City of Dublin

Office of the City Manager
5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090
Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

Memo

To: Members of Dublin City Council

From: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager

Date: August 10, 2015

Initiated By: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director
Devayani Puranik, Planner II

Re: Ord. 50-15 - Rezoning of approximately 49.6 acres from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae Subarea S) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the development of 45 fee simple single-family lots and 90 detached condominium units, with approximately 18 acres of open space, on the east side of Cosgray Road and the CSX railroad tracks, north of Rings Road, and west of future Churchman Road under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. And a preliminary plat for 45 fee simple single-family lots, rights-of-way, condominium and private drive reserves, and open space in accordance with Chapter 152, the Subdivision Regulations (Case #15-004Z/PDP/PP).

Summary

Ordinance 50-15 is a request for review and approval of a rezoning from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, for 49.63 acres on the east side of Cosgray Road and the CSX railroad tracks, north of Rings Road, and west of future Churchman Road. The proposal includes a preliminary plat that will create 45 single-family residential lots, reserves for detached condominium units, ten reserves of open space, access easements for private drives for condominiums, and right-of-way for Ballantrae Woods Drive.

Background

2015

On April 2, 2015, the Commission reviewed a concept plan for this project. The Commission supported the concept and provided positive feedback regarding the proposed uses and density. The Commission was concerned about the fence treatment for the property line between the proposed development and the Village of Amlin to the south, and suggested a buffer that would be visually appealing from both sides of the property line. The Commission members noted the architectural concepts presented at the informal review meeting in 2014 had better character and details. The Commission asked the applicant to reconsider the elevations to include the elements from the concepts presented at the informal review.

Additionally, the Franklin County Engineer's Office voiced their concerns about the quiet zones for the CSX railroad tracks and stated that establishing quiet zones is a multijurisdictional process and requires a long time to implement. Franklin County maintains the Rings Road railroad crossing, and is not currently in support of a quiet zone.

On May 21, 2015, the Planning and Zoning Commission tabled the case at the applicant's request after receiving Commissioner's feedback to revise the development text to include illustrative concepts to ensure the intent of the quality and unique architecture is met.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval to City Council of this application on July 9, 2015.

2014
On September 9, 2014, the Commission informally provided feedback to the applicant. Overall, the Commission was in support of and provided positive feedback with respect to use and density. Commissioners generally supported the proposed architecture, and while they did not see a need to integrate the condominiums with the single-family homes, the Commission preferred a greater degree of connectivity. Commissioners also requested a larger open space for the condominium area and emphasized the importance of screening from the railroad tracks and providing more access to the open spaces.

2001
The northern portion of the site is part of Ballantrae, Subarea S, approved in 2001 as a 70-unit condominium development with specific development standards for setbacks, landscaping, street network and architecture.

Description
Site
The 49.6 acres site is currently being farmed. The site includes a large mature tree cluster in the northern portion with other mature trees along the west property line and the railroad tracks. Landmark trees are also present on the property. Parcels to the west and south are currently in Amlin, Washington Township. The character of the area is village residential with limited commercial uses along Rings Road. CSX railroad tracks run along the west property line. These tracks are currently very active.

Surrounding Sites
All land to the east and north is zoned PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District as part of Ballantrae. Adjacent development includes the Woodlands at Ballantrae, a multiple family development. The farmland west of Cosgray Road is zoned R, Rural District. Land between the CSX railroad tracks and Cosgray Road west of the property line, and land to the south are part of Amlin, Washington Township outside of City of Dublin corporate boundary.

Preliminary Development Plan
The site is divided in three subareas. The 45 units in the north section are in single-family fee simple ownership (Subarea A) and 90 detached units are in condominium ownership (Subarea B). Subarea C, with 2.2 acres, will be dedicated for the Churchman Road right-of-way.

Access to the site is from Churchman Road at three points, one near the center of the site as a continuation of Marmion Drive in Ballantrae, a second to the north near Cosgray, and the third as a private drive at the south end of the site serving Subarea B (condominiums).

Approximately 18.2 acres of open space is within the setbacks of the adjacent roads, a wooded area in Subarea A, a central green area in Subarea B, and the buffer along the railroad tracks. A

larger portion of the site in the northwest corner is heavily wooded and is incorporated into a reserve. A stormwater retention basin is proposed at the southern tip of the site.

Preliminary Plat
The proposed preliminary plat subdivides 49.7 acres of land into 45 fee simple single-family lots (Subarea A), seven reserves for the detached condominium residential units (Subarea B), ten reserves of open space, access easements for private drives, and 2.2 acres for Churchman Road right-of-way. All streets within Subarea A are public with a typical residential section with 50-foot rights-of-way with sidewalks on each side of the street. Rights-of-way for Churchman Road and Ballantrae Woods Drive are provided.

The preliminary plat shows all required information.

Community Plan

Future Land Use
The recommended future land use for this site is Mixed Residential Medium Density, which is described as having greater walkability and pedestrian orientation at a village scale, at a density of up to 5.0 dwelling units per acre. This would permit up to 245 units for this site where 135 units are proposed at a density of 2.72 units per acre.

Southwest Area Plan
This site is within the Southwest Area Plan (Avery to Railroad Focus Area) that recommends the Village of Amlin's unique and quaint character be protected as adjacent development occurs. Future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area. Construction of the Rings Road bypass (Churchman Road) will also provide an opportunity to create clear gateway features that will further signify the special importance of the village area.

The Plan recommends establishing a roadway network that preserves existing character. The existing rural roadway network will not be sufficient to meet future needs of the area. The Plan notes that regional and local connectivity is needed to maintain Dublin's standards for quality, and considers visual character of the roadway with variable width medians, greater setbacks, landscape treatments and other techniques to maximize aesthetic benefit.

Development Details
Use
The development text provides standards, requirements and restrictions for each Subarea, but the overall proposal includes 45 fee simple single-family lots and 90 detached condominiums on 49.6 acres with a net residential density of 2.72 units per acre.

Subareas
Subarea A
This portion of the development is 23.1 acres with 45 fee-simple single-family lots in the north of the site. The development text does not require a minimum lot size or depth. The required lot width is a minimum of 60 feet at the building line. Required front and rear yard setbacks are 20 feet with a 5-foot side yard setback.

A 100-foot setback is required along Churchman Road except for Lots 1 and 3, which are at a 45-foot setback from Churchman Road.

Subarea B
This subarea is 24.3 acres with 90 detached condominiums units in the south portion of the site. The front yard setback is 14 feet from the sidewalk or from the back of curb if there is no sidewalk. A minimum of 12 feet is required between homes and 45 feet between the backs of homes, exclusive of patios. Sides of homes adjacent to the rear of a home are required to be 25 feet.

The text requires a 100-foot setback along the railroad tracks, with the exception of condominium lots 65 and 73 that are permitted a setback of 70 feet due to property boundary irregularities. Condominiums adjacent to single-family homes and condominiums along the south boundary must maintain a 25-foot setback, while patios are required to maintain a minimum of 10 feet from single-family homes and the southern property line.

Subarea C
Subarea C is 2.2 acres provided for right-of-way for Churchman Road. A 100-foot setback is required along Churchman Road.

Traffic Impact Study and Access

The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) as required for a rezoning application. Churchman Road along the eastern property line will connect to Cosgray Road to the north and Rings Road to the south, with roundabouts at the Rings Road and the Cosgray Road intersections as future phases.

