- Proposed Use(s):** Two single-family house lots
- Existing Density:** 1 du / 5 acres
- Proposed Density:** 1 du / 2 acres
- School District:** Big Walnut Local School District
- Utilities Available:** Del-Co Water and private on-lot treatment systems

Critical Resources: none

Surrounding land uses: Agriculture and residential 5-acre lots

Soils: CaB Cardington Silt Loam 2-6% slope

CaC2 Cardington Silt Loam 6-12% slope

BeA Bennington Silt Loam 0-2% slope

PwA Pewamo Silty Clay Loam 0-1% slope

III. Issues

This is a straight district rezoning, so no development plan is required. The applicants recently purchased an 8.55-acre lot with an existing house and barn on the west side of the parcel. The remaining area includes a pond and farmland. The proposed rezoning will be followed by a Lot Split request for a new, 2.417-acre lot, which will include the existing house and barn.

The new lot will meet zoning requirements for frontage (it will have 256') and setbacks for existing buildings. The applicant should consult with the Health District to ensure that there is adequate area for on-lot waste treatment systems. The application states that this is currently being pursued.

The 2008 Berkshire Township Comprehensive Plan shows the proposed site as Residential on 2-acre lots without sewer, or 1.25 units per acre if sewer is extended.

IV. Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends **Approval** of this rezoning case from A-1 to FR-1 for David and Jane Ann Weade to the DCRPC, the Berkshire Township Zoning Commission and the Berkshire Township Trustees.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Weade was present to answer any questions from the Commission. He explained that he bought the property for the land not for the home, which is why they would like to eventually split the house lot off.

Mr. Sedlacek made a motion to recommend Approval of the rezoning request by David and Jane Ann Weade. Mr. Hanks seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

12-09 ZON Tom Bernardo – Genoa Twp. – 1.5 acres – PD-3

Location: 6030 Chandler Court, southwest corner of intersection of Chandler and S.R. 3, west of Mount Royal Avenue.

I. Conditions

Present Zoning: PD-3 (Planned Industrial and Warehouse District)

Present Use: vacant

Proposed Uses: 6,000-square-foot restaurant

School District: Westerville

Utilities Available- Del-Co Water

Soils: BeB Bennington Silt Loam, 2-4% slope

PwA Pewamo Silty Clay Loam, 0-1% slope

Surrounding Land Uses: East – Commercial properties along Frost Road, Orchard Lakes Condos; South – Eastlawn Cemetery with commercial development beyond; West – Other commercial and office uses along

Chandler Court; North – Commercial and office uses across Chandler Court, with Highland Lakes East Section 8 beyond.

II. General Background

Tom Bernardo, owner of Giammarco's Pizza & Pasta, is currently negotiating the purchase of 6030 Chandler Court and has submitted this application for a Final Development Plan on behalf of the property owner.

Giammarco's is currently operating a business at 7094 State Route 3 just south of this site, and is seeking to expand into a larger facility. The applicant proposes to construct a 6,000-square-foot building that will seat up to 276 customers. Outdoor seating will also be available, along with a children's play area and two bocce courts. The site will include 70 parking spaces.

III. Divergences

1. To allow patio seating for patrons purchasing ice cream from an exterior window. Service will benefit users of the bike path, which extends along S.R. 3. Existing regulations require all business to take place within a closed building.
2. To allow outdoor seating and bocce area on the south side of the building. Will include covered patio and landscape features. Existing regulations require all business to take place within a closed building.
3. To allow outdoor seating on the west side of the building. Will include covered patio with safety railings and structural piers. Existing regulations require all business to take place within a closed building.

Staff comments: All three outdoor activity divergence requests appear to be reasonable. The applicant notes that outdoor seating will not impact neighboring properties since the nearest residential uses are approximately 300 feet north of the site. Applicant commits to controlling noise levels as much as possible and using vegetation and garden walls to shield ambient background music. Staff supports outdoor seating and notes that the restaurant use is the only one in the PD-3 District that is more commercial than industrial in nature. The township should limit outdoor activity to prevent amplified musical entertainment since amplified sound would likely reach the residential development to the north, even if limited to the opposite side of the building.

