

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 26, 2015

AGENDA

1. **Stansbury** **10799 Drake Road**
14-009FDP/FP **Minor Text Modification (Approved 6 – 0)**
Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)
Final Plat (Approved 6 – 0)

2. **Dominion Homes Planned Unit Development – Pulte Sign**
15-009AFDP **4900 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard**
Minor Text Modification (Approved 6 – 0)
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)

3. **Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 - The Centre at Perimeter - Hand and Stone**
15-016AFDP/CU **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**
Minor Text Modification (Approved 6 – 0)
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)

4. **Riviera** **8025 Avery Road**
14-068Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan (Tabled 6 – 0)**
Preliminary Plat (Tabled 6 – 0)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Todd Zimmerman, Robert Miller, Deborah Mitchell, Christopher Brown; and Cathy De Rosa. Amy Salay was absent. City representatives present were: Jennifer Readler, Philip Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Alan Perkins, Gary Gunderman, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Aaron Stanford, Marie Downie, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Chris Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair said there were three cases eligible for the consent agenda this evening: Stansbury, Dominion Homes, and Hand & Stone. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The Chair said Ms. Salay was not able to attend this evening but prepared a letter she had sent out to her fellow Commission members and read her concerns in the letter:

I apologize, as I will be at a City Council Annual Retreat tomorrow evening and thus not in attendance of the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She has a few comments she would like to share about three of the cases.

Stansbury

I know that Muirfield Assn. will have “jurisdiction” over the appearance of the homes. However, I am curious what the requirements are in Muirfield with regard to exterior materials and the mix of materials on homes. My point is that in their text it is specified that the homes will be “high quality”. The text disallows vinyl, but I assume does not prohibit any other building materials. I think one of the keys to a high quality neighborhood is a mix of materials (in most cases) on homes. For example, in Jerome Village there are many large homes that are quite expensive, but some of the homes are clad in cementitious siding exclusively, and the appearance of the overall neighborhood suffers and appears of lower quality. I think the same is true when there are homes consisting of all stucco, unless of a certain architectural type. I think it makes sense to require a certain percentage of stone or brick with the likely stucco and siding in order to discourage the all-siding or all-stucco look on most of the homes. The southernmost section of Tartan West and the new neighborhood off Brand that Virginia Homes built is another example of the “all siding” look that I think we should avoid. The newest section of Ballantrae that we recently approved is building out this way, too. (Schottenstein Homes, I think)

My thoughts on exterior cladding also apply to the Riviera development, when/if we get to that point with them.

Hand and Stone

I just want to verify that this massage salon will be occupying the westernmost tenant space on the opposite end of the building from the future Starbucks?

Mr. Ghidotti had assured the Commission and council that a restaurant use was forthcoming in that space, if I’m correct in my assumption of its location. I am curious where or if any restaurant uses will be, if this salon takes this 3000 sf of tenant space, leaving what appears to be much smaller spaces left.

Riviera

This application has come a long way since we last saw it, and I would complement Mr. Ruma on his efforts with the neighbors and with the site and lot layout. I do not, however, believe that this plan is ready for passage at this point. Some of my concerns:

I’m not sure why we have aerial photos of the site from 30, 40 and 50 years ago. The site as it exists today is quite special to the community because of its beautiful trees, recreational open space use, and lack of rooftops and traffic generation. These are the aspects that the Dublin Community Plan addresses in its future land use, and I don’t believe the site’s appearance years ago is relevant to our discussion today. Approval to deviate from the Community Plan requires a very special situation and a great design done with a deft and sensitive touch on this site.

Claudia, would we be able to get an “overlay” of the proposed lots/neighborhood layout on top of the existing topography and existing trees? In using conservation design with this site it seems to me that the specimen trees and existing topography are what we would be looking to “conserve”. I cannot easily ascertain where the trees all are in relation to the house sites.

I think we need to know the locations of the trees and where they are in relation to the proposed lots and home sites so that we may protect the trees and site the homes appropriately, with the goal being to conserve these trees and being careful not to disturb the topography any more than absolutely necessary. We don’t want to cause any storm water or other problems with the surrounding homes.

The text is weak and I believe it needs to be re-worked to insure that we get a very high quality neighborhood that will enhance and improve the area. Building materials (and the variety and mix of same), exterior landscaping requirements for the homesites and overall landscaping for the development need to be better and more thoroughly addressed. The fact that the applicant wants very small lots means that we have to be very vigilant on the quality of the exterior materials. Also, I am VERY uncomfortable with the language in the text that addresses tree preservation. We want to make sure that the applicant goes way above and beyond:

“A good faith effort to preserve as many good and fair trees as possible” and “where appropriate”. This language does not give me comfort, especially given the recent experiences in new developments where large trees were inappropriately removed. We need to be hyper-vigilant about the trees on this site, again since the applicant is looking to use conservation design to gain approval, and the “conservation” in this case being largely all about the trees on the site.

I think we also need to have a discussion about the types of housing this neighborhood will have. I am very sensitive to the fact that this part of our school district is being over saturated with single family homes that will attract families with school-age children. We have neighborhoods within Dublin, and especially outside of Dublin city boundaries that are going to result in many, many students added to the school district. At the same time, retirees, singles and empty nesters in Dublin are saying they don't have many options for housing that fits their needs. The Bridge Street District will satisfy some of this demographic, but the BSD style of housing won't fit everyone who wants to “downsize” or “rightsize” their housing situation.

It seems that this may be a good location for some of this type of housing, but more work would need to be done with this application. Council and PZC toured Franklin, TN years ago and there was a neighborhood there (Westhaven?) that had some great examples of alternative housing types and different home styles and lot layouts that could be appropriate here. Again, simply putting smaller lots in a neighborhood won't address this issue effectively, and the quality and layouts would need to be re-worked. I am hesitant to add “roof tops” to this part of our city, unless the homes are filling a need besides family homes and we are assured of high quality and high value to protect the adjacent neighborhoods. At minimum I think the development text needs to be tightened up and offer much more detail.

For these reasons, I hope that the Riviera application will be tabled. There is too much outstanding to pass this rezoning at this time.

The Chair decided the two consent cases would be heard first and then Riviera and last will be Stansbury. She said the minutes will reflect the order as presented on the agenda.

**1. Stansbury
14-009FDP/FP**

**10799 Drake Road
Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for development details for an approximately 12.3-acre site with 18 single-family lots and 4.5 acres of open space on the east side of Drake Road, 200 feet south of the intersection with Springburn Drive. She said the Commission is the final authority on the review and approval of a Final Development Plan and the Commission will make a recommendation to City Council for the Final Plat.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission regarding this case.

Claudia Husak said Planning has been working on this application for a couple of years and this is the final stage for approvals before the applicant would be getting construction plans approved by engineering and building permits approved for the individual lots.

Ms. Husak said this parcel is in the middle of Muirfield, the only vacant site left within the development. She said when this was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2013 for a Preliminary Development Plan that was actually permitted to have 19 lots when it was forwarded to City Council, which reduced that number to 18. At that time, she said City Council took a couple additional actions with right-of-way exchanges for Drake Road, which was actually platted but never developed and vacated as part of the zoning. Subsequently, she said, the name of Drake Road, which is the southern leg, was also changed to Stansbury Drive. She indicated that has not been updated on all of the county maps yet.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed Final Development Plan. Except for the elimination of Lot 19 she said, it is the same plan that the PZC recommended for approval to City Council and she noted the vacated piece of road that will become open space that is being dedicated to Muirfield.

Ms. Husak presented the Stream Corridor Protection Zone that was studied by the applicant and determined that it is required to be 55 feet wide. She noted that north of Stansbury Drive is in a reserve as it is on the south.

Ms. Husak presented the 4.5 acres of open space to be owned and maintained by the Muirfield Association. She said typically the open spaces are to be dedicated to the City of Dublin.

Ms. Husak presented the lot minimum requirements and the setback requirements.

Ms. Husak said the applicant was approved for a Tree Waiver at City Council, which really addresses the tree replacement requirements. She said the applicant is proposing a tree planting zone, which is not a requirement but wanted to create an area that has some protection with it, where tree replacement could also take place. She explained that one of the conditions is to include requirements and a definition for this particular zone on the plat.

Ms. Husak explained the proposed landscape plan she presented. She stated there is a requirement in the development text for metal or wood fencing along tree protection areas, which would be over a 1,500-foot stretch. She explained Staff was willing to work with the applicant to allow heavy duty tree protection fencing in more sensitive areas as opposed to having it along the entire length of the tree protection area.

Ms. Husak said there are three motions to be voted on this evening: 1) Text Modification to allow Staff more of an onsite determination for where tree protection fencing is needed; 2) Final Development Plan is recommended for approval with three conditions; and 3) Final Plat is recommended for approval to City Council with two conditions.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is present with their representative to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Jack Reynolds, attorney with Smith and Hale; and Jason Francis with M/I Homes, said they agree with the conditions and have no problem working with Staff on the location of the tree protection materials as well as adding the definitions to the text. Mr. Reynolds said he would like to add to the record, that had been discussed at length during the last case is the architecture. He presented a letter from the Muirfield Association. He said M/I Homes have been working with the association in terms of providing houses that are going to be reviewed and approved by the Muirfield Association. He said he had the six different elevations in hand that had been reviewed and more or less approved with some minor modifications. He said the text does include that Muirfield Association will be reviewing and approving the houses that are

proposed for this subdivision. He said they are making the statement this evening that they are also committed to bringing the presentation to Muirfield Association for their approval prior to seeking a building permit from the City of Dublin. Mr. Reynolds stated they understood their obligations for approval to move forward. He said there would be no vinyl, but cementitious siding, brick, and stone, will be submitted materials for approval.