All three entrances include left turn lanes with the construction of Churchman Road. The north half of Churchman Road between Cosgray Road and Marmion Road is expected to be constructed first, followed closely by the south half, which includes a roundabout at the intersection of Rings Road. A roundabout at the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is not yet in the City's CIP, and may not be needed for several years; however, necessary right-of-way will be dedicated by the applicant.

Infrastructure improvements, including a southbound left turn lane from Cosgray Road to Churchman Road, and a contribution to the intersection of Rings Road and Eiterman Road will be required. Details will be finalized with the final development plan or in a separate infrastructure agreement.

Tree Preservation

Trees in good condition within the reserve will be preserved. Additional trees will be preserved and added within the buffer areas as required by the Code. The Tree Survey has been updated to reflect the changes due to Churchman Road right-of-way.

The proposal includes the preservation of two landmark trees -- a 56-inch Silver Maple and a 62-inch Red Oak near the southern border with Amlin, between Units 78 and 79 in Subarea B. These trees are included in the open space reserve for the future maintenance requirements.

Architecture and Building Materials

Subarea A
The development text includes character descriptions indicating homes will follow the "Traditional" vocabulary. This provides for visual consistency by use of natural tone colors, materials, and traditional design elements. These design elements will also help to tie the Subarea A with Subarea B while maintaining their separate identity.

Permitted cladding materials are vertical or horizontal fiber cement siding, cultured stone, and board and batten siding. Cultured stone when used as a cladding material must encompass the entire design element. Cultured stone is required from grade to minimum 24 inches along all sides. A specific natural tone color palette is used for the homes in Subarea A.

All homes have minimum two-car garages. All garages are set two feet behind the front façade. A front load garage has a minimum driveway length of 19 feet, exclusive of sidewalks. No more than two garage doors are located on the same plane. Garage doors have options for either decorative elements above or decorative brackets or transoms. The garage door color will complement the main structure.

The proposed standard for the garage door opening for front facades is maximum 45% for a two-car garage and a maximum of 50% for a three-car garage. The Appearance Standards of the Zoning Code limit the percentage for garage door openings of more than 18 feet to 36 feet to 45%. Planning previously recommended the garage door openings meet the Appearance Standards. However, the Planning and Zoning Commission agreed with the applicant's proposed deviation from the Appearance Standards where the third car garage has an additional setback.

The text provides details regarding permitted window and doors, roof materials, other special elements like dormers, chimneys, trim, fascia and soffits as well as an architectural diversity matrix.

Subarea B
The architectural vocabulary for the "Cottages" in Subarea B is from the Central Ohio farmhouses, a style known as "Carpenter Gothic." The character of Subarea B varies from single story to a maximum of one and a half stories in height.

The material palette is consistent with the Subarea A and includes fiber cement siding and boards and batten siding. Cultured stone is required along all sides for up to 18 inches from grade. A specific shade of white will be used for all the cottages to provide backdrop for the landscaping colors.

Outdoor amenities such as patios are permitted. The patios may not be greater than the width of the home and are limited to 15 feet deep. Building elements and/or other types of screening such as solid fencing will be used for the privacy between outdoor amenity areas. Screening details will be finalized with the final development plan.

The text addresses permitted building materials that maintain a high quality consistent with Subarea A, specifically dimensional shingles, window and shutter detailing, and porch/stoop standards. Decorative garage door elements including windows, panels, and hardware will be used.

Open Space and Landscaping

Approximately 18.2 acres of open space are created with 11.2 acres dedicated to the City and seven acres maintained by the development associations.

Reserves Owned and Maintained by Dublin
Reserve 'B' is 4.5 acres in Subarea A and has existing mature tree cover and paths.

Reserves 'C' and 'P' have a total of four acres in in the setback from the railroad. These will have combination of mounds, trees, and fence to buffer and screen from railroad tracks. A shared-use path provides north-south connectivity. These reserves will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin to ensure public safety and allowing public use of the shared-use paths.

Reserve 'F' includes a stormwater detention area.

Reserves Owned and Maintained by HOAs
Reserves 'D' – 'E' are 7.5 acres, including the Churchman Road setback at the front of the site. The entry feature designs and open space frontage along Churchman Road will be similar in character to the adjacent Ballantrae development. Large vertical stone slabs will be incorporated at entries along Churchman Road and augmented with trees and landscaping. The rock/rubble wall sections with informal character, similar to others in Ballantrae, will be installed for the Churchman Road frontage.

Reserve 'L' is a .5 acre central green in Subarea B intended as a passive recreational space.

The final development plan will have detailed landscaping plans for the Churchman Road setback and entry features, Amlin buffer, railroad tracks buffer, and Cosgray Road setback. These areas will have a combination of mounds, trees, fences, dry stacked stone walls, and other features. A no-mow area is proposed along the railroad track buffer.

Screening and landscaping is provided between single-family homes and detached condominium units. The landscaping is also provided for the back-to-back detached condominium units to augment the outdoor amenity area screening. Landscaping and screening is provided where rear yards of the detached condominium units are visible from the drives.

Utilities

Sanitary Sewer
This site proposes that public sanitary sewer main be installed with this development to serve the residential units. This network of sewer will ultimately connect into an eight-inch sanitary sewer main located near Marmion Drive.

Water
Access to public water will be provided by connecting to two eight-inch water mains that will be constructed with the Churchman Road improvements. New public water main and fire hydrants are proposed to be installed to serve the single-family section of the development. The condominiums will have access to public water through a master metered private water and fire protection system.

Stormwater Management
Stormwater management is provided by creating a retention basin located at the southeast portion of the site ('Reserve F'). In addition, public storm sewer is proposed along with storm structures placed at appropriate intervals throughout the development.

Recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning/preliminary development plan to City Council on July 9, 2015 with the conditions listed below.

The applicant has addressed the conditions requiring site plan and development text updates (Conditions 2, 5 – 8), a revision to the TIS was submitted addressing Condition 3 (Franklin County Engineer's office has accepted the TIS as well), and Conditions 4 and 9 will be addressed either as part of the final development plan and/or a separate Infrastructure Agreement.

Planning and Zoning Commission Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Conditions
1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan.
2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association.
3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing.
4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
5) That the sidewalk connection adjacent to unit 82 is eliminated and reflected in the plans prior to Council review.
6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northernmost site intersection.
7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text.
8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B.
9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

The Planning and Zoning Commission also recommended approval of the preliminary plat to City Council on July 9, 2015 with the condition listed below, which has been addressed in the submission to City Council.

Preliminary Plat Condition

1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat, are made prior to City Council submittal.

Recommendation

Planning recommends City Council approval of Ordinance 50-15 at the second reading/public hearing on September 8, 2015.

Planning also recommends City Council approval of the Preliminary Plat.

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc. Form No. 30043

Ordinance No. 50-15 *Passed* _____, 20____

AN ORDINANCE REZONING APPROXIMATELY 49.6 ACRES FROM R, RURAL DISTRICT AND PLR, PLANNED LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (BALLANTRAE SUBAREA S) TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 45 FEE SIMPLE SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AND 90 DETACHED CONDOMINIUM UNITS, WITH APPROXIMATELY 18 ACRES OF OPEN SPACE, ON THE EAST SIDE OF COSGRAY ROAD AND THE CSX RAILROAD TRACKS, NORTH OF RINGS ROAD, AND WEST OF FUTURE CHURCHMAN ROAD UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF ZONING CODE SECTION 153.050; AND A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR 45 FEE SIMPLE SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, CONDOMINIUM AND PRIVATE DRIVE RESERVES, AND OPEN SPACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHAPTER 152, THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (CASE NO. 15-004Z/PDP/PP).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, _____ of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. The following described real estate, (see attached legal description, Exhibit A), situated in the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, is hereby rezoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and shall be subject to regulations and procedures contained in Ordinance No. 21-70 (Chapter 153 of the Codified Ordinances), the City of Dublin Zoning Code and amendments thereto.