4. Principal structure to have a rear-building setback of 30 feet and a front setback of 98 feet and an eastern setback of 93 feet. Current regulations require a rear setback of 100 feet, based on it being a District boundary (PD-2 is to the south). Majority of the building face is 100 feet from the right-of-way but includes a design feature that encroaches 2 feet into the setback. Eastern setback is 93'7" from the right-of-way.

Staff comments: The lots along Chandler Court predate the current Planned Industrial zoning code, which requires a 100-foot perimeter setback. This has been an issue with previous proposals on Chandler and Frost Roads. Other existing buildings west of this site have setbacks of approximately 30' and one appears to be 20' from the DALIS aerial. Also, land to the south is cemetery property with an undeveloped tract zoned PD-2. The applicant is proposing landscaping to the south. Given these facts and the lack of potential residential development to the south, staff recommends approval of this divergence. The eastern setback divergence is reasonable since the S.R. 3 right-of-way is excessively wide at the site's frontage.

5. To allow a dumpster enclosure and a garden building in the southeast corner of the lot. The location would be considered in the "front yard" along S.R. 3 where no accessory buildings are allowed.

Staff comments: *The location is actually to the rear of the “frontage” along Chandler Court, but because of the site’s frontage on S.R. 3, the accessory structure is not allowed. The application states that the area will be enclosed in a structure that will be of complimentary materials (stucco). It also states that there is an existing mound along the east side in the ODOT easement that forms a buffer. It appears that the dumpster and garden building could be located on the west side of the main structure. However, if it remains on the east side, it should be of a quality design, realizing that the mounding is in the right-of-way and may not be permanent.*

6. To allow a reduction from the required parking spaces. The code requires 102 spaces and the development plan indicates 70 on the site with 7 along Chandler Court directly in front of the building.

Staff comments: *Staff notes that parking requirements are sometimes excessive and not always applicable to every use. The application includes a letter from the owner of the office building to the northwest indicating that she is amenable to an agreement for shared parking when necessary. Staff supports the reduction of impervious surfaces and encourages shared parking where possible. The applicant has submitted a study, which shows its projected typical parking needs during peak, off-peak and special occasions and rarely would need more than 77 spaces. Other businesses along Chandler Court have no activity in the evenings and the street is not a through street. Staff recommends approval, but suggests that agreements be in place with other owners and that spaces be striped along Chandler Court, including the addition of “no parking” signs near the intersections and driveways according to sight distance standards.*

7. To allow multiple uses for loading space between parking spaces on the west side of the building. (The text says “west side” but the layout shows the loading zone on the east side.)

Staff comments: *The application notes that deliveries will be made prior to 11:00 a.m., when the restaurant will be open and that separating loading areas from parking areas is unnecessary. Staff agrees.*

8. Divergence to have 2 large wall signs (north and east side), one small wall sign (west side), two identification signs at the ice cream and pick-up door and one freestanding sign. The sign code allows a single sign, either wall or freestanding, based on road frontage.

Staff comments: *The allowable sign size is based on 1 square foot per lineal foot of frontage up to 100 square feet. With frontage on two streets, the proposed use could request a 100-foot sign. The six signs requested total 77 square feet. Staff supports two wall signs, each of which is 18 square feet, based on the location of the building in relation to traffic on S.R. 3 and the large right-of-way of the highway. Staff also supports a 4 square foot sign at each secondary use (the ice cream window and pick-up door) with the content limited to identification of each entrance or window. The freestanding sign is unnecessary, as it is only visible from Chandler Court and the western sign, although smaller in size, also is unnecessary. Staff does not support those divergences.*

No divergence should be needed for a temporary construction sign nor should it count toward the overall square footage allowed.