Chris Brown asked if that was a condition of approval that the Muirfield Association actually judges the architecture.

Ms. Husak said it was included in the development text under requirements.

Mr. Reynolds said he just wanted to make sure it was on the record.

The Chair asked Ms. Husak if there were any recommendations.

Ms. Husak said what was presented is acceptable and wanted to ensure that the applicant continue to work with Muirfield Association to review/approve elevations.

The Chair invited public comment.

Russ Randall, 8883 Belisle Court, said he attended prior meetings and asked if there was going to be a retention pond.

Ms. Husak confirmed there was a pond proposed and presented it on the slide.

Mr. Randall inquired about tree replacement for the tree Waiver.

Ms. Husak explained City Council approved a Waiver for allowing replacement for a tree-for-tree as opposed to inch-for-inch.

Mr. Randall asked if there was a plan; were all the trees mapped out.

Victoria Newell said the applicant completed a tree survey as a requirement of the application.

Mr. Randall said it appears this application is ready to close with no questions asked and yet the Riviera case had a lot more questions before it was concluded.

Ms. Newell said this application had come to the Commission previously so they have had a number of residents that have commented on this application in the past.

Mr. Randall asked about potential flooding going under Carnoustie Drive and further down where there is some washing out downstream. He asked what will be done to prevent that from happening.

Ms. Newell said Engineering can answer that question but any time a piece of property is developed, it cannot be developed in such a way to be detrimental to the surrounding areas. She explained any water generated on this site cannot be run off onto the surrounding property per Code regulations.

Aaron Stanford said one of the things Engineering does with stormwater management is to look for two separate items: 1) stormwater quality – removing solids and has more to do with water pollution; and 2) water quantity requirements. He said the pond we would put in there is specifically designed to release at the controlled rate; this helps with flood control.

Mr. Randall asked if there was a tree layout for the site.

Todd Zimmerman gave Mr. Randall his landscape map from his Commission packet.

Alan Swearingen, 8881 Crudden Bay Court, asked for clarification on proposed tree planting, specifically, evergreens.

Ms. Husak said there are evergreens permitted to be used as replacement trees to provide more of a buffer. She said Staff wants to work with the applicant on-site to establish locations where tree plantings would be useful for buffering as opposed to providing markings on a plan.

Mr. Swearingen inquired about tree protection fencing. He said his concern is when developers change. He said when this first came about it was a different developer. He said there is orange fencing that was initially put up and it is half up/down. He asked if that was going to be removed, replacing it with either a metal or wood fence for tree protection.

Ms. Husak said if there is orange tree protection fencing that has come down, it needs to be put back up. She said the more heavy-duty fencing would be for areas it is appropriate, like larger tree areas near the creek.

Ms. Newell invited more public comment. [Hearing none.]

Bob Miller asked if the Muirfield Association will maintain the common areas. Ms. Husak said they have agreed to that, yes.

Victoria Newell said she was supportive of the application.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the following Minor Text Modification:

To allow staff determination of locations where metal or wood tree protection fencing is appropriate.

Mr. Reynolds said they are agreeable to the conditions for both the Final Development Plan and the Plat.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the plans be updated to include a reference to the approved tree waiver;
- 2) That the plans include definitions for the Tree Preservation and Tree Planning Zones; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Planning to update the Landscape Plans prior to submitting the construction drawings in accordance with the comments in the Planning Report.

The vote was as follow: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to recommend approval of the Final Plat to be forwarded to City Council with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and

2) That the plat includes definitions for the Tree Preservation and Planting Zones.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

2. Dominion Homes Planned Unit Development – Pulte Sign
15-009AFDP **4900 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard**
Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a sign face change for an existing office building on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 400 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said the Commission is the final authority on both requests and we will need to make two motions, one for the Text Modification and one for the Amended Final Development Plan.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission regarding this case.

Claudia Husak stated the Text Modification desired to allow administrative approval of future sign face changes is common in all the other PUDs we have in the City.

The Chair asked if there were any questions. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the following Minor Text Modification:

To permit sign face changes to be approved administratively as permitted by the Zoning Code provided all relevant sign requirements are otherwise met.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

3. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 - The Centre at Perimeter - Hand and Stone
15-016AFDP/CU **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**
Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a massage and facial spa for an existing tenant space within Subarea A3 of the Riverside PCD North. She said the site is on the north side of Perimeter Drive, west of the intersection with Avery-Muirfield Drive. She said three requests are before us tonight, which will require three separate motions, one for the Minor Text Modification, the second for the Amended Final Development Plan and the third one for the conditional use. She said the Commission is the final authority on all of the requests.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission regarding this case.

Claudia Husak presented the first motion, which she said was similar to the Elli Nail Spa case a few weeks ago where text is being modified to allow the conditional uses in the SO District for the beauty and barber shops that are not listed currently in the development text.

Todd Zimmerman asked Paul Ghidotti to address the Commission. He asked him about the west end of that building where a Starbuck's was originally proposed for that space and at that time, a restaurant was proposed for that west side. He asked if Hand and Stone was going to occupy the whole 3,000 square feet of space.

Mr. Ghidotti confirmed Hand and Stone would occupy 3,500 square feet on the west end.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the restaurant idea then is no longer a consideration.

Mr. Ghidotti explained that originally, the developer planned to have restaurants on each end with patios. He said Dewey's Pizza asked to be in the center without a patio. He said they now do not have the square footage allowable to have a restaurant.

Bob Miller asked Staff why conditional use was not part of the original text.

Ms. Husak stated it was an oversight on the kind of uses that were considered.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the following Minor Text Modification:

To allow beauty and barber shops as personal services as a conditional use within the Riverside North Planned Commerce District, Subarea A3.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the conditional use. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

4. Riviera 14-068Z/PDP/PP

8025 Avery Road Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Preliminary Plat

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a rezoning of approximately 152 acres from R, Rural District and R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the potential development of the site with up to 185 single-family lots and approximately 76 acres of open space. She said the site is on the west side of Avery Road, north of the intersection with Memorial Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council for a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and also a request for review and

recommendation to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. As City Council is the final authority on these requests, she said applicants do not have to be sworn in.

Claudia Husak said Tina Wawzkiewicz, Traffic Engineer and Aaron Stanford, Civil Engineer, will also be presenting for this case. Ms. Husak provided a presentation outline. She said even though there have been a lot of people in the room that have attended the meetings on this case throughout the process, she would provide a lot of detail for the benefit of the new Commission members.

Ms. Husak explained the formal steps involved in the PUD process. She said the PZC reviewed the Concept Plan in March 2014. She said the rezoning step is being presented this evening and the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat are also included in this step. She said this step was completed in November 2014 but it was tabled by the Commission. She explained the PUD requires a development text be part of the zoning so that is the booklet the applicant provided to the Commission.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is requesting two actions from the Commission: 1) recommendation to City Council for the Rezoning with the Preliminary Development Plan that Planning is recommending approval with 15 conditions; and 2) recommendation to City Council for the Preliminary Plat that Planning is recommending approval with two conditions.

Ms. Husak presented the site, which has decreased in size slightly from what was previously previewed. She said it is 152 acres and on the east side is Avery Road. She reported there are three City of Dublin schools adjacent to the site: Deer Run Elementary, Grizzell Middle School, and Dublin Jerome High School. She said the major residential developments surrounding the site are: Tartan West, Muirfield Village, Shandon Glen, and Belvedere. She described the site as having 2,020 feet of frontage on Avery Road and has been a golf course since the 1970's. She said the applicant has provided the aerial views to address Commission questions from the November meeting about the trees on the site prior to the development of the golf course. She said there are two existing access points off of Avery Road and there are streams that run through the site. She noted the site includes a floodway and a Stream Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ) over the streams. She said there are many existing mature tree stands and tree rows as part of the golf course development as well as the ones that existed along the creek bed. She explained the existing zoning of the site is split and the site is also split by counties: Union, Franklin, and Delaware. She said the area in Union county is zoned R, Rural District; and Franklin and Delaware are zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential. She said both districts have very similar zoning allowances for land use and the other permitted uses in the district are agriculture, parks, and public schools.

Ms. Husak presented the Future Land Use map from the Community Plan that guides development decisions for the future of the City. She said the site is shown as Parks and Open Space, which stems from a request from the owners in 2007 when there was a major update of the Community Plan. She indicated some consideration was made for future connectivity to future developments.

Ms. Husak said the surrounding developments ranged in density from 1.27 units per acre in Muirfield Village, 1.5 units per acre in Belvedere, and 1.8 units per acre in Tartan West. She said these numbers follow what was written in the Community Plan as 1 – 2 units per acre.

Ms. Husak presented the plans the Commission previously reviewed. She noted the Concept Plan that proposed 284 lots at a density of 1.7 units per acre with 35% open space. She indicated the Preliminary Development Plan that was tabled, which reduced the number of lots to 248 with a density of 1.4 units per acre and 38% open space. She said this plan also included Subarea D to be dedicated for a potential elementary school. She said there have been discussions with the school district regarding the absorption of potential students within this development. She reported that Deer Run Elementary is one of the oldest schools in the City and the Dublin City School District may want to rebuild that school so that is why the applicant was working with the school superintendent to find a potential site within the neighborhood.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has been working with Staff to address many of the comments made by the Commission and the residents when the two previous plans were reviewed. She presented the summarized comments, one of which was the applicability of a Council Resolution passed in 2004 regarding "Conservation Design" that takes into account existing natural features, such as woodlots, steep slopes, and other natural features that might exist on various properties. She reported the applicant has revised the proposal to adhere to the Conservation Design Principles as outlined in the Resolution. Another issue has been density she said. The applicant has reduced the density significantly she reported down to 185 lots so there is now a proposed density of 1.22 units per acre and the open space has increased to 50% for the entire site. She explained the site boundary has decreased by 15 acres that the applicant will retain and not include in the proposed plan. Traffic impacts were another great concern she said with the adjacent neighborhoods and the larger intersections within the area. She said there was a push to have more protection of natural features, specifically tree preservation. Architectural standards were also a concern she said.