Section 2. The application, including the list of contiguous and affected property owners, and the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, are all incorporated into and made an official part of this Ordinance and said real estate shall be developed and used in accordance there within.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this _____ day of _____, 2015.

_____
Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk of Council



City of Dublin

15-004PDP/Z/PP
Preliminary Development Plan/ Rezoning/Preliminary Plat
Ballantrae Woods
Cosgray Road

0 250 500
Feet

N

CITY OF DUBLIN.
Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION APPLICATION

(Code Section 153.232)

I. PLEASE CHECK THE TYPE OF APPLICATION:

- ☐ Informal Review
- ☐ Concept Plan (Section 153.056(A)(1))
- ☒ Preliminary Development Plan / Rezoning (Section 153.053)
- ☐ Final Development Plan (Section 153.053(E))
- ☐ Amended Final Development Plan (Section 153.053(E))
- ☐ Standard District Rezoning (Section 153.018)
- ☐ Preliminary Plat (Section 152.015)
- ☐ Final Plat (Section 152.085)
- ☐ Conditional Use (Section 153.236)
- ☐ Corridor Development District (CDD) (Section 153.115)
- ☐ Corridor Development District (CDD) Sign (Section 153.115)
- ☐ Minor Subdivision
- ☐ Right-of-Way Encroachment
- ☐ Other (Please Specify): _____

Please utilize the applicable *Supplemental Application Requirements* sheet for additional submittal requirements that will need to accompany this application form.

II. PROPERTY INFORMATION: This section must be completed.

Property Address(es): Cosgray Road	
Tax ID/Parcel Number(s): 274-000305 / 000342 272-000100 / 000113 / 000063 / 000208 / 000131	Parcel Size(s) (Acres): 51.05± acres
Existing Land Use/Development: Agricultural Uses	

IF APPLICABLE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:	
Proposed Land Use/Development: Single family and condominium residential development	
Total acres affected by application: 51.05 acres	

III. CURRENT PROPERTY OWNER(S): Please attach additional sheets if needed.

Name (Individual or Organization): See attached sheet	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code)	
Daytime Telephone:	Fax:
Email or Alternate Contact Information:	

Property Owners

William Darling
212 Oak Court
Westerville, OH 43081

Jay Liggett, Trustee
6315 Meaghan Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

David Patch, Jr.
P.O. Box 156
Amlin, OH 43002

Valerie N. Finch
5000 Scioto Darby Road
Hilliard, OH 43026

Edwards Golf Communities LLC
500 South Front Street, Suite 770
Columbus, OH 43215

schott-liggett-dublin-po1.lst (nct)
12/9/14 S:Docs

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Schottenstein Homes	Applicant is also property owner: yes ☐ no ☒
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, OH 43230	
Daytime Telephone: 478-1100	Fax: 478-3188
Email or Alternate Contact Information: Paul Coppel - pc@schottensteinhomes.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable

Name: Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel - c/o Smith & Hale LLC	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 37 West Broad Street, Suite 460, Columbus, OH 43215	
Daytime Telephone: 221-4255	Fax: 221-4409
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jreynolds@smithandhale.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I EDWARDS GOLF COMMUNITIES LLC, the owner, hereby authorize Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner: Chris Driscoll V-PRES	Date: 12/10/14

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this 10th day of December, 20 14

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public [signature]

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

Holly K. DeJordy
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 07-10-2018

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are necessary to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative: Jackson B. Reynolds III	Date: 12/10/14

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Schottenstein Homes	Applicant is also property owner: yes ☐ no ☒
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, OH 43230	
Daytime Telephone: 478-1100	Fax: 478-3188
Email or Alternate Contact Information: Paul Coppel - pc@schottensteinhomes.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel - c/o Smith & Hale LLC	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 37 West Broad Street, Suite 460, Columbus, OH 43215	
Daytime Telephone: 221-4255	Fax: 221-4409
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jreynolds@smithandhale.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I Jay W. Liggett, Tr., the owner, hereby authorize Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner: Jay W. Liggett TR	Date: 12.15.14

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this 15TH day of DECEMBER, 20 14

State of OHIO

County of FRANKLIN

Notary Public

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF OHIO

JOSEPH E. BUDDE
Notary Public-State of Ohio
Attorney-at-Law,Lifetime Commission

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative: Jackson B. Reynolds III	Date: 12/10/14

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Schottenstein Homes	Applicant is also property owner: yes ☐ no ☒
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, OH 43230	
Daytime Telephone: 478-1100	Fax: 478-3188
Email or Alternate Contact Information: Paul Coppel - pc@schottensteinhomes.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel - c/o Smith & Hale LLC	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 37 West Broad Street, Suite 460, Columbus, OH 43215	
Daytime Telephone: 221-4255	Fax: 221-4409
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jreynolds@smithandhale.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I David W Patch Jr, the owner, hereby authorize Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner: David W. Patch Jr. Date: 12-10-14

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this 10 day of Dec, 20 14

State of Ohio

County of Franklin Notary Public Marilyn

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

Marilyn Geiger
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 07-19-2017

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative: Jackson B. Reynolds III Date: 12/10/14

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Schottenstein Homes	Applicant is also property owner: yes ☐ no ☒
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, OH 43230	
Daytime Telephone: 478-1100	Fax: 478-3188
Email or Alternate Contact Information: Paul Coppel - pc@schottensteinhomes.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel - c/o Smith & Hale LLC	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 37 West Broad Street, Suite 460, Columbus, OH 43215	
Daytime Telephone: 221-4255	Fax: 221-4409
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jreynolds@smithandhale.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I WILLIAM S DARLING, the owner, hereby authorize Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner: William S Darling	Date: 12/15/2014

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this 15th day of December, 20 14

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public Benjamin S Cowell

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF OHIO

BENJAMIN S. COWELL
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Comm. Expires 12-15-20

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative: Jackson B. Reynolds III	Date: 12/10/14

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Schottenstein Homes	Applicant is also property owner: yes ☐ no ☒
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, OH 43230	
Daytime Telephone: 478-1100	Fax: 478-3188
Email or Alternate Contact Information: Paul Coppel - pc@schottensteinhomes.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel - c/o Smith & Hale LLC	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.):	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 37 West Broad Street, Suite 460, Columbus, OH 43215	
Daytime Telephone: 221-4255	Fax: 221-4409
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jreynolds@smithandhale.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I Valerie N Finck, the owner, hereby authorize Jack Reynolds / Paul Coppel to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner: Valerie N Finck	Date: 12/15/14

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this 15 day of Dec., 20 2014

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF OHIO

ANTHONY GROSSI
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Comm. Expires Dec. 10, 2018

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative: Jackson B. Reynolds III	Date: 12/10/14

VIII. UTILITY DISCLAIMER: The Owner/Applicant acknowledges the approval of this request for review by the Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission and/or Dublin City Council does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, acknowledge that approval of this request does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: 12/10/14

IX. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT: This section must be completed and notarized.

