

Planning Commission
September 26th, 2018
Meeting Minutes

The following members were present: Mr. David Miller, Mr. David Waddington, Chairman Zuilhof, Mr. McGory, Mr. Galea, and Mr. Whelan. Ms. Angie Byington, Mr. Greg Voltz represented the Planning Department; Mr. Trevor Hayberger represented the Law Department and Ms. Casey Sparks, Clerk from Community Development. Mr. Jim Jackson arrived at 5:00 PM.

Mr. Miller motioned to approve the minutes from August 2, 2018; Mr. McGory seconded the motion.

Mr. Miller motioned to approve the minutes from August 22nd, 2018; Mr. McGory seconded the motion.

Chairman noted the agenda change on item four, Shoreline Drive discussion of traffic calming and safety alternatives including alternate A.

Chairman Zuilhof stated the application is from Cedar Point Park, LLC for petitions for the following vacations: a petition for the vacation of a portion of Farwell Street located between 1800 Cleveland Road and 1810 Cleveland Road and a petition for the vacation of a 10' alley located between 1706 Cleveland Road and 1800 Cleveland Road.

Mr. Voltz stated that Cedar Point Park, LC has submitted a petition for the vacation of a portion of Farwell Street located between 1800 Cleveland Road and 1810 Cleveland Road. Cedar Point Park, LLC has also submitted a petition for a 10' alley located between 1706 Cleveland Road and 1800 Cleveland Road, the existing use of the area is vacant building and land. The current zoning of the property is General Business. The alley proposed to be vacated is located between parcels 57-01884.000 and 57-04694.000. The proposed vacated portion of Farwell Street is located between parcels 57-04694.000, 57-0775.000, and 57-04750.000. The proposed vacation of the alley and street would be divided between the properties, in this case the only property owner is Cedar Point Park, LLC. The applicant proposed to utilize the area for future development of these parcels. Engineering staff has reviewed the proposed vacation and stated that the applicant needs to maintain access to sewer and water and would request easements to maintain access to a 36" interceptor sewer on Farwell Street.

Mr. Voltz stated that in conclusion planning staff has no objections to recommending approval of the requested vacation to City Commission contingent upon easements for Engineering to access and maintain the sewer line on Farwell Street.

Mr. McGory asked staff if the short alley just beneath Route 6 sign was ever extend further.

Mr. Voltz stated that this was previously vacated.

Mr. McGory asked staff if the larger Farwell street extension is this another roadway.

Mr. Voltz stated that this is the original Cleveland Ave right-of-way.

Mr. McGory asked if there is a requirement for the surrounding homes to weigh in regarding the proposed vacation.

Mr. Voltz stated that if Cleveland Ave were to be vacated it would be a requirement but not for this area.

Mr. McGory stated that because there is right-of-way between the properties it is not necessary, their property would have to abut this area for notification requirements.

Mr. Miller ask if the application is an encroachment on easement.

Mr. Voltz stated that it would appear to be an encroachment on the easement.

Mr. Miller ask if they were to combine the lots is there still a prohibition about building onto of the sewer.

Mr. Voltz stated that they will be restricted to 15' on either side of the easement in which they would not be able to build.

Mr. McGory made a motion to approve the vacations of both parcels with staff's conditions; Mr. Whelan seconded the motion.

With no further discussion the motion passed 7/0.

Chairman Zuilhof stated that the next item on the agenda is discussion of traffic calming and safety alternatives.

Ms. Byington stated Planning Commission has previously approved a conceptual drawing for Shoreline Drive. During the design process thought has been given to the east end of Shoreline Drive specifically to improve pedestrian and vehicular safety. Your packets have alternative A, this evening they are looking for input and opinion on the proposed alternatives from the Commission. The final plan will still come back to Planning Commission approval, Mr. Klein is here to explain the alternatives.

Mr. Klein stated that he can explain how they arrived at this point and explain what they are proposing through the design build process. This came to Planning Commission in November and City Commission in December, City Commission decided to go with the design build process. The design build process takes the plan to 30%. Going through this process, the budget numbers began looking high so they began looking at several possibilities. When it got to the far east end of the street, there was a lot of discussions regarding safety, the consultants knew the conversations that had happened during the planning process and why that drive entrance was to be closed off at the park. The base bid in design build documents only showed a buffer between the condos drive entrance and the roadway. This could be accomplished with a curbed buffer or rain gardens, however this is not fully designed as it is only at 30%. This area needs to be improved from a safety standpoint it is a blind turn. The reason in the plans presented only two options is because they need to show cost on these options. They tried to determine if there is a cost savings with closing the east end of the road. They received the base bid price and the alternate price. Staff would like to go to Commission in October stating that we are not certain of what we are going to do, however we want to include the alternatives and costs. We initially have developed concepts, we now need to develop a design. Looking for support for this body to say that something needs to be done. Staff has not seen the traffic accident reports but would not want to wait until something happens, they will do the public process and get buy in for the final recommendations.

Mr. McGory ask staff if one of the alternative is that they clean up the area and leave it how it is.

Mr. Klein stated that is correct.

Mr. McGory ask if the second alternative is change to change it from a thru public street to a private drive for condos.

Mr. Klein stated that a private drive is not an alternative they are proposing and explained the proposed drive entrance.

Mr. Wobser stated that drive proposed is to be access drive that would prohibit all 13 condos from all backing into Shoreline Drive.