Jeffrey L. Brown, attorney with the firm Smith & Hale, representing the applicant, said several consultants are present to respond to any questions. He thanked staff and leadership of the various civic associations that have both given a lot of time and have a lot of interest in terms of this development. He indicated what is being presented this evening is a positive resolution of those issues raised in November 2014. He said one of the key conditions/requests was what happens if the Conservation Design Principle was used. He indicated they started from scratch to address this issue. He explained that this area was originally a farm field including two streams and the trees were primarily along that stream corridor. He presented aerial views of the site over the years. He said the more natural features such as ponds and additional trees were all created as part of the development of the golf course. He pointed out the SCPZ on the property. He said the applicant overlaid the potential development with the trees and found the developable areas. He confirmed this follows the Conservation Principles in terms of how a piece of property is evaluated. He said the applicant then overlaid the proposed lots. He presented a slide that showed how this all worked together. He restated that the density has dropped to 1.22 units per acre, which is below the density of any surrounding neighborhoods. He noted on the slide the trees to be preserved. He summarized the applicant has less units, lower density, and a better protection of natural resources, including the trees. The one other interesting thing about this site he said was young family's children could walk to school as a Kindergartener all the way up through high school since an elementary school, middle school, and high school were all within walking distance of this location.

Charles Ruma, real estate developer and builder, said he has not built many homes in the past five years but is still developing land, which he has been doing in Central Ohio for the past 45 years in the excess of 10,000 lots. He said he was the developer of Wedgewood in Powell, Ohio, and several developments in Dublin, Ohio, including the Metro Center, Waterford Village, Deer Run, Wedgewood Hills, Wedgewood Glen, and most recently, Wellington Reserve.

Mr. Ruma said Riviera started looking for land in the 60s by the American Italian Golf Association that have been in existence for approximately 80 years. He said they pieced together 67.1 acres to develop a golf course, which was originally opened in 1971. He presented a site plan of this piece in 1959 to show there was nothing anywhere but noted a Chestnut Oak tree that is still standing today. He presented a slide of the site from 1979 to show where some of the trees were planted. He reported the American Italian Golf Association has planted over 800 trees on this site over a ten-year period. He presented a slide showing five ponds that were built. He presented a slide showing the development of Deer Run Elementary School and Muirfield Village that were the first developments in the area, surrounded by farm land. Lastly, he presented the current site and the surrounding developments noting Dublin Jerome High School directly adjacent to the golf course, Tartan West, Grizzell Middle School, Belvedere, and Shannon Glen. He said now this is an infill lot of 167 acres completely surrounded by development. He restated that all of the densities around Riviera are higher. He said he has met the objective of being lower in density than every development in the surrounding area. He indicated he had been working on this plan for 28 months, which included two traffic studies, sanitary sewer analysis, soil studies, environmental

studies, ecological studies, tree surveys, stormwater analysis, stream corridor protection analysis, five different separate layouts, and participated in 70 – 80 meetings. He believes they have come a long way.

Mr. Ruma thanked the Planning Commission for their indulgence and the feedback received from the residents. He said this culminated in a Conservation Design that has not been used in any other development since the Resolution in 2007. He indicated he hopes Riviera will be the first one.

Mr. Ruma said this is a dynamite site and does not see any better site for residential living in Dublin or anywhere in Ohio. He said this site has walking and cyclist availability for school age children from Kindergarten to high school graduation. He explained that it is 76 acres of open space that includes a park the size of Goodale Park in Columbus, Ohio. He indicated he has created a community that is just as good as anybody could ever put on paper. He said there is over a mile of multi-purpose paths connecting Riviera with all the schools, local parks, Belvedere, Shannon Glen, and Tartan West. This he said meets the objectives of connectivity.

Mr. Ruma said tree preservation has been a main issue. He reported the plan saves the Chestnut Oak mentioned earlier, a Red Oak that is sitting in the middle of the north side of the site, as well as the trees along the stream corridor.

Mr. Ruma said at the entrance, the first house from Avery Road is 600 feet away, which equates to two football fields. He reported that 900 trees were identified in the survey of which 185 are Ash trees. He said they intend to preserve approximately 50 – 60% of the trees as a result of this design.

Mr. Ruma said architecture was another huge concern. He emphasized his experience. He said he is prepared to go point by point on the specifics of Tartan Ridge Architectural Standards, which he has been told is the guideline for what is expected for this site. He said he compared his text line by line to the architectural text of Tartan Ridge. He said there were 18 specific areas:

- 1) Dublin Appearance Code – the language was written by the same people, the Edge Group.
- 2) Architectural Review Committee – exactly the same.
- 3) Architectural Character – the words are exactly the same as Tartan Ridge but they have two pages of description styles with pictures.
- 4) Architectural Diversity – exactly the same.
- 5) Architectural Massing – he said this is not included in his plans and does not desire to include it as it is difficult to build to. He explained if they are to fit into neighborhoods that abut them, they do not believe they should do different looks except they want to make sure the quality is a good as or better.
- 6) Exterior Materials – exact same language.
- 7) Configuration of Materials – same except for Tartan's text calls for a transition of materials around a corner up to 8.5 inches, which he does not have. He said the base for Tartan's water table is 22 inches and his is 36 inches by Code.
- 8) Trim Materials – exact same words and specifications.
- 9) Shutters – same text except Tartan's text includes pictures.
- 10) Roofs – materials and pictures are the same.

- 11) Eaves, Dormers, Gutters, and Downspouts – exactly the same.
- 12) Exterior Paint – his text states natural colors, Tartan's specify Benjamin Moore or Sherwin Williams paint colors permitted.
- 13) Front Door Design – different. He said Tartan's four pages are magnificent along with columns and transoms and he does not do that.
- 14) Chimney Design – exactly the same.
- 15) Lighting – language the same but he puts lights on garages.
- 16) Front Porch, Windows, Soffit and Fascia – language is exactly the same.
- 17) Garages – same except for the setbacks that coincide with Tartan's massing.
- 18) Gates and Posts –he does not see these as being part of this development.

Mr. Ruma summarized by saying he hoped they have done everything in their power to meet the objections/requirements/suggestions that have been expressed. He said he is prepared to address the earlier questions about traffic and said what was reported is accurate. He added they were prepared to address any flood plain issues or stormwater protection concerns.

Diane Marin, EMH&T, said she wanted to explain what was in the stormwater management memo report provided. She noted Zone A, of the FEMA designated flood plain; she said there was no flood base determined so no FEMA designated flood way was on this property. As a result she said, sometimes areas that are not really in the flood plain are mapped as such. She said as part of their study, a detailed flood plain analysis has been completed and provided but it will be fine-tuned and resubmitted again. She said the report shows the actual flood plain and lays out the Stream Corridor Protection Zones. She indicated there are a few areas where the lots are within the FEMA designated Zone A that actually are not in the flood plain. As a result, she said they will be submitting a LOMA, which is a Letter of Map Amendment to FEMA to get those areas out of a FEMA designated flood plain. She explained they are not really in the flood plain based on the study and this is a common practice when FEMA maps things that are vaguely close. She said prior to the Final Development Plan, they will be working to get those removed from the FEMA designated flood plain.

Todd Zimmerman asked if there would be any lots that would require flood insurance. Ms. Marin said there will be no lots that are within the FEMA designated flood plain. He asked if any lots would be within the 100-year flood plain. Ms. Marin confirmed not as the site is developed.

Chris Brown inquired about detention/retention basins. Ms. Marin said they were retention basins as they are wet.

Bob Miller asked for more information about the answer Mr. Zimmerman received. He asked if any of the lots are currently in FEMA's defined flood plain. Ms. Marin answered affirmatively. He clarified that FEMA will be requested to remove that designation from the property. Ms. Marin confirmed a LOMA will be submitted and it will not be based on fill, it will be based on a map amendment.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if those lots will receive a letter for future use stating they are out of the defined flood plain when they go for resale. Ms. Marin replied there would be something on record with FEMA and she volunteered to provide that information.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing three subareas for the site, which she presented. She noted the lot area sizes and setbacks permitted for each area.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about side-loaded garages. Ms. Husak said for example in Ballantrae, all 100-foot lots are required to have side-loaded garages. She said a courtyard garage, which has been seen recently in development styles could be accommodated on a lot of that site.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed phasing plans, with the first phase being Subarea A on the southeast side, which would include the demolition of the existing clubhouse and left-turn lane off Avery Road at the entrance.