I Jack Reynolds, the owner or authorized representative, have read and understand the contents of this application. The information contained in this application, attached exhibits and other information submitted is complete and in all respects true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: 12/11/14

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of December, 20 14

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

Natalie C. Timmons
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 09-04-2015

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
Amount Received:	Application No:	P&Z Date(s):	P&Z Action:
Receipt No:	Map Zone:	Date Received:	Received By:
City Council (First Reading):		City Council (Second Reading):	
City Council Action:		Ordinance Number:	
Type of Request:			
N, S, E, W (Circle) Side of:			
N, S, E, W (Circle) Side of Nearest Intersection:			
Distance from Nearest Intersection:			
Existing Zoning District:		Requested Zoning District:	

QUIT CLAIM DEED, Short Form, Statutory Form No. 27-S (Reprinted 3/86) Registered in U.S. Patent and Trademark Office anderson publishing co. cincinnati, ohio 45201

QUIT-CLAIM DEED *

116378

EMMA K. PATCH, WIDOW, (1), of Franklin County,

for valuable consideration paid, grants(s) to DAVID W. PATCH, JR.

, whose tax-mailing address is

MAIL 6940 Rings Rd., Amlin, Ohio 43002

the following **REAL PROPERTY:** Situated in the County of Franklin in the State of Ohio and in the of : (2)

See Exhibit"A" hereto attached and made a part hereof.

TIME 9:52 A M
RECORDED FRANKLIN CO. OHIO
AUG 24 1987
JOSEPH W. TESTA, RECORDER
RECORDER'S FEE $ 10.00

Prior Instrument Reference: Vol. 00014 Page A08 of the ~~Deed~~ Official Records of Franklin County, Ohio. (3) ~~wife (husband) of the Grantor releases all rights of dower therein.~~ Witness my hand(s) this 23rd day of August, 1987.

Signed and acknowledged in the presence of:

Rosemarie R. Menapace
WITNESS

Emma K Patch (4)
Emma K. Patch

Reno J. Menapace
WITNESS

State of Ohio County of Franklin ss.

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on this 23rd day of August, 19 87, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public in and for said county, personally come, EMMA K. PATCH the Grantor(s) in the foregoing Deed, and acknowledged the signing thereof to be her voluntary act and deed.

IN TESTIMONY THEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal on this day and year aforesaid.

Reno J. Menapace

RENO J. MENAPACE, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
NOTARY PUBLIC, — STATE OF OHIO
My commission has no expiration date.
Sec. 147.03 R.C.

This instrument was prepared by Reno J. Menapace, Attorney at Law, 1375 London Dr., Columbus, Ohio 43221

1. Name of Grantor(s) and marital status.
2. Description of land or interest therein, and encumbrances, reservations, exceptions, taxes and assessments, if any.
3. Delete whichever does not apply.
4. Execution in accordance with Chapter 5301 of the Revised Code of Ohio.

Auditor's and Recorder's Stamps 17431

CONVEYANCE TAX
$5.00 JDP
PALMER C McNEAL
FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR

TRANSFERRED
AUG 24 1987
PALMER C. McNEAL
AUDITOR
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

* See Section 5302.11 Ohio Revised Code

1029 A 12

Emma K. Patch, widow, to David W. Patch, Jr.

EXHIBIT "A"

Being an undivided one-half (½) interest in and to the following described real estate:

Situated in the Village of Amlin, County of Franklin and State of Ohio

Being Lots Numbers Two (2) and Nine (9) and Ten (10) in Ida N. Cramer and others' Amended Plat and addition to the said Village of Amlin, Franklin County, Ohio as per recorded plat thereof, of record in the Recorder's Office Franklin County, Ohio, in Plat Book 8, page 12A.

Also the following described real estate situate in the County of Franklin, in the State of Ohio and in the Township of Washington and bounded and described as follows:

Being part of Survey #6953, beginning in the center of the Dublin and Union County Free Turnpike at John Shire's S.E. corner; thence east in the center of said Pike eleven (11) feet; thence north one hundred and fifty (15) feet; thence west one hundred and eight (108) feet; thence S.E. with John Shire's E. line to the place of beginning containing thirty-three (33) rods of land, more or less and being part of the same tract conveyed to Joshua P. Kreiszell by Henry Hensil and wife, by deed dated April 1, 1880, recorded in Volume 145, pages 176 and 177, Deed Records of Franklin County, Ohio and designated as Lot No. 2 in subdivision of lots.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Being a portion of Lot Number Two (2) of Ida M. Cramer's and Others Amended Plat and addition to the Village of Amlin as said lot is numbered and delineated upon the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book 8, page 12-A Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio, and bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the south line of the 15-foot wide alley north of Rings Road (Main Street) at the northeast corner of Lot Number One (1) of said Amended Plat and Addition and at the northwest corner of said Lot No 2; thence N 83° 21' E. along the south line of said alley and along a portion of the north line of said Lot No. 2 a distance of 15.17 feet to a point; thence S 30° 40' E through a portion of said Lot No. 2 a distance of 156.00 feet to a point at the intersection of the north right-of-way line of Rings Road (Main Street) (60 feet wide) with an east line of said Lot No. 1 and a west line of said Lot No. 2; thence N 39° 47' W along a portion of an east line of said Lot No. 1 and along a portion of a west line of said Lot No. 2 a distance of 143.90 feet to a corner of said Lot No. 1 and said Lot No. 2; thence N 6° 39' W along an east line of said Lot No. 1 and along a west line of said Lot No. 2 a distance of 22.00 feet to the place of beginning; containing 0.045acre of land more or less and being subject to all easements and restrictions of record.

8-24-87

N-87
ALL OF
114 & 113
WASH. HILLIARD S.D.

Instr:200004120071171 04/12/2000
Pages:2 Fee:$14.00 12:46PM
Richard B. Metcalf T20000047513
Franklin County Recorder MLCHRISTOP

QUIT-CLAIM DEED

JACK E. FINCH**, Married to Valerie N. Finch*, of Franklin County, Ohio, for valuable consideration paid, grants to ***VALERIE N. FINCH, whose tax-mailing address is 5000 Scioto Darby Road Hilliard, Ohio 43026, the following **REAL PROPERTY**: Situated in the County of Franklin, in the State of Ohio, in the Township of Washington and in the Village of Amlin:

See the attached "Exhibit A"

Parcel No. 272-000063-00 & 272-000208-00
Commonly Known As: 6960 Rings Road

Prior Instrument Reference: Vol. 11847, Page J09 of the Deed Records of Franklin County, Ohio. Witness my hand this 6th day of April, 2000.

Signed and acknowledged in the presence of:

Christopher J. Geer

Kellie S. Kesselring

Jack E. Finch

State of Ohio
County of Franklin ss:

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on this 6th day of April, 2000, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public in and for said county, personally came, ***JACK E. FINCH***, the Grantor in the foregoing Deed, and acknowledged the signing thereof to be his voluntary act and deed.

IN TESTIMONY THEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal on this day and year aforesaid.

Notary Public

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

CHRISTOPHER J. GEER, Attorney at Law
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF OHIO
My commission has no expiration date.
Section 147.03 R.C.