Mr. McGory stated that another option that they are considering is to close off the entrance to Water Street and extend green space to the condos.

Mr. Klein confirmed that this is one of the options, closing the street and create green space.

Mr. Klein stated that everything is on the table.

Mr. Whelan asked if there a visual representation for an option of closing the street where the rain gardens behind the condominiums.

Mr. Klein stated that this does not occur until the drawings are at 60%.

Mr. Miller asked if it is the case that the western entrance of the park is eliminated in all alternatives, is that within the base bid.

Ms. Byington stated the ideas that they would like to get from the Commission this evening would be thoughts on narrowing the road to try to calm traffic, a large bump out, and determine if you are all in agreement that something needs to be done and if so what needs to be done.

Mr. Galea asked if whatever alternative is selected, a driveway will need to be maintained to these condos. The question could be is if it is a thru drive or a private drive.

Mr. Miller confirmed if the commission is to task engineering, planning staff, or the consultants to come up with a range of possibilities.

Mr. Klein stated that they will be looking to Commission and everyone for ideas, however they will have a budget so there will be give and take.

Mr. Miller asked with any alternative that would be considered would there be a trade off with something else on the project. Are there line items for certain aspects of the project, for example is there a certain budget for utilities and a certain budget for streetscape work.

Mr. Klein stated that those conversations have been occurring for two months and they reduced the scope of the project to meet the available budget that they had. They are proposing burying some of the utilities from Wayne Street to the marina, just that piece. If those things are locked in they will stay, if an alternative stays in they could see if there is savings elsewhere or come back to commission to get additional funding. The City Manager's office is trying to find funding to accommodate certain things such as this.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that he was hoping for utilities to be buried along Shoreline Drive, he is worried that whatever does not get done in this process we will have to wait a long time to get done.

Mr. Wobser stated the through this process stakeholders expressed that they would like to see the utility lines buried as much as possible. The base bid we had as Wayne Street to marina, we do not have the funds available to go east of Wayne Street. It would be an additional \$400,000-500,000 to bury the lines from Wayne to Hancock, however we will look to find alternative funding if possible. For safety and aesthetics the city would like to bury as much as possible.

Mr. Zuilhof stated another idea for cost savings would be to eliminate separated bike lanes within this area to reduce cost.

Mr. Wobser stated that he would not eliminate the bike path within this area, this is supposed to be mile zero for people to go on and off the back bike path downtown. The plans call for allowing pedestrians and bikers to share the sidewalk which does not appear to be uncommon.

Mr. Klein stated that if utilities are not buried now staff will not be going back to them for another 15 years. Now would be the best time to do bury the utilities.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that expanding the park and eliminate motor vehicle traffic could cause an issue because it would make public uses right under the windows of the condominiums, and he would suggest a small buffer.

Mr. Galea stated that if it should come to pass that Shoreline Drive is closed there could be a berm or permanent landscaping so park users will be encouraged to the park area and away from the access drive, creating a barrier for privacy of the residents in that area.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that the Bayfront Corridor Committee was invited to listen to presentation. That committee will be discussing this on their regular scheduled meeting. If there is interest in hearing public comment the commission will need to make a motion to take public comment.

Mr. McGory moved to hear public comment; Mr. Whelan seconded the motion.

Tim Schwanger, stated that he was under the impression that Planning Commission was going to approve alternate A which included closing off Shoreline Drive between Franklin and Hancock Street. Mr. Schwanger ask if the agenda was amended.

Mr. Zuilhof stated that it was amended and they are here to review options provided by Engineering on this issue.

Mr. Schwanger stated that there is an issue with the park entrance, he would support closing off the entrance to the park not closing the street.

Mr. Wieber, 335 East Water Street, thanked the Commission for allowing him to comment on improving safety and calming traffic. He lives in the condos along Shoreline Drive and he has witnessed a number of times where a car nearly misses children and bikers. There is a blind curve when approaching from the east and there is only 30' between the edge of the building crosswalk as it terminates into East Water Street. People speed within this location. He has also witnessed ODNR dodge people when trying to back out of their research vessels into their facility. He believes that closing this street will assist in calming the traffic and creating a safe area.

Mr. McGory asked Mr. Weber if as a resident he supports the closing of the street completely.

Mr. Weber stated that he does support closing the street completely.

Marcy Platt, 1217 Columbus Ave stated that looking at the drawing she is wondering why they are not concerned about parking. She believes the intersection of Facer Park is worse than the area of Shoreline Park.

She stated that she is concerned about the proposed back in parking, if the commission is really concerned about safety they should review this issue again.

Mr. Galea stated that in light off the comments made and what Mr. Klein sated on behalf what engineering and staff want to do, he would like to make a motion to support engineering and staff to study and develop traffic calming and safety alternatives for the east end of Shoreline Drive at their discretion, otherwise not taking any options off the table, also concurrent with that to bury the utilities along Shoreline Drive recognizing that this may be our one shot for the foreseeable future to do that; Mr. Waddington seconded the motion. Mr. Waddington seconded the motion.

With no further discussion the motion was passed 7/0.

Mr. McGory motioned to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Jackson seconded the motion.

With no further business, the meeting at 5:21 PM.

APPROVED:

Casey Sparks, Clerk

Michael Zuilhof, Chairman