Ms. Husak presented a map of the reserves of open spaces. She said the requirement for this site is 13 acres or 8.5% of the site per the Subdivision Regulations within the City of Dublin. She said the applicant has stated with the Conservation Design approach to this site, they are providing 50% open space and that is 76 acres. She pointed out the areas that are proposed to be maintained by the City of Dublin as well as the areas to be maintained by the homeowners' association. She said all the open spaces and reserves within the development will be owned by the City of Dublin. She explained that as the plans come forward, those areas will be dedicated to the City and the City will have ownership of them.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is being asked to make changes to the Preliminary Plat to ensure the open space maintenance requirements are also included on the Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Brown asked how it is determined that the City maintains a specific open space designated area.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has met with the City's Director of Parks and Open Space prior to coming to the PZC. She explained it is more or less areas that have less maintenance required and the more natural areas/less programmed, which is specifically the case here. She noted an area where there is not a lot of City maintenance envisioned because it is intended to be more natural. She said it is the park staff working with the applicant. She explained that the drawing for the open spaces is also examined. She gave an example where a person would park along the road to use one of the paths connected throughout the community, which makes it appropriate for the City to maintain as opposed to more interior spaces to the neighborhood itself. She said the development text includes potential programming for all of the open space reserves.

Ms. Husak presented the path connection map showing all the sidewalks/bike paths and proposed shared paths or existing shared paths. She said the applicant is willing to work with Engineering specifically to ensure the existing paths, which were built as golf cart paths, not built to Dublin path standards that will be evaluated and rebuilt if necessary.

Tina Wawzkiewicz presented the overview of the intersections that were focused on in the traffic impact studies prepared by the applicant. She explained the purpose of having a traffic impact study during a rezoning process is to understand the impacts of the proposed land use on the roadway infrastructure. She said it is a tool used to determine the developers' responsibility for their site access points and off-site intersections. She presented a snapshot of the proposal with 185 lots and the 24-hour volume on normal weekday is expected to be about 1800 trips and that is from the ITE Generation that matches up well with our City counts around town. She highlighted the am/pm peak hours, which are one hour out of a two-hour count; the pm peak is the higher of the two. She said these counts are significantly different than the last time this application was reviewed as it is 25% less. She presented a table to show the potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood streets. She noted that Firenze Place is one that stubs to Tartan West the other two are to the south that extend into Belvedere. She said this help illustrate the need for that connection from the site directly out to Hyland-Croy Road. She said projecting volumes on Hyland-Croy Road out 10 years and adding the site without the Hyland-Croy connection shows poor levels of service and emphasized the need for the connection. She said this would also provide benefits

for the Belvedere and Shannon Glen areas. She said this allows students to get to the high school. She noted fewer trips for the Avery Road/Brand area with this connection.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the phases are expected to run from Avery Road west and Staff is recommending a condition with the rezoning to have the Hyland-Croy connection programmed prior to the approval of a Plat for section 3.2, most critically, the connection to Tartan West. She said Staff is also suggesting a sign at the end of the stub street to indicate a future extended road.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the connector would be a cost for the developer.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said that could be determined with the infrastructure agreement. She said Staff needs to state this connection is needed as it is important from the perspectives of transportation and the roadway network. She said Staff also wants the developer to commit to entering into an infrastructure agreement. She said the details of all those dollar amounts can be worked out at the City Council level.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz noted the alignment of Timble Falls Drive where staff requested a change.

Ms. Newell requested further explanation.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz explained that when small curves that go back and forth are introduced, a driver is going to tend to take the path of least resistance. She said a northbound driver would hug the outside of that curve and vice versa for the southbound driver and this interaction between the vehicles is not desired. She said it also makes the lot layout a little awkward, which could impact the footprint of those homes. She said it generates awkward geometry for the roadways. She said gentler curves are desired to alleviate the back and forth, back and forth action.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said the Avery Road/Brand intersection have been included in the Capital Improvement Plan regardless of the status of this application. She reported the Avery Road/Brand intersection is currently in the preliminary design phase. She explained it had not been programmed for construction yet but the typical phase is a cost estimate for construction and then Council will decide when to program the construction. She said it appears that a roundabout will be the solution for this intersection. She indicated the current level of service is a grade C, which is acceptable from engineering's perspective, with or without site traffic. She said projecting 10 years out, the intersection fails with or without site traffic.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz summarized that based on the future traffic projection, which are nearly double in ten years, and distribution presented in the traffic impact study, the site is expected to increase traffic at this intersection by about 3%, with the Hyland-Croy connection.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz noted the overview for the infrastructure prompts asking the developer to be responsible for the Avery Road improvements at their site intersection including the turn lane required there, the connection to Hyland-Croy Road, and a pedestrian crossing system across Avery Road that would include some sort of an electronic sign. In addition, she said to Avery Road/Brand intersection, other off-site intersections could be included in the infrastructure agreement. She suggested the recent infrastructure agreement with Avondale is a good example of what kind of agreement could be expected with this application. She noted various other intersections that could be included in the agreement.

Mr. Miller said when he considers the Hyland-Croy/Brand roundabout then he thinks of Tuscany Drive, and this connector coming into Hyland-Croy; there are three events occurring there. He said he anticipates Hyland-Croy to become four lanes in the not-so-distant future. From an engineering perspective, he asked if that would solve the problem right now but create a mess later on. Ms. Wawzkiewicz said Staff analyzed it with respect to the intersection that will be developed with Celtic Crossing. She said there are a series of intersections but Staff feels the spacing would be okay to include

this new access point. She said consolidating private driveways could also help with some of that access management as this area is realigned, not to say it will not change eventually.

Cathy De Rosa said the first phases of this are going to go on/off of Avery Road based on Phase 1 & 2. She said she is trying now to overlap the bike paths and the sidewalks to this. She asked if there will be bike paths and sidewalks up and down Avery Road on both sides.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said there is an existing bike path on the west side of Avery Road, which will probably have some reconstruction along with the widening of Avery Road when the turn lanes are built. She is assuming those connections north and south of the boulevard to be constructed with the phase they are adjacent to.

Ms. De Rosa said the first couple of phases are going to be the route to get in/out and the movement in/out to the park.

Aaron Stanford said he wanted to provide an overview of the utility system proposed with this development. He confirmed there is an existing FEMA flood plain on the site. He said the one important thing to note about that flood plain is what we would call a Zone A, which is a flood plain that is not as a result of a detailed study; it is a preliminary guess of the 100-year flood plain in that area. As part of this development, he said we have required the applicant to do a detailed study of that area that will become the basis of an analysis of what that flood plain is from a much more detailed study.

Mr. Stanford said the applicant is putting in a series of public storm sewers, catch basins, curb inlets, and stormwater ponds to meet the Code stormwater requirements for quantity and quality control.

Mr. Stanford said this site will gain access to sanitary sewer service by connecting into the North Fork Indian Run trunk sewer and that exists to the south and the west of this development. He indicated with different phases, the developer will construct new sanitary mains and services to each of the individual lots. He reported that much further downstream from this development, in the North Fork Indian Run trunk sewer, we have begun to see a long-term capacity issue with that sewer. As a result, he said the applicant was asked to do a pretty extensive study already on the sanitary sewer system for this entire sewer shed, which is over 2,000 acres of which 426 of those acres are undeveloped. He said Staff has analyzed what would happen to those undeveloped areas as well as this development in terms of impact on the sewer system after a few years. He reported they have a very good idea of what that impact is. He said the City also recommended four separate solutions or mitigation measures to improve the system. He said they intend to look at that improvement, start considering programing, and if there is cost sharing, that could be wrapped in that infrastructure agreement, similar to the transportation improvements.

Mr. Stanford said the applicant will gain access to public water for domestic and fire protection service through connecting to a 16-inch main that exists along the east side of Avery Road and also by connecting to 8-inch mains at each of the three street stubs. He explained that loop system will help maintain water pressure throughout the district and will provide better circulation. He said they have adequate water pressure in these areas and would not experience an adverse effect on the existing system.

Ms. Husak said Staff is outlining all of the conditions tied to the review criteria into the development text. She pointed out that there have been discussions by the Dublin City Schools with regard to the vicinity specifically Jerome High School but also to some extent Grizzell Middle School to this proposed development. She said the schools have informed Staff that Jerome High School is very heavily used throughout all seasons. She said there are camps in the summer, sporting events, band activities, and a lot of activity overall even outside regular school hours. She said Staff has suggested that the applicant include language in the development text that highlights that to which they have agreed. She said that is

not always something that prospective buyers read when they purchase a home but it is definitely something that gives Staff some comfort of being able to point to, to demonstrate this development is near a very active school. She said people should be made aware of the noise levels associated with such activities.

Ms. Husak added Staff is concerned about the location of proposed Lot 185 at the T-intersection there of what will eventually become the Hyland-Croy connector to the development. She said having headlights come into this lot is something Staff is quite concerned with so a condition has been proposed that this lot and the two lots to the north of proposed Cacchio Lane be eliminated from the proposal for this reason. She said it would also open up the view of the open space on the northern piece of Timble Falls Drive.

Ms. Husak said Staff wants to ensure the applicant works with Planning during the Final Development Plan stage to ensure lots that are adjacent to the SCPZ have some demarcation so that people do not start mowing into the zone, which is intended to be undisturbed. She said this has been done with a small sign or marker in a couple of areas of the City where a SCPZ exist.

Ms. Husak said Staff wants to ensure the applicant is willing to work with the schools on a path connection to Jerome High School, should that be desired by the school.

Ms. Husak said Ms. Wawszkiewicz had mentioned many of the other conditions that are related to the traffic impact study and the infrastructure agreement as well as the “wobble” so those are all outlined in detail in the Staff Report in our recommendation section.