This Instrument prepared by:

CHRISTOPHER J. GEER SC#0012371
Attorney at Law
MATAN, GEER & WRIGHT
261 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 228-2678

TRANSFERRED
APR 12 2000
JOSEPH W. TESTA
AUDITOR
FRANKLIN COUNTY

903525
CONVEYANCE TAX
EXEMPT
D.M.
JOSEPH W. TESTA
FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR

11847J10

EXHIBIT A

Situatedin the County of Franklin, State of Ohio, and in the Township of Washington and Village of Amlin:

Being Lot No. 3, the west half of Lot No. 4, Lot No. 11, Lot No. 12, and Lot No. 13 of Ida M. Crane and others' amended plat and addition to the Village of Amlin, Franklin County, Ohio as the same are numbered and delineated upon the recorded plat thereof of record in Plat Book 8, page 12A, Recorders Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

N-87
ALL OF
62
63
208
WASH TWP.
SC. DAR. SD.
BM
6/30/88

N-87
AW OF
208
63
(272)

Description Verified
John Circle, P.E., P.S.
Franklin County Engineer
Date 9-12-00

Instr:200101260016924 01/26/2001
Pages:6 Fee:$30.00 1:15PM
Robert G. Montgomery T20010011412
Franklin County Recorder MLALLEN YU

ntc

Quit Claim Deed - Ohio
Statutory Form

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS

THAT

JAY W. LIGGETT aka JAY WILLIAM LIGGETT and
MARGARETT JO LIGGETT, His Wife,

of Franklin County, State of Ohio, for valuable consideration paid, grants

to

JAY W. LIGGETT, TRUSTEE OF THE JAY W. LIGGETT TRUST
DATED THE 5th DAY OF January, 2001.

whose tax mailing address is

5800 Cosgray Road, Dublin, OH 43016-8735

the following real property:

TRACT I:

Situated in the County of Franklin, in the State of Ohio and in the Township of Washington, and bounded and described as follows:

Being Lot Number Six (6) as set off and assigned to Elizabeth Hoskinson in the case of Flora A. Marshall vs. Joseph Cosgray, et al., No. 91768 in the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County, Ohio, being Lot No. 2 of the subdivision of the Homestead of Joseph Cosgray, deceased, bounded and described as follows:

Being a part of Survey No. 6953 Virginia Military Lands, beginning at a limestone in the center of the Dublin and Union County Free Turnpike, North West corner of Lot No. 1 of the subdivision of the old homestead of the said Joseph Cosgray; thence with said pike North 6° 45′ W. 663.60 ft. to a limestone in the Southeast corner of Lot 3 of said subdivision; thence with the South line of said Lot No. 3 South 80° 37′ W. 2331.78 feet to a stake in the west line of said homestead, being the south west corner of Lot No. 3; thence with the west line of said land S. 00° 40′ East 663.61 feet to a stake in the north west corner of said Lot No. 1; thence with the north line of Lot No. 1, N. 80° 37′ E. 2332.77 ft. to the place of beginning, and **containing "33.6 acres" except 1.43 acres** sold by George Cosgray to the Toledo & Ohio Central Railroad Company for a right of way by deed dated April 7, 1893, and recorded in Recorder's Office of Franklin County, Ohio, in D. B. 245, page 587, and **except 4.07 acres** sold by William H. Graham, executor of the estate of George Cosgray, deceased to Martha J. Geary, by deed dated December 17th, 1909, and recorded in the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio, in D. B. 497, page 60, and **leaving in said Parcel No. 6, 28.10 acres,** more or less. 0-110-A

Parcel No. 272-000174-00

All of (272) 174

TRACT II:

Being a tract of land situated in the township, county and state aforesaid and being a part of Survey No. 6953 V.M. Land and a part of Lot No. 2, assigned to George Cosgray, Sr., in the subdivision of the Homestead of Joseph Cosgray, deceased.

Beginning at the S.W. corner of Lot No. 3 of said subdivision; thence East to the right-of-way of the Toledo & Ohio Central Rail Road Company; thence with the west line of said right-of-way South about 26 rods to an angle in said right-of-way; thence East with said right-of-way about 17 feet; thence South with the same right-

900888

CONVEYANCE TAX
EXEMPT
1
JOSEPH W. TESTA
FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR

TRANSFERRED
JAN 26 2001
JOSEPH W. TESTA
AUDITOR
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

of-way to the North line of Lot No. 1 in the aforesaid subdivision of the Homestead of Joseph Cosgray, deceased; thence West with said North line of Lot No. 1 to the East line of John Eversole's land; thence with said line North to the beginning, **containing 4 1/15 acres of land,** more or less, and are the same premises that William M. Graham, as Executor of the estate of George Cosgray, Sr., deceased, conveyed to Martha Geary by Deed dated December 17th, 1909.

Parcel No. 272-000103-00

O-110-A All of (272) 103

TRACT III:

Situated in the County of Franklin, State of Ohio and Township of Washington:

Being a part of Survey No. 6953 V.M. Land; beginning at a boulder stone in the S.E. corner of the Home Farm of Joseph Cosgray, deceased, and sub-divided among the heirs of said Joseph Cosgray, deceased, and in the center of the Dublin and Union County Free Pike; thence with the center of said Pike N. 6° 45′ W. 38.04 poles to a limestone in said pike the S.E. corner to Lot No. 2 of said sub-division; thence with the south line of said Lot No. 2 S. 82° 37′ W. 141.38 poles to a stake in the West line of said farm; thence with the West line thereof S. 6° 40′ E. 38.04 poles to a boulder stone in the southwest corner of said Joseph Cosgray land and the N.W. corner of John Cramer land; thence with the North line of said Cramer land N. 82° 37′ East 141.44 poles to the beginning, **containing Thirty-three and 6/10 acres of land** and being the south part of a tract of 98¼ acres of land conveyed to Joseph Cosgray by William L. Carey and others by deed dated June 10, 1837.

Always excepting and reserving from the foregoing description all that part heretofore conveyed as a right-of-way to the Toledo & Ohio Central Rail Road Company. Leaving **32.44 acres.**

Parcel No. 272-000104-00 **For description see Exhibit A attached.**

O-110-A All of (272) 104

ALSO

Real estate situated in the County of Franklin, in the State of Ohio, and in the Village of Amlin and in the Township of Washington and bounded and described as follows:

BEING Lots Nos. 7 and 8 of Ida M. Cramer and others amended plat and addition to the Village of Amlin, Franklin County, Ohio, as per the recorded plat thereof of record in the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

LDR: 24305J20

Parcel No. 272-000-100-00

N-87 All of (272) 100

ALSO

Situated in Franklin County, State of Ohio, Village of Amlin, Township of Washington and being Lot Number Fourteen (14) of IDA M. CRAMER, et al. Amended Plat and Subdivision of lands in said Village of Amlin, as the same is numbered and delineated upon the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book 8, Page 12A, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

N-87 All of (272) 131

LDR: Volume 2547, Page 303

Parcel No. 272-000-131-00

ALSO

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, Virginia Military Survey Number 6953, being part of Parcel 4 of that tract of land conveyed to Shookuh B. Koozekananai, by deed of record in Deed Book 3650, Page 765, (all reference being to

the records of the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio) and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at an iron pin set the northwesterly corner of Lot 2 of the subdivision entitled "Wilbur I. and Emma Cramer's First Addition to the Village of Amlin" of record in Plat Book 10, Page 98.

thence North 06° 35′ 25" West, with the easterly line of that tract conveyed to Jay W. Liggett by deed of record in Deed Book 2547, Page 303, a distance of 510.62 feet to an iron pin set;

thence South 47° 50′ 47" East, crossing said Parcel 4, a distance of 535.56 feet to an iron pin set in a westerly line of that tract conveyed to Ned E. Lare by deed of record in Deed Book 3798, Page 456;

thence South 06° 34′ 07" East, with said westerly line a distance of 111.22 feet to P.K. Nail found at the northeasterly corner of Lot 12 of said subdivision;

thence South 83° 33′ 53" West, with the northerly line of said subdivision, a distance of 353.13 feet to the True Point of Beginning, **containing 2.521 acres of land,** more or less.