IV. Comprehensive Plan

1. The recently adopted Genoa Township Comprehensive Plan supports continued use of Chandler Court as commercial in nature. It recommends that the two eastern-most lots be allowed to convert to a Commercial use rather than Planned Industrial and Warehouse use. Although this request retains the PD-3 designation, the proposed restaurant use is much more in line with what is typically a commercial or retail use. The township may wish to consider moving the Restaurant use into its PD-2 District in a future code revision.

V. DCRPC Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends **Conditional Approval** to the DCRPC, the Genoa Township Zoning Commission and the Genoa Township Trustees of the Final Development Plan for 1.56 acres at 6030 Chandler Court in the PD-3

District, *subject to the following:*

- Review the Restaurant Use and determine if it should be moved to the PD-2 Planned Commercial and Office District;
- Review the Sign Standards article and determine if it allows a sufficient amount of signage for current commercial uses. Also recommend sign size be based on the frontage of the building and not the frontage of the lot;
- Divergences 1-3: recommend approval of the first three outdoor use divergences, with limitations put on outdoor amplified entertainment, at least during certain hours, such as evenings and weekends;
- Divergence 4: recommend approval of the setback divergences;
- Divergence 5: recommend the applicant consider moving the dumpster and structure to the western side of the building;
- Divergence 6: recommend approval of the parking reduction, if the applicant secures agreements from all neighboring properties;
- Divergence 7: recommend approval of the loading and delivery zone divergence;
- Divergence 8: recommend the township allow two identification wall signs and two smaller signs at the pickup window and ice-cream counter.

Commission / Public Comments

No one was present to represent the applicant.

Mr. Miller made a motion to recommend Conditional Approval of the rezoning request for the property at 6030 Chandler Court, subject to staff comments. Mr. Shoaf seconded the motion. VOTE: Majority For, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstained (Mr. Clase). Motion carried.

IV. SUBDIVISION PROJECTS

Preliminary

19-02.2.A Alum Crossing, Section 2, Phase A (revised) – Orange Twp. - 19 lots / 10.09 acres

I. Conditions

Applicant: Rockford Homes, Inc.
Subdivision Type: Single-family Residential
Location: West side of S. Old State Road, 4000' north of Ro Park within Estates of Glen Oak, Orange Twp.
Current Land Use: Vacant, former agricultural
Zoned: Single Family Planned Residential District, (SFPRD)
Utilities: Del-Co water and public sanitary sewer
School District: Olentangy
Engineer: Sands Decker CPS

II. Staff Comments

Alum Crossing Section 2, Phase A is a revision of a portion of Alum Crossing, which received Preliminary Approval on October 31, 2002. Section 1 has been developed with 52 residential lots.

The purpose of the revision is to delete one buildable lot, thereby increasing the lot width and road frontage of 8 lots from 80' to 90'. This change required the alteration of storm water structures and grading. Phase A will extend

Alum Crossing Drive to an intersection with Orangelake Drive, which will extend west into a cul-de-sac. It also includes the dedication of two open space areas totaling 1.812 acres, some of which will be used for storm water management.

A technical review was held on July 21st, after which the applicant has addressed all of the required changes.

III. Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends *Preliminary Approval* of the **Alum Crossing, Section 2, Phase A** to the RPC.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Mark Cameron with Sands Decker CPS was present to represent the applicant.

Mr. Farahay stated that the Township is not in favor of the grassy islands. He suggested the applicant work with the Township Trustees on this issue.

Mr. Cameron said that he was asked to speak with the fire chief regarding the islands. Mr. Stewart stated he did not have a problem with them but he should also talk to Mr. Gholson (Twp. Fire Inspector). Mr. Cameron said the PUD was approved with the grass islands. The first section, which is already built, also has the same islands and to take them out now would leave a large impervious area.

Chairwoman Foust asked if the islands would be curbed. Mr. Cameron said yes and they would also be marked with “No parking” signs in the cul de sac.

Mr. Farahay explained that the Township might be agreeable to grass only with no other vegetation along with the HOA maintaining the area.

Mr. O’Brien stated that in general he agrees with making lots bigger.