Ms. Husak said there are other amendments or changes requested for the development text expected from the applicant:

- o Garage locations for lots adjacent to Avery Road
- o Architecture for garages
- o Architecture Review Committee member information

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 15 conditions:

- 1) That the development text be updated to include language highlighting that Riviera is proposed near a very active high school with year round activities and that homeowners will likely be affected by the noise and light that typically accompanies such activities;
- 2) That Lots 135, 136, and 185 in Subarea B be removed to provide larger open space vistas;
- 3) That the applicant work with Planning to determine a method of either physically delineating the Street Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ) area, and/or ensure the property owners are aware of the presence of the SCPZ and its restrictions;
- 4) That the applicant provide a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) and a detailed engineering study approved by FEMA with the Final Development Plan that includes lots in FEMA designated 100-year floodplain (Zone A), subject to approval by Engineering;
- 5) That the applicant enter into an infrastructure agreement with the City, prior to submitting the first Final Development Plan for development thresholds and public project contributions including the necessary sanitary sewer system improvements;
- 6) That the applicant work with the City to program a direct site connection to Hyland-Croy Road to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to the approval of a plat that includes the Firenza Place connection to Tartan West;
- 7) That the alignment of Timble Falls Drive between Lots 140 and 165 be realigned to eliminate the proposed curvature, subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;

- 8) That the developer revises the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to City Council hearing of the rezoning;
- 9) That as part of the development of Section 1, the applicant provides a northbound left-turn lane on Avery Road into the site and a pedestrian crossing system for Avery Road, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 10) That the plans be updated to accurately name all proposed streets;
- 11) That the applicant place a sign at the proposed stub for Cacchio Lane indicating future connectivity to Hyland-Croy Road and indicate this on the Final Development Plan;
- 12) That the applicant evaluates existing cart paths intended to remain on site and upgrade if necessary to ensure compliance with City standards;
- 13) That the development text be updated to indicate a willingness to provide a path connection to Jerome High School;
- 14) That the development text be updated to address garage locations for lots adjacent to Avery Road as outlined in the Planning Report; and
- 15) That the applicant provides membership information for the Architectural Review Committee to the satisfaction of Planning as part of the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for the Preliminary Plat to be forwarded to City Council with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to Council submittal; and
- 2) That the Preliminary Plat is updated in terms of open space ownership and maintenance responsibilities prior to Council review.

The Chair invited public comment.

Kevin Walter, 6289 Ross Bend, asked Ms. Readler about the exclusion of the 15 acres, and if that area needed to be subdivided to allow a different zoning on that parcel. Ms. Readler said that would be done as part of the Plat.

Mr. Walter thanked the Commission for allowing the public to participate in this process. He said he represents a coalition of nine neighborhood groups including homeowner associations and civic groups from across northwest Dublin. He said as a voice behind the Friends of Dublin, he is committed to helping to build the best Dublin possible, respecting our history and building our future. He said it was one year ago this month that we met for the first Concept Plan discussion and they have continued discussion ever since. He said originally, the group was overwhelmingly opposed to this development but they are now supportive of most of the elements of the current application. He thanked Charlie Ruma and his team for taking a critical look at the plan, listening to the residents of Dublin, and producing a significantly better plan that will result in the preservation of a heritage and unique beauty that is Riviera.

Mr. Walter requested a few alterations to the application after mentioning the real benefits in both aesthetic and financial terms:

- o Elimination of multiple lots in addition to what Staff has proposed
- o Remove responsibility from the applicant for the improvements at the Avery/Brand intersection to be placed on the City
- o To not connect the stub street of Tantalus Drive and only expand a multi-use path
- o Clearly delineate a future connector to Hyland-Croy both in the development text and physically on property
- o If an elementary school is built on the designated 15 acres, that the T-intersection at Timble Falls Drive and Cacchio Place be replaced with a neighborhood size roundabout.

- Add hardscape elements to the slivers of open space such as fences, stonework or paver walks to ensure the public understands these are to be used as open space access points and not private property
- Provide a descriptive pattern book for homebuilders that clearly expresses the character of Riviera rather than mirroring the specificity of the Tartan Ridge Architectural Standards

Mr. Walter said they understand the applicant is a developer and not a homebuilder and he will negotiate with multiple homebuilders to build on this site. He said it is critical that the architectural standards section of the development text be strengthened. He said the level of quality needs to be clearly communicated for homes built now and into the future.

Mr. Walter concluded stating they are requesting that the application be tabled this evening to work on the details of the development text.

Lisa Judson, 8018 Summerhouse Drive, West, said the presentation was very exciting and thanked the applicant for going back to the table to create a new design. She indicated she was not originally from Dublin but has been residing in Dublin for the past 8.5 years. She said she is raising six adopted daughters. She said the bottom line has been affected by the development but she believes her family's bottom line will be affected as well. She said she has been told by her realtor that her property will decrease in value by approximately \$100,000 from when it was purchased in 2006. She said this is considered a lot of money for someone raising eight children. She said her lot is at a T-intersection at Abbey Glen and Summerhouse Drive. She challenges the traffic numbers as there is a huge traffic problem with students going to the high school, which is also a safety issue for children. She said the high school students do not walk to school, which adds to the traffic numbers. She said it is dangerous crossing Abbey Glen in the walking path. She is requesting speed bumps or flashing signs, etc. She indicated she has a concrete front porch because if a driver misses the stop sign, they could head right into her porch. She has witnessed that most people view the stop sign as a yield sign. She said there have been multiple accidents there, which usually involve the students. She said she has to be on alert all the time.

Robert Fathman, 5805 Tarton Circle North, said he endorsed everything Mr. Walter said. He said when Mr. Ruma and his team were at his home two weeks ago meeting with our nine neighborhood associations, he said Mr. Ruma's son, who builds Virginia Homes will build part of Phase 1 and the rest he plans to sell to M/I Homes. He said they want to ensure there are sufficient detailed architectural standards in the development text that MI Homes would have to follow.

Kristina Ledford, 6328 Cragie Hill Court, said she is new to Dublin and her house is directly across from the proposed development. She said her concern was with impact on the neighboring schools. She stated she understands the benefit of children being able to walk to the schools but does not believe that will necessarily be the case. When she enrolled her children in the system she said, the concern was that Deer Run and Grizzell were already at capacity and was concerned her children would need to be shipped to other schools on the other side of Muirfield Village. She said this is still very dense, appealing to single-family homes. She indicated she appreciates the empty nester portion of this proposal as this is a growing need.

Kip Rosier, 8079 Alimoore Green, said he is the president of Belvedere HOA. He said one of the big concerns their neighbors had was the traffic situation as the traffic is currently horrendous in their neighborhood at 7 am. He asked the Commission to consider a connector to the high school. He asked if the 15 acres that are off the table, if they were going to stay in their current form. He questions what it will look like if left barren that allows weeds to grow and become unsightly.

Mark Mace, 6469 Green Stone Loop, said traffic on Abbey Glen is a problem in the mornings and questioned the traffic impact study stating there would only be an addition of four cars cutting through

that neighborhood from the 185 homes proposed for Riviera. He said even if there is a Hyland-Croy connection, students will figure out it is harder to make a left turn onto Hyland-Croy than it is to make two right turns to get to the high school coming through their development. He stated he is also concerned about the noise levels for empty-nesters. He said he can already hear the broadcasts from the sports activities while sitting at his dining room table. He said he did not understand why his tax dollars should maintain the significant amount of that green space when he pays HOA dues for their green space in their neighborhood.

Roland Kolman, 8622 Davington Drive, Dublin, said he had been neighbors with Charlie Ruma many years ago. He said he is familiar with Tartan West as it is the route he takes for walking. He indicated he has seen it develop over the years. He said he believes this is the same house as what was built at Tartan West, just with a few minor changes. He noted the architecture is very dull. He indicated the small single floor houses are just like Levittown on steroids, which is not interesting. He said when Charlie promotes he did Tartan West, it causes him concern because he wants Riviera to be better.

Brett Bohl, 5735 Whitecraigs Court, thanked everyone, and commented on Mr. Ruma's passion. He emphasized it was not Mr. Ruma's mismanagement of that club that got us to this point in the first place. Adversely, he said, Mr. Ruma came in and saved the day and should be applauded for that. In Dublin he indicated, sports are celebrated, and many of the teams win championships. He said he wanted to go on record to offer an olive branch to Mr. Ruma as there is a consortium with the American Italian Golf Association and he would like to talk.

Jesse Oddi, Jr., 3118 Adena Point Court, stated he is the president of the American Italian Golf Association. He indicated they had no desire to be in the state they are in; this is driven purely by economics. He said over the last 15 years, there have been eight golf courses created within five miles of Riviera and two of them have fallen under hard times. He said the families that started this organization had a dream to just play golf somewhere. He explained the American Italian Golf Association was formed before there ever was a golf course. He said Riviera is their legacy and this is very difficult for them. He indicated there were people in attendance tonight that started this organization. He explained they have to sell or lose everything they have. He said they selected Mr. Ruma from a group of developers that are well respected within the community. He asked the Commission to consider this application so they can move on and move forward. He said his children and grandchildren are proud of who they are and the legacy of the American Italian Golf Association. He said there are first and second generation Italians in the association and they worked hard to be a good neighbor to the City of Dublin. He said Dublin was a Village when they first arrived. He said a lot of the members came to Dublin and still live here. He said the American Italian Golf Association and Riviera brought people to this community. He reported they had the first professional golf tournament, the LPGGA. He said this is not a 'get rich quick scheme' for them but an opportunity for them to continue their legacy. He asks that they be treated like everybody else. He said the homeowners are passionate about where they live and we are passionate about what we have. He said it has always been an honor for the American Italian Golf Association to be a part of Dublin.

Mr. Ruma said the 15 Development Plan conditions in the Staff Report had not been addressed:

- 1) That the development text be updated to include language highlighting that Riviera is proposed near a very active high school with year round activities and that homeowners will likely be affected by the noise and light that typically accompanies such activities;**

Mr. Ruma said that was in their text already and they will be notifying homeowners of that situation.