Subject, however, to all legal rights-of-ways and/or easements, if any, of previous record.

Bearings for this description are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as per NAD 83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of F.C.G.S. Monument Numbers 5536 and 7752, establishing a bearing of South 85° 44′ 20" East between said Monuments.

EVANS, MECHWART, HAMBLETON & TILTON, INC. by Matthew A. Kirk, Registered Surveyor No. 7865, June, 2000.

LDR:

Parcel No. 273-010-477

All of (274) 330

ALSO

Real Estate situated in the County of Franklin, in the State of Ohio, and in the Township of Washington and bounded and described as follows:

Being part of Survey No. 6953, Virginia Military Lands and being Parcel 1, Parcel 2, Part of Parcel 3 and Parcel 4, as described in an Affidavit for Transfer in the Auditor's Affidavit Book 18, page 175, Auditor's Office, Franklin County, Ohio and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a railroad spike set in the top of a post in the northerly line of an alley 15 ft. in width, shown on Ida M. Cramer's et al Amended Plat and Addition to the Village of Amlin, of record in Plat Book 8, page 12-A, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio, said alley being the first alley Northerly from Rings Road, said place of beginning also being the Southeasterly corner of the above mentioned Parcel No. 4; thence from said place of beginning, S. 83° 21′ W. and along the northerly line of said alley 15 ft. in width, the southerly line of Parcel No. 4, a distance of 373.27 ft. to an iron pin at the intersection of the northerly line of said 15 ft. alley and the easterly line of First Avenue, 40 ft. in width, as shown on Ida M. Cramer, et al Amended Plat and Addition to the Village of Amlin; thence N. 6° 39′ W. and along the easterly line of First Avenue, 40 ft. in width, the westerly line of Parcel No. 4, a distance of 190.00 ft. to an iron pin in the northerly line of Cramer Street, 40 ft. in width; thence S. 83° 21′ W. and along the northerly line of Cramer Street, 40 ft. in width, the southerly line of Parcel No. 4, Parcel No. 1 and Parcel No. 3 a distance of 568.73 ft. to an iron pin at the southeasterly corner of a 0.07 Acre Tract described in Deed Book 1356, page 315 and in the name of the Toledo and Ohio Central Railroad Company, said iron pin being Easterly a distance of 63.0 ft. from the center line of the Toledo and Ohio Central Railroad; thence N. 30° 47′ W. and along the easterly line of the said 0.07 Acre Tract and passing an iron pin on line at 99.19 ft., a distance of 100.00 ft. to a point

at the northeasterly corner of said 0.07 Acre Tract; thence S. 83° 21′ W. and parallel to the northerly line of Cramer Street and along the northerly line of the said 0.07 Acre Tract a distance of 35.82 ft. to a point, said point being witnessed by an iron pin 0.81 ft. South, said point also being 33 ft. Easterly from the center line of the Toledo and Ohio Central Railroad; thence N. 39° 47′ W. and along the westerly line of Parcel No. 3 and the westerly line of Parcel No. 2 and along the easterly right-of-way line of the Toledo and Ohio Central Railway and 33 ft. Easterly from the center line, a distance of 1167.82 ft. to an iron pin at the northwesterly corner of Parcel No. 2; thence N. 84° 25′ 43" E., and along the northerly line of Parcel No. 2, a distance of 1659.72 ft. to a spike in the top of a post at the northeasterly corner of Parcel No. 2; thence S. 7° 11′ E. and along the easterly line of Parcel No. 2 and Parcel No. 4, a distance of 1220.48 ft. to the place of beginning, **containing 33.073 acres;** subject to all easements and restrictions shown of record.

The above described property is the same property as described as Parcels 1, 2, 3 and 4 containing .85 acre, 25 acres, 3.71 acres, and 5.85 acres shown in the Certificate of Transfer from Margaret Finch, deceased, recorded in Deed Book 1622, page 194, excepting therefrom a tract of 0.07 acre conveyed by Effie R. Finch, Elsie E. Temple and others to The Toledo and Ohio Central Railway Company, recorded in Deed Book 1356, page 315.

The description shown in this deed was prepared by The Jennings-Lawrence Company, civil engineers, on February 7, 1963.

LDR: Volume 2547, Page 303

Parcel No. 273-010-326

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE FOLLOWING:

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, Virginia Military Survey Number 6953, being part of that tract of land conveyed to Jay W. Liggett, by deed of record in Deed Book 2547, Page 303, (all reference being to the records of the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio) and more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning, for reference, at the northwesterly corner of Lot 2 of the subdivision entitled "Wilbur I. and Emma Cramer's First Addition to the Village of Amlin" of record in Plat Book 10, Page 98.

thence North 06° 35′ 25" West, with the easterly line of said Liggett tract, a distance of 510.62 feet to an iron pin set at the True Point of Beginning for this description;

thence North 47° 50′ 47" West, crossing said Liggett tract, a distance of 762.75 feet to an iron pin set in the southerly line of that tract conveyed to Richard O. Wiseman by deed of record in Official Record 13280E08;

thence North 84° 49′ 24" East, with said southerly line, a distance of 503.13 feet to an iron pin set in the westerly line of Parcel 4 of that tract conveyed to Shookuh B. Koozekananai by deed of record in Deed Book 3650, Page 765;

thence South 06° 35′ 25" East, with said westerly line a distance of 561.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning, **containing 3.239 acres of land,** more or less.

Subject, however, to all legal rights-of-ways and/or easements, if any, of previous record.

Bearings for this description are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as per NAD 83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of F.C.G.S. Monument Numbers 5536 and 7752, establishing a bearing of South 85° 44′ 20" East between said Monuments.

Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc., by Matthew A. Kirk, Registered Surveyor No. 7865, June, 2000.

Leaving after said exception 29.834 acres, more or less.

Description Verified
Dean Ringle, P.E., P.S.
Franklin County Engineer
Date: 01/26/01

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
FRANKLIN COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPT.
DATE 1/19/2001 BY BWM
7735 7606

Pending legible description of [illegible] described in DB 245 PG. 587

EXHIBIT A

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM:

Real estate situated in Washington Township, Franklin County, Ohio and described as follows, to wit:

Being a strip of land 100 feet wide and 395 feet long and a strip of land 66 feet wide and 346 feet long in the lands in Survey 6953 Virginia Military Lands conveyed to Geo. Cosgray by deed dated 9 May, 1888, recorded in Vol. 196, page 1, Deed Records of Franklin County, Ohio. Said first mentioned strip being bounded on the east and south by said 66 foot strip on the south and west by a line 33 feet from and parallel with the center line of said railroad on the west and north by Barnet J. Cosgray's land, on the north and east by a line parallel with and 33 feet from the center line of said railroad. Said 100 foot strip being bounded on the east and south by lands of Martha J. Gray on the south and west by a line 50 feet from and parallel with the center line of said railroad, on the west and north by said 66 foot strip and on the north and east by a line 50 feet from and parallel with the center line of said railroad and **containing 1 43/100 acres of land.**

LDR: Volume 245, Page 587

Prior Instrument Reference: Deed Volume Page

Grantors respectively release all rights of dower therein.

WITNESS their hands this 5TH day of January, 2001.