Mr. Price made a motion for Preliminary approval of Alum Crossing, Section 2, Phase A. Mr. Hanks seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

Preliminary/Final (none)

CONSENT AGENDA

Final

03-09 Premwood - Liberty Twp. - 04 lots / 05.364 acres

I. Conditions

Applicant: Jennifer Vrabel (Owner), SUMS Inc. (Developer)

Subdivision Type: Single Family Residential (CAD)

Location: North side of Home Road slightly northwest of Bridlespur Lane, Liberty Township.

Current Land Use: Vacant/woods

Zoned: Farm Residential (FR-1)
Utilities: Del-Co water and individual on-lot treatment
School District: Olentangy
Engineer: Cornerstone Engineering / Scioto Land Surveying

II. Staff Comments

Premwood is a 4-lot Common Access Drive (CAD) subdivision of 5.36 acres. It is located on the north side of Home Road approximately midway between Liberty Road and SR 315. The lots range from 1 to 1.6 acres. A deep ravine cuts through the middle of the site from west to east draining to the Olentangy River. The CAD is designed so that the steepest grade is slightly more than 7 percent (10 percent is the maximum permitted). All lots will utilize Del-Co water and individual on-lot treatment systems.

The applicant has presented to the RPC Office a Final Plat (mylar) signed by the various County agencies, a requirement for Final approval.

III. Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends *Final Approval* of **Premwood** to the RPC.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Shoaf made a motion for Final Approval of Premwood. Mr. Sedlacek seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

09-02.5.A **Glen Oak, Section 5, Phase A - Orange Twp. - 22 lots / 11.67 acres**

I. Conditions

Applicant: Dominion Homes
Subdivision Type: Single Family Residential
Location: East of Blue Holly Drive, north of Glen Oak, Sec. 3, Ph B
Current Land Use: vacant/former agricultural
Zoned: SFPRD (Single Family Planned Residential District)
Utilities: Del-Co Water, public sewer system
School District: Olentangy
Engineer: Stantec

II. Staff Comments

Glen Oak, Section 5, Phase A forms a connection between Primrose Avenue and Blue Holly Drive. It includes 21 buildable lots and a 5.151-acre open space. Typical lot size is 9,700 s.f. with 80' of frontage. Lots take access from a new road, Marigold Street.

The applicant has presented to the RPC Office a Final Plat (mylar) signed by the various County agencies, a requirement for Final approval.

III. Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends *Final Approval* of **Glen Oak, Section 5, Phase A** to the RPC.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Shoaf made a motion for Final Approval of Glen Oak, Section 5, Phase A. Mr. Sedlacek seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

V. EXTENSIONS

06-07 Sorrento at Highland Lakes (Formerly known as Preserve at Highland Lakes)-
Genoa Twp. - 01 lot / 30.57 acres

Applicant: Romanelli & Hughes Building Company

Engineer: Stantec

Preliminary approval: 07-26-07

I. Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends *Approval* of a 12-month extension for **Sorrento at Highland Lakes** to the RPC.

Commission / Public Comments

Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the 12-month extension of Sorrento at Highland Lakes. Mr. Sedlacek seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- **Meeting room** – Mr. Sanders explained that the current meeting room (G-35) in the Hayes Building would no longer be available for RPC use after September (possibly October). The space will be converted to offices for Juvenile Court. He explained that the Board of Elections (US 23 North, former Hall's building) has a meeting room available for use. Staff will let the Commission know prior to that month's meeting when the change of space will occur.

VII. POLICY / EDUCATION DISCUSSION (*none*)

VIII. RPC STAFF AND MEMBER NEWS (*none*)

Having no further business, Mr. Miller made a motion to adjourn at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Shoaf seconded the motion. VOTE: Unanimously For, 0 Opposed. Motion carried.

The next meeting of the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission will be Thursday, August 27, 2009, 7:00 PM at the Delaware Hayes Services Building, 140 N. Sandusky Street,

Conference Room G-35, Delaware, Ohio 43015.

Holly Foust, Chairperson

Stephanie Matlack, Executive Administrative Assistant