- 2) That Lots 135, 136, and 185 in Subarea B be removed to provide larger open space vistas;**

Mr. Ruma said he was at the end, had no more to give and he was already underwater on the deal. He indicated he would gladly remove those lots as long as he can replace them in another area in this subdivision. He said there are plenty of places to put these lots if he is asked to move them and they would not deduct anything from the open space.

- 3) That the applicant work with Planning to determine a method of either physically delineating the Street Corridor Protection Zone (SCPZ) area, and/or ensure the property owners are aware of the presence of the SCPZ and its restrictions;**

Mr. Ruma said he agrees and will clearly mark these areas on deeds or plats.

- 4) That the applicant provide a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) and a detailed engineering study approved by FEMA with the Final Development Plan that includes lots in FEMA designated 100-year floodplain (Zone A), subject to approval by Engineering;**

Mr. Ruma said he would.

- 5) That the applicant enter into an infrastructure agreement with the City, prior to submitting the first Final Development Plan for development thresholds and public project contributions including the necessary sanitary sewer system improvements;**

Mr. Ruma said he would. He said they have contributed considerably to the sanitary sewer system already, providing a \$60,000 study. He said these are problems existing today and not because of any future development. He said this serious problem needs to be solved whether he develops Riviera or not.

- 6) That the applicant work with the City to program a direct site connection to Hyland-Croy Road to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to the approval of a plat that includes the Firenza Place connection to Tartan West;**

Mr. Ruma said he is against a Hyland-Croy connection because of what it is going to do to Riviera. He presented a traffic situation that is going to be created by putting a connection through to Hyland-Croy Road. He explained that if there is a direct connection between Avery Road and Hyland-Croy, a thoroughfare that goes through this site. He said in the morning and afternoon, there will be 200 – 300 cars going to/from the high school. He said if there is a football game, this will be the place to go to the football game. He said this is not the thing to do for Conservation Design and the people living in Riviera. He noted the multiple paths of traffic that converges onto the high school that would go through this proposed connection. He said the Brand/Avery Road intersection is the problem and there needs to be a priority on that to get it fixed. He said he has done everything in his power to make this a beautiful living space and now a Hyland-Croy connector is requested to go through here that is going to devastate citizens that live in Riviera. He said we might as well make it Morse Road and add gas stations and fast food establishments. He emphasized it was wrong. But saying all that, he said he would cooperate with the City because he wants to get this application approved but will fight it as much as he can. He said he does not want to be part of it, especially the way it is being designed.

- 7) That the alignment of Timble Falls Drive between Lots 140 and 165 be realigned to eliminate the proposed curvature, subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;**

Mr. Ruma said he would straighten out the road.

8) That the developer revises the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to City Council hearing of the rezoning;

Mr. Ruma said he would update the traffic study to the satisfaction of the City.

9) That as part of the development of Section 1, the applicant provide a northbound left-turn lane on Avery Road into the site and a pedestrian crossing system for Avery Road, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;

Mr. Ruma said he would build a left-turn lane on Avery Road but has a problem with the pedestrian crossing as it goes nowhere. He explained that across the street where he is being asked to put it, there is a storm outlet that is in the way and there are no sidewalks on Memorial Drive so there is no connection to anything other than going to a path that is private, restricted to Muirfield residents. He asked why someone would want to make that crossing. He said if the point is to go north of the school entrance, he recommended a different path. He said if he is forced to do it, he will participate and take care of it in the infrastructure agreement with the City but again, does not believe it is the right thing to do.

10) That the plans be updated to accurately name all proposed streets;

Mr. Ruma said he thought they were correct but if there was anything he needed to do he will.

11) That the applicant place a sign at the proposed stub for Cacchio Lane indicating future connectivity to Hyland-Croy Road and indicate this on the Final Development Plan;

Mr. Ruma said he hopes he does not have to but if he does, he will. He said he does not believe there should be a sign stating there is going to be a future road if there is not going to be a future road. He said he does not know what is going to happen with those 15 acres.

12) That the applicant evaluates existing cart paths intended to remain on site and upgrade if necessary to ensure compliance with City standards;

Mr. Ruma said he would ensure the paths comply and are high quality.

13) That the development text be updated to indicate a willingness to provide a path connection to Jerome High School;

Mr. Ruma said he had already committed to doing that.

14) That the development text be updated to address garage locations for lots adjacent to Avery Road as outlined in the Planning Report; and

Mr. Ruma said he will not have any garages facing Avery Road on the lots that are opposite facing Avery Road. He said there are only 12, 75-foot lots in this area. He said all the other lots are 86 feet or larger and all the lots in Section A are 100 feet or larger. He said homes in Section A will be custom-built homes. He said he was sure his son would be building on those lots but there will be other builders, too. He predicts that will be a very expensive area (\$750,000 - \$900,000). He said the homes planned for Section B will be \$550,000 - \$700,000; and the empty-nester homes should probably be in the \$600,000 - \$700,000 range and maybe higher.

15) That the applicant provides membership information for the Architectural Review Committee to the satisfaction of Planning as part of the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Ruma stated there will be an architect, a developer, and a landscape architect on that committee to determine approval of the plans.

Mr. Ruma said he has 20 reasons why the Commission should approve this site. He emphasized he needs approval to move ahead, out of PZC and get to City Council. He said the American Italian Golf Association needs an answer. He said the association can either buy another golf course or they can get themselves out of debt and plan on their own future. He said the association needs to know what to do with their golf course in this upcoming season. He indicated this is been a real problem and apologized for taking this long to return to the Commission. He said this is a new Planning and Zoning Commission, they are here, and are asking for a decision.

Mr. Ruma said he would work on architectural renderings, provide pictures, and will deal with the neighbors to fix problems. He said if someone would tell him what is wrong, he could fix it. He concluded his comments by asking again for approval.

Todd Zimmerman said he has been to a few APA conferences, has listened to Randall Arendt, and the applicant has made the numbers for Conservation Design. He asked Staff if the design is there that Dublin would expect.

Ms. Husak said she had to refer back to something that Mr. Ruma said earlier in his part of the presentation, that we do not have in the City a single development that has met the Conservation Design resolution principles to the point, each and every one of them that is there, that alone sets this development apart from anything else that we have.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this was a vision for what Staff would have expected for Conservation Design.

Ms. Husak replied yes. She said there have been a few comments at City Council when we have taken residential products forward in the last couple of years (Links of Ballantrae comes to mind and Avondale Woods specifically where some of the Council members had concerns about lack of open space behind lots or lots backing up to open space). She said in this instance, each and every lot has open space behind it.

Mr. Zimmerman said he brought this up for the other members on this Commission that have not had the experience of APA or heard different talks on Conservation Design. He said he wanted to ensure that Staff was comfortable with this proposal and it was as good as it gets.

Ms. Husak said the site is somewhat unique that the Conservation is really all man-made features except for the streams; there is not a large woodland area in this site. She said there are areas you cannot build on anyways but you have to preserve them.

Mr. Zimmerman said the topography of the site has a lot of grade changes.

Mr. Zimmerman indicated he would like to see a minimum 30-year asphalt shingle added to the roof materials required as part of the architectural standards. He referenced the windows on #2 and asked if an awning style window could be added to the text. He said he would like to see vinyl and PVC shutters removed.

Mr. Ruma said the latest and best material for shutters is PVC as it does not warp or peel and holds its color. He said he would be glad to remove vinyl as a permitted material for shutters.

Mr. Zimmerman indicated that is fine because he has seen vinyl over time lose its color very rapidly.

Mr. Brown stated the PVC shutter does hold up.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned the configuration of materials. He asked if a house had to be clad in two materials or if there could be an all brick or an all stone house.

Ms. Newell said there is similar text and terminology in our Architectural Review Standards. She said an all brick home is considered lovely. She indicated there are incidences where an all siding home can be very attractive. She said she believes that text was added to prevent the repetitiveness of having three homes in a row with siding. She said when you try to put architectural elements in text alone, it is difficult to illustrate the result. She said for eliminating one thing, you are taking away another possibility but there was good reason why that language was added.

Ms. De Rosa said she recognizes this has taken some time and many of us were not here when this was started. She said she has seen the past recordings, as she assumes her fellow new members have, so as a “newbie” on this, it has been incredibly heartwarming to see how well the work has advanced and how hard everybody is working together. She said she believes this was worth the time and effort as we are getting close to having something that seems to work around the ring.

Ms. De Rosa said there have been discussions about ensuring diversity in the architectural design. She said based on your experience, the drawings, the discussion, the requirement to have diversity it sounds to her like that is what the community is stating is the piece that is missing. She said she believes it is more about putting it on paper than disagreeing about what it is. She indicated we are in agreement but maybe we do not see it yet on the paper.

Mr. Ruma said there will be a matrix set up so no two similar houses can be beside each other, or two houses away, or across from each other so there is a guide for builders and the Architectural Review Committee.

Ms. De Rosa asked Staff if a matrix is something the Commission would expect to see at this level.

Ms. Husak said the architectural diversity requirements are currently in the development text and the matrix is due at the Final Development stage.

Mr. Brown inquired about transition on corners; he asked if that was returnable materials off the main façade to an adjacent façade. He asked what that specifically addressed. He inquired about garage setbacks related to massing.

Mr. Ruma said there would be a variety of garage locations. He said some will be behind the front façade, some tied into a porch, and a lot of them will be side-loaded. He said on the 100-foot lots there will be side-loaded with garage doors to the outside, a number of the interior lots/Section B lots will be courtyard where garages would be off a courtyard toward the front door, and some will be front-loaded garages.