Signed and acknowledged
in the presence of:

David F Allen

Judith F. Lowry

JAY W. LIGGETT aka
JAY WILLIAM LIGGETT

MARGARETT JO LIGGETT

STATE OF OHIO
COUNTY OF UNION, ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared the above named

JAY W. LIGGETT aka JAY WILLIAM LIGGETT and
MARGARETT JO LIGGETT, His Wife,

who acknowledged that they did sign the foregoing instrument and that the same is their free act and deed.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal at Marysville,

Ohio this 5TH day of January, 2001.

NOTARY PUBLIC

DAVID F. ALLEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO
My Commission has no Expiration Date.
Section 147.03 R.C.

This instrument prepared by:

ALLEN, YURASEK & MERKLIN
Attorneys at Law
233 West Fifth Street
P.O. Box 391
Marysville, OH 43040-0391
Telephone: 937/642-4070

General Warranty Deed

200409280226413
Pgs: 3 $36.00 T20040084536
09/28/2004 3:33PM BXOHIO TITLE
Robert G. Montgomery
Franklin County Recorder

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

Dorothy Thomas, unmarried, of FRANKLIN County, Ohio, for valuable consideration paid, grants, with general warranty covenants, to **Edwards Golf Communities, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company**, whose tax-mailing address is 495 S. High Street, Suite 150, Columbus, OH 43215,

an undivided one-half interest in the real property more particularly described on Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Subject to the following: The lien of any taxes and assessments not now due and payable; zoning ordinances and regulations; legal highways; and restrictions, conditions, reservations and easements of record.

Prior Instrument Reference: Instrument No. 200009290198495 and at Instrument No. 200009290198519, Franklin County, Ohio records.

EXECUTED by **Dorothy Thomas**, this 28th day of September, 2004.

Dorothy Thomas
Dorothy Thomas

CONVEYANCE TAX
$1580.70
JOSEPH W. TESTA
FRANKLIN COUNTY AUDITOR

264469
TRANSFERRED
SEP 28 2004
JOSEPH W. TESTA
AUDITOR
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO)
) SS:
COUNTY OF FRANKLIN)

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on this 28th day of September, 2004, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public in and for said county, personally came, **Dorothy Thomas**, and acknowledged the signing thereof to be her voluntary act and deed.

IN TESTIMONY THEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal this day and year aforesaid.

OHIO TITLE BOX

No. 132524

Richard A. Utz
Notary Public

This instrument prepared by:
Richard A. Utz, Attorney at Law
155 W. Main Street, Suite 200
Columbus, Ohio 43215

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

RICHARD A. UTZ
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Has No
Expiration Date

Exhibit "A"

Description of 7.294 Acres:

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, Virginia Military Survey Number 6953, being part of Parcel 2 of that tract of land conveyed to Shookuh B. Koozekananai by deed of record in Deed Book 3650, Page 765, (all references being to the records of the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio) and more particularly bounded and described *as* follows:

Beginning, for reference, at Franklin County Geodetic Survey Monument Number 0049, at the centerline intersection of Rings Road and Cosgray Road;

thence North 05° 29' 31" West, with the centerline of said Cosgray Road, a distance or 1793.64 feet to a railroad spike found at the northwesterly corner of that tract conveyed to Richard O. Wiseman by deed of record in Official Record I3280E08 at the True Point of Beginning for this description;

thence North 05° 29' 31" West, continuing with said centerline, a distance of 441 .24 feet to a mag nail set;

thence crossing said Parcel 2, the following courses and distances:

North 84° 30' 29" East, a distance or 50.00 feet to an iron pin set;
North 39° 30' 29" East, a distance of 49.50 feet to an iron pin set;
North 84° 30' 29" East, a distance of 23.62 feet to an iron pin set at a point of curvature to the right;

with the arc of said curve (Delta = 47° 38' 44", Radius = 865.00 feet) a chord bearing and distance of South 71° 40' 09" East, 698.76 feet to an iron pin set; and South 47° 50' 47" East, a distance: of 269.44 feet to an iron pin set in the northerly line of said Wiseman tract;

thence South 84° 49' 24" West, with said northerly line, a distance of 929.39 feet to the True Point of Beginning, containing 7.294 acres of land, more or less, 0.304 acre of which falls within the presently occupied right-of-way of Cosgray Road.

Bearings for this description are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as per NAD 83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of F.C.G.S. Monument Numbers 5536 and 7752, establishing a bearing of South 85° 44' 20" East between said Monuments.

(continued)

Description of 8.171 Acres:

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, Virginia Military Survey Number 6953, being part of that tract of land conveyed lo Richard O. Wiseman by deed of record in Official Record 13280E08, (all references being to the records of the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio) and more particularly hounded and described as follows:

Beginning, for reference, at an iron pin set at the northwesterly corner of Lot 2 of the subdivision entitled "Wilbur I. and Emma Cramer's First Addition to the Village of Amlin" of record in Plat Book 10, Page 98.

thence North 06° 35' 25" West, with the easterly line of that tract conveyed to Jay W. Liggett by deed of record in Deed Book 2547, Page 303, a distance of 1071.62 feet to an iron pin found;

thence South 84° 49' 24" West, with the northerly line of said Liggett tract, a distance of 598.33 feet to an iron pin set at the True Point of Beginning for this description;

thence South 84° 49' 24" West, with said northerly line, a distance of 1061.51 feet to an iron pin found in the easterly right-of-way line of the Conrail Railroad;

thence North 39° 16' 17" West, with said easterly right-of-way line, a distance of 340.84 feet to a railroad spike found in the centerline of Cosgray Road;

thence North 05° 29' 31" West, with said centerline, a distance of 68.76 feet to a railroad spike found at the southwesterly corner of Parcel 2 of that tract conveyed to Shookuh B. Koozekananai by deed of record in Deed Book 3650, Page 765;

thence North 84° 49' 24" East, with the southerly line of said Parcel 2, a distance of 929.39 feet to an iron pin set;

thence South 47° 50' 47" East, crossing said Wiseman tract, 477.39 feet to the True Point of Beginning, containing 8.171 acres of land, more or less, 0.047 acre of which falls within the presently occupied right-of'-way of Cosgray Road.

Bearings for this description are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System as per NAD 83. Control for bearings was from coordinates or F.C.G.S. Monument Numbers 5536 and 7752, establishing a bearing of South 85°44' 20" East between said Monuments.

Parcel Nos. 274-000297-00 and 274-000304-00

C-110-A

DESCRIPTION VERIFIED
DEAN C. RINGLE, P.E.,P.S.
BY: _____
DATE: _____
FRANKLIN COUNTY ENGINEER

Ida M. Cramer's and Others amended plat and addition

To The

Village of Amlin

Franklin Co. Ohio.

BOOK 8 PAGE 12-A

SCALE 50 FT = 1 IN.

H. J. Converse C.E.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT WE IDA M. CRAMER, JOHN A. CRAMER, ET AL ARE LAWFULLY SEIZED OF THE TRACT OF LAND SITUATE IN WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO AS SHOWN BY THIS PLAT AND DESIGNATED "IDA M. CRAMER'S AMENDED PLAT AND ADDITION TO THE VILLAGE OF AMLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO. THAT WE HAVE CAUSED THE SAME TO BE LAID OUT INTO INLOTS AND NUMBERED AS INDICATED BY SAID PLAT, TO WHICH REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE FOR FURTHER DESCRIPTION. WE HEREBY DEDICATE TO PUBLIC USE ALL THE STREETS AND ALLEYS SHOWN UPON SAID PLAT AS BEING A PART OF SAID AMENDED PLAT AND ADDITION. IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE HAVE HEREUNTO SET OUR HANDS THIS 17" DAY OF JULY A-D 1906

WITNESS: Jacob Mock Jr.
C. A. Orrison

Ida M. Cramer
John A. Cramer
Stephen Elzey
Louisa A. Elzey
A. F. De Witt
Lucy De Witt
Lillian Pendleton
E. D. Pendleton
L. P. Wolpert
Freida Wolpert
Mary E. Davis
Charles B. Davis.

"HILDE DIDIT"
DELIVERED TO JOHN A. CRAMER. Aug 8-06.

STATE OF OHIO, FRANKLIN COUNTY SS.

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT ON THIS 17TH DAY OF JULY A-D 1906, BEFORE THE SUBSCRIBER A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY PERSONALLY CAME THE ABOVE NAMED GRANTORS AND ACKNOWLEDGED THE SIGNING OF THE SAME TO BE THEIR VOLUNTARY ACT FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN MENTIONED.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF

I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED MY NAME AND AFFIXED MY OFFICIAL SEAL ON THE DAY AND YEAR LAST AFORESAID.

SEAL

Charles A. Orrison
NOTARY PUBLIC
IN AND FOR FRANKLIN
COUNTY OHIO.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE MADE A SURVEY OF IDA M CRAMER'S AMENDED PLAT AND ADDITION TO THE VILLAGE OF AMLIN FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO AND STAKED IN STREETS, ALLEYS AND LOTS AS SHOWN ON THE PLAT HERETO ATTACHED.

Howard J. Converse SURVEYOR.

APPROVED, 7-21-06 Walter Braun COUNTY SURVEYOR.

APPROVED July 21st 1906.

Peter Swickard
W. S. Carlisle
Morton Hayes
County Commissioners

TRANSFERRED July 23' 06.
L. E. Jones
Co Auditor

SEAL

FILED JULY 23RD 1906 - 10
RECORDED JULY 24" 1906 P.B. 8
Jos. W. Wickham
Co. Rec
By Jos. B. Harrison

12-A

Case # 15-004Z/PDP/PP

*William Darling
212 Oak Court
Westerville, OH 43081

*Jay Liggett, Trustee
6315 Meaghan Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

*David Patch, Jr
PO Box 156
Amlin, OH 43002

*~~Valerie Finch~~
~~5000 Scioto Darby Road~~
~~Hilliard, OH 43026~~

*~~Edwards Golf Communities LLC~~
~~500 S Front Street, STE 770~~
~~Columbus, OH 43215~~

*Schottenstein Homes
140 Mill Street, STE A
Gahanna, OH 43230

*Jack Reynolds
Smith & Hale LLC
37 W Broad St, STE 460
Columbus, OH 43215

*Paul Coppel
Smith & Hale LLC
37 W Broad St, STE 460
Columbus, OH 43215

Lance & Mary Bowman
6938 Foresthaven Lp
Dublin, OH 43016

Cosgray Crossing Ltd
400 S Fifth #400
Columbus, OH 43215

David Gease
5713 Cosgray Rd
Dublin, OH 43016

JWE Development LLC
495 S High St, STE 150
Columbus, OH 43215

Jay Liggett
6315 Meaghan Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

New York Central Lines
500 Water St (C910)
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Marianne Ruane
5658 Marmion Dr
Dublin, OH 43016

Joseph Bucci
7032 Rings Rd
Dublin, OH 43016

Shawn & Bryony Ferrell
7034 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Valerie Finch & William Darling
5407 Bullfinch Dr
Westerville, OH 43081

Patricia Gallup
6960 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Christopher Howard
7012 Rings Rd
Dublin, OH 43016

Woodlands of Ballantrae
c/o Steve Brown
5664 Montridge Lane
Dublin, OH 43016

Nidovi Ltd
PO Box 1494
Dublin, OH 43017

Lois Parsell
6930 Rings Rd
Amlin, OH 43002

Craig & Terry Vlies
7006 Rings Rd
Dublin, OH 43016

Harold & Catherine Elson
PO Box 33
Amlin, OH 43002

Northwest Chapel Grace Brethren Church
6700 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

David Patch
1 Miranova Place 1930
Columbus, OH 43215

BCP Properties LLC
6931 Rings Road
Amlin, OH 43002

Victor M & Laura A Manicho
6927 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

David May
P.O. Box 83
Amlin, OH 43002

John C Carter et al.
6856 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Lois A Parsell
6930 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Northwest Chapel
Grace Brethren Church
6700 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Mark J & Christine M Lucas
73 East Sycamore Street
Columbus, OH 43206

FS Real Estate Development LLC
635 Brooksedge Blvd.
Westerville, OH 43081

John R Brown
6886 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

David W & Wanda L Scott
6852 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Ronald S Mills Lori J Hawkins
6876 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Deborah A Eger
6870 Rings Road
Amlin, OH 43002

Lois A Parsell
P.O. Box 1
Amlin, OH 43002

Coretta Gonzalez et al.
6894 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Ronald G & Beverly J Wilcox
P.O. Box 57
Amlin, OH 43002

Kevin A & Kathryn A Ketchum
6961 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Bryan D & Margaret F Scott
5251 Cosgray Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Candace & Bradley R Pitman
6891 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Peggy J Richardson
6959 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Barbara J Lemaster
5251 Avery Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Hugh Ferrell II et al
7007 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Kevin A & Kathryn A Ketchum
6961 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Conrad G & Nina J Jones
5524 Cosgray Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Bruce A & Joyce E Robinson
7060 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Jonathan D & Tonya L Upperman
7040 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

John & Sherri K Rister
3449 Lacon Road
Hilliard, OH 43026

Sharon Lynn Ferrell et al
c/o Sheila G Lemaster
P.O. Box 142
Amlin, OH 42002

Susan B Lear
6906 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Jeffrey J & Susan B Kiddey
6902 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Joseph & Kathleen Bellomo
6905 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Sally J Beidelman
6901 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Amy M Zockle
6897 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Robert L & Judith A Barlow
6893 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Barbara L Merz, TOD
5654 Marmion Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

Deloris J Godfrey
5650 Marmion Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

Patrick J & Sue K O'Brien
5646 Marmion Drive
Dublin, OH 43016

Anita L Barney
6922 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Glen R Herchik
6918 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

D Terry & Millie Hartle
6914 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Patricia J Benincasa
6910 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Lance & Mary Bowman
6938 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Donald W & Suzanne E Nielsen
6934 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Hayden D Eberhart
6930 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Deborah P Reed
6926 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Brian Eady
6915 Foresthaven Loop #36A
Dublin, OH 43016

R Gary & Karen J Butler
6916 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Peter Gildea
6923 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Philip & Pamela Merz
6927 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

M/I Homes of Central Ohio
3 Easton Oval, Suite 310
Columbus, OH 43219

Brian S Nevers, et al.
5616 Newtonmore Place
Dublin, OH 43016

John D & Sharon K Lane
6872 Beltain Lane
Dublin, OH 43016

Syed & Talat A Hague
6872 Beltain Lane
Dublin, OH 43016

Deborah P Reed
6926 Foresthaven Loop
Dublin, OH 43016

Bruce A & Joyce E Robinson
7060 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Jonathan D & Tonya L Upperman
7040 Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Preliminary Development Plan

BALLANTRAE WOODS

Dublin, Ohio

OWNER:

Schottenstein Homes

140 Mill Street
Suite A