Mr. Brown referred to Mr. Walter’s comments about the development text where one shows pictures and the other does not. He asked where the main contention is between the two, between Mr. Ruma’s text and Mr. Walter’s perspective including the whole Dublin Association.

Mr. Ruma said regardless of if they are approved tonight, he plans to sit down with Mr. Walter and figure it out. He said the language is all the same; and the pictures are the difference to describe what they want to see.

Ms. Husak reported in the Tartan Ridge text, each of the styles permitted in the development text has a picture illustrating that style.

Mr. Brown indicated he had seen those in a lot of planned communities.

Mr. Ruma said we have mentioned those styles in the text but have not shown pictures.

Deborah Mitchell said it makes sense to her that the residents would want to see pictures, and she would like to see the quality detail in pictures as well; something along the lines of the Tartan Ridge model. She said that would be an important piece given everyone's comfort level. She indicated that words are powerful but can also be ambiguous. She stated the more pictures the better.

Ms. Mitchell inquired about condition #6 because Mr. Ruma had said the connector would be a real threat to the integrity of Conservation Design.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said it is important to look at the big picture on this one because the more connections you make, the better you disburse traffic. She said we have been talking about this in the Bridge Street District and it fits this scenario where the more options given to drivers the better the traffic works everywhere. She said the connection to Tartan would suffer if there was not another way to get out to Hyland-Croy. She anticipates the cut through traffic in Belvedere would become worse. She said engineering knows that the Avery/Brand Road intersection is a problem and are addressing it.

Ms. Mitchell asked if Staff sees a trade-off between the integrity of Conservation Design versus the need for traffic management.

Ms. Husak said it is still part of the Community Plan and there are streets stubbing into Riviera for a reason because Planners before us have realized the importance of connections being made throughout the community regardless of the kind of design.

Ms. Mitchell asked for clarity; she said Staff does not believe it is a trade-off.

Ms. Husak said the traffic safety and distribution is a higher priority.

Mr. Ruma said what we are really talking about is neighborhood to neighborhood traffic verses traffic coming from off-site, unconnected, through this site because it goes to the high school; that is the difference. He said we are really saying we are taking traffic from off-site and bringing it through this area to go to the high school rather than directing it to the collector streets where it should be. He reiterated he needed to get this application approved.

Mr. Brown said he is not a traffic engineer but he tries to drive down Coffman Road in the morning and frankly he would rather have high school traffic on the collector roads than driving through the neighborhoods. He said there is some merit to what Mr. Ruma is saying. He said he does not totally disagree with engineering as he always sees the merit in additional connections but knows how the students drive through neighborhoods and again would rather have them on the collector streets.

Mr. Ruma said if the City fixes the Brand/Avery intersection by putting the right kind of traffic control circle there, and traffic moves constantly, there will not be students going through Belvedere.

Ms. Mitchell said the intent of this neighborhood is walkability and family orientation other than the empty nesters of that area. To that point, she said people cutting through would be more of a threat to walkability.

Mr. Ruma agreed with Ms. Mitchell's statement. He said most of the high school students probably walk or ride a bike.

Mr. Brown said they drive.

Ms. Newell said more children probably do drive because many of them go to sports activities immediately after school, and many have jobs after school. She said her two daughters lived within walking distance of the school, needed to be there at the same time but both drove separately because they needed to go separate directions after school for sports activities. She believes that happens a lot in the City of Dublin. She said she has never seen a lot of kids walking in her particular neighborhood.

Ms. Newell said there is public perception that there is a lot of cut-through traffic on Tara Hill, assuming to get from one direction to the other. She said she knows traffic studies were done on that area. She asked if other such studies have been done in other periods.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said Tara Hill is the most intense. She said through that process, a revised traffic calming program was developed that is in place now and part of that program sets out some limitations and some expectations for cut-through traffic and where there seems to be an acceptable threshold.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said a connector with three right turns to get from Avery Road to Hyland-Croy is not going to be all that attractive. She said there will be a lot of mutual benefits for neighborhood connectivity. She believes the traffic from Avery Road directly to Hyland-Croy would be low.

Ms. Newell thanked Mr. Ruma for the effort he has made. She noted the substantial changes he had made based on the Commissions comments thus far but she still has some reservations about the architectural details. She compared the text from the November proposal to today's proposal and said the vast majority of the text is the same. She indicated she went through the Architectural Standards noting the vinyl siding, roof slopes, and decorative garages. She said while the words are wonderful, the words do not provide a visual illustration of what is associated with the meaning of those texts. She said we see that so often and there have been some cases recently where it is wonderful to get this far with a development but sometimes developments do not always proceed. She said it was the architectural illustrations that provide the Commissioners with something to refer back to when property had changed hands and being developed by new applicants. She said having those illustrations added something to the property owners so they knew exactly what was expected. She said that was the one thing she had hoped she would see along with this application.

Ms. Newell asked where the pedestrian crossing is supposed to be.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said the applicant reviewed this proposed pedestrian crossing in their traffic impact study. She said the location is not tremendously obvious because there is not an immediate bike or pedestrian facility right along the eastern edge of Avery Road. She said there is a decent location down at the Memorial Drive intersection where the Muirfield path could be tied in on the east side and the existing Avery Road path on the west side to help integrate these communities.

Ms. Newell asked about that intersection and asked if there were walks on one side.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said there are not any current curb ramps and that would be part of the applicant's responsibility to actually bring the connection to Avery Road itself.

Mr. Miller asked if there was a sidewalk on Memorial Drive. Ms. Wawszkiewicz answered there was not.

Mr. Miller clarified the pedestrian would cross over to a well. Ms. Wawszkiewicz said there is a path that takes off to the north. She indicated Muirfield in general lacks the roadside pedestrian access.

Mr. Miller asked if going under Avery Road was an option.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz said there is a tunnel at the north end of the schools by Grizzell Middle School.

Mr. Miller asked if the crossing for Avery Road at Memorial Drive is located at the driving range. He said he was envisioning crossing Avery Road at St. Bridget's Church on a Sunday morning. He said he was not sure how to stop people that want to cross Avery Road.

Ms. Newell stated it is really important to have that interconnection between neighborhoods, especially with the amount of conservation land and park land that will be owned by the City, available to all residents.

Mr. Brown agreed there should be a crosswalk there but also the path that connects Albany Circle that juts out towards Avery Road; it would be nice to swing that around to the south. He said engineers always do paths rectilinear. He said people do not walk that way. He said every college campus has learned you put in a building, you let people walk, and then a path is constructed.

Ms. Newell said aluminum, vinyl, and PVC were listed in the development text for allowable trim materials. She said the Commission has asked that vinyl be removed from most of our text recently. She said she has the same concern with PVC; it can be a really good product but there are no qualifications to what the vinyl or PVC material would be. She indicated there can be a lot of very good products of PVC, and admitted it was easier to omit certain materials 20 years ago; it is harder now because there is a lot more variety of better quality materials. She said as a Commissioner making decisions, we cannot discern the quality of one material to another when there are not examples. She said there are issues with PVC being painted.

Ms. Husak confirmed what the text stated.

Ms. Newell asked if the development of the Architectural Standards be brought in at the Final Development Plan stage or if they needed to be considered in the application this evening.

Ms. Husak said she did not know how to defer that.

Jennifer Readler said if the Commission wants illustrations to be part of the text, that is what the Commission is being asked to approve right now. She explained text modifications could be made at the Final Development Plan but typically they are minor in nature. She said it was possible to make the illustrations a condition and bring in samples at City Council.

Ms. Newell said if the Commission did that, they would be asking Council to make decisions on architectural elements and design, which are really the Commission's task and responsibility. She said she would be more comfortable to see those illustrations and examples now.

Mr. Ruma said he recently remodeled his house on Cape Cod facing the northeast, subject to heavy winds, rain, snow, and salt water. He explained they had oak corner boards and but had to constantly replace them until they installed PVC. He said PVC boards are straight, strong, hold color, and are of extraordinarily good quality.

Ms. Newell admitted she replaced the wood boards on her house a lot. She restated her concern with architectural text not specifying materials and also not having those illustrations of what is intended by the text to be judged against. She said text alone only leaves it more open-ended. She said she looked at what they are giving up when not passing the zoning this evening and compared the proposal with what would be allowed under current zoning.

Mr. Ruma said it is not fair to do that.

Ms. Newell said it is fair in terms of what the criteria/standards are that the Commission is being asked to judge this project against. She said she was stating that because one of the criteria is that you are meeting or exceeding the standards for which the Commission would accept that development. She stated the only thing missing for her and her fellow Commissioners is the final development of those architectural details.

Mr. Ruma said when he reviewed the architectural standards for Belvedere, there was practically nothing; the architectural standards for Tartan West contain just a half a page and most of it was architectural diversity; the standards for Celtic Crossing, which was approved last year; and the standards of Tartan Ridge. He said when he reviews what the Commission has approved in the past, he assumed he would be in line if he did the same kind of thing. He said we did that in November and then expanded it for this meeting. He indicated he has gone well beyond what is really necessary here. He said he can understand the Commission's desire to feel comfortable. He said he is committed to adding pictures/illustrations but they would not change the words.

Ms. Newell said his commitment for the illustrations makes a difference. She said they illustrate to the Commissioners and the developers what that exact intent is, and sometimes that intent in the text is not always communicated clearly. She stated she would like to see pictures/illustrations before she cast her final vote, otherwise she is very supportive of the project. She emphasized she wanted that complete package.

Mr. Ruma asked the Commission if they were in support of him replacing the lots rather than removing them.

Ms. Newell said if she knew where they were going to go, that would potentially make a difference. She said she does not see where he is going to put them at the moment.

Mr. Ruma said there are several locations. He said he wanted to study the tree survey before he places them. He said he is certain he has more than enough space to fit three lots that will not affect tree preservation. He said more than likely, the entrance part will be diminished by 100 feet.

Ms. Newell said she would like to see the results of that. She indicated there is a little bit of give and take there between Staff's requests of eliminating the lots and Mr. Ruma's desire to keep them. She said she is not opposed to keeping the lots as long as something else is not sacrificed. She emphasized the importance of tree preservation. She asked Mr. Ruma to allow the Commission to review this further.

Mr. Brown said he is not opposed to lot replacement. He indicated he did not think the entry part was fundamental to the whole development. He said he reviewed what was planted versus what was original in the flood plain. He noted one of the pictures shown of what the site looked like initially and what it looked like 30 years later where the trees showed up. He said he hates waiting 30 years for trees that are removed to develop something and replaced to come back to that same scale. He said a phenomenal job of tree preservation was done at Wedgewood. He said there are a lot of great trees that were planted four years ago, that have matured. He indicated he would hate to see the lots cleared prior to a builder starting to develop on that lot. He said there are so many great trees on that first fairway that are mature, salvageable, and can be worked around. He indicated if he was buying a premium lot and he could buy something with mature trees, that is what he would want.

Mr. Ruma said you can well those trees as they did in Wedgewood to protect them and change grade elevations.

Mr. Brown said it is up to the builders to well them.

Mr. Ruma noted Wedgewood Hills, which is in Dublin that is phenomenal. He said it is exactly what Mr. Brown is saying; he saved 90% of those trees on those lots. He explained a house has to sit someplace. He understands if you put a foundation too close to a tree it is going to die.

Mr. Brown said the mistake that is still sticking in everyone's mind is Wellington Reserve. He said he drives by that every day and cringes. He said he hates the detention pond, the retention pond, the buffer that was cleared against the neighbors, and the mature trees that were knocked down. He said no one stood up and protected those trees.

Mr. Ruma said Wellington Reserve had a 20-foot drop from west to east and all of that water was flowing down into the backyards of those who lived on the backside of Wellington Reserve. He said that was a serious problem and the water had to be stopped. He said when you start changing grade, you start losing trees. He indicated it was a shame to lose a good sense of those trees but they are all being replaced.

Mr. Brown said 30 years from now they will look decent.

Mr. Zimmerman inquired about driveways and sidewalks as there is nothing listed as a permitted material in the architectural standards and he would like to see brick, concrete, or pavers and not the use of asphalt.

Mr. Ruma said he does not use concrete for driveways because it does nothing but go bad (flakes, cracks, stains). He said if a buyer asked for concrete however, he would give it to them. He said all the sidewalks would be concrete, brick, or pavers.

Mr. Zimmerman said he has had asphalt twice and been discouraged by it and with the house he is building right now he is using concrete. He said the cost factor right now is \$200 - \$300 a driveway; it is pretty close. He said it is hard to maintain and take care of, same as asphalt. Other members said they agreed.

Ms. Newell said she had a personal preference. She said she had an asphalt driveway that really needs to be replaced but she takes good care of it but when it becomes time, she would replace it with pavers.

Mr. Miller asked Ms. Husak to alter the colors she used on her plans as it was hard for him to distinguish certain colors. He said this is a great project. He said he was sorry he was not here in November to address some of these issues. He stated the connector is a 'got to have' for a yes vote from him. He said he thinks Mr. Ruma would agree to the connector. He said Subarea C is an opportunity to really make this project pop. He inquired about the appearance intent of the cluster/empty-nester homes. He stated that is a type of housing that is going to be of value and can really make this a special place. He said he has a hard time understanding what that is going to look like. He said if it is a bunch of ranches on a bunch of skinny lots, he would not be supportive.

Mr. Ruma said more than likely the cluster/empty-nester homes will be a story and a half.

Mr. Brown said if he could just see that, he would be a lot more comfortable. He said if Mr. Ruma can make Timble Falls Drive less of an enticement to cut through by putting those lots in some way, shape, or form, he would be very supportive of that.

Mr. Brown said he hopes Ms. Salay's comments were entered into the record and hoped they would get addressed in some way, shape, or form.

Jeff Brown said, in terms of that senior housing/empty-nester housing, the text calls for that. He said if that happens, when they do the Final Development Plan they would bring in building architecture for the Commission to review at that time.

Mr. Brown confirmed that is not a commitment to doing that.

Mr. Ruma said it is a commitment for them to come back with that product to show the Commission.

The Chair asked Mr. Ruma what he would like to do. He said he did not believe he would get the Commission's approval vote if he did not do something about pictures.

Ms. Newell restated for herself, the pictures are not completing this package for her. She commended Mr. Ruma for his time and knows he has a financial expenditure. She said she appreciates that he has been working with Staff and the community.

Mr. Brown said he has been contentious but with the effort Mr. Ruma has put forth, it is a great project. He said he believes the applicant is doing the right thing and is so close to the finish line. He said it has to be super emotional for the American Italian Golf Association. He thanked all the neighbors that have stepped up and cooperated and had all these meetings with the applicant; he said this is tremendous input and this is how this process is supposed to work.

Mr. Ruma asked if the first PZC meeting he would be eligible for would be April 9th. Ms. Husak confirmed that date but would need materials on Monday, March 30th.

Mr. Oddi said this is a tremendous financial burden for them; every day they bleed thousands of dollars. He said they were prepared for an 18 month process and now they are at 28 months. He said he understands the Commission wanting to see the pictures. He said two more weeks is not a big deal but it is. Because that two weeks turns into two more weeks after that, and they are going to lose everything they have. He said he knows there are no guarantees but is asking for respect and not anything the Commission would not give anybody else. He said it is not just the money it is who they are; every day is depleting. He said if they could return April 9th and everybody is happy, they will be happy.

Ms. Newell said if Mr. Ruma follows through with what he was going to do, and presents good quality, that would complete this package.

Ms. Mitchell agreed that was the only thing missing for her.

Mr. Ruma asked if there was some way he could submit and receive feedback before returning to the Commission. He said he will fix things and make things happen. He said the feedback is really helpful.

Mr. Ruma asked that the application be tabled until April 9, 2015.

Ms. Husak asked for clarification on a few things before moving forward:

- Return materials at corners – Ms. Husak asked if an 8-inch return was the standard desired; the text states 8 – 12 inches.

Ms. Newell said 12 inches is not a typical masonry dimension but rather 8, 16, or 24 inches. Ms. Newell said 8 inches is a little weak; she would rather see 16 inches.

Mr. Brown said he was not opposed to the latitude of 8 inches but more is better. He said sometimes there is a weird corner to be contended with.

- Two cladding styles – Ms. Husak indicated she did not get a consensus on that. She said there are colonial homes in Tartan Ridge that have siding with a brick course. She asked if that was considered two cladding materials. The answer was yes.
- Driveways – Ms. Husak confirmed the permitted materials were concrete, pavers, or brick, which can all complement each other; no black asphalt.

Mr. Brown asked for verbiage about tree protection. He said he was not certain how to define or check that but would appreciate some comfort on that.

Mr. Ruma indicated he thought he had tree protection language.

Mr. Ruma asked Ms. Husak when he would have to submit his materials that were requested this evening. She responded the materials would need to be submitted by the end of the day on Wednesday, April 1 because the materials go to the Commission for review on Friday, April 3.

Ms. Newell asked if a concession could be made for the timing of materials to arrive later than normal. She said she would be happy to have less time to review and would do her due diligence if her fellow Commissioners would support it. She said she appreciates her applicant's willingness to work with us and understands the time constraint on the owner of the property as well. She said she would be happy to make a concession on the arrival of her packets to allow the applicant more time for submission.

Ms. Husak said that could certainly be worked out.

Ms. Newell asked if it was acceptable to everyone else. The Commission agreed to the concession.

Ms. Husak asked if the waiving of the material deadline be stated as part of the motion. The Chair agreed.

Mr. Walter said he did not want to be an impediment to the timeline that is being established for material submittal. He said the things Mr. Ruma said tonight are things the neighborhoods support and would look to have codified. He said their largest concern is that the phases down the road will be developed by other developers and so while the applicant is stating wanting to well the trees, M/I Homes may not. He said he wants to see a picture this body agrees with such that future builders understand the intent of the Commission tonight. He emphasized the need from a neighborhood perspective.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell motioned, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to Table this case and additionally for the applicant waiver for the timeframe for the return of the next application so they can be heard at the next meeting on April 9, 2015. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Communications

Ms. Husak said this was Todd Zimmerman's last meeting. She said he did not want a plaque so a treat basket was presented to him from Staff. She reported Mr. Zimmerman had been on the Planning and Zoning Commission for over 10 years, appointed first in 2002. She told him how much Staff has enjoyed working with him, he has been a great mentor, and stuck it out all these years. She said he will truly be missed.

Todd Zimmerman thanked Staff; it has been a great last nine months. He said he has enjoyed working with everyone and said Victoria Newell was doing a great job as Chair. He told the new Commission members attending the APA Conference that they will find how good a staff they have.

Victoria Newell said it has been a real honor to serve with him and one of her favorite Commission members when she was on the other side of the bench because he treated applicants fairly.

Mr. Zimmerman said it is so important that everyone is comfortable on both sides.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:49 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 21, 2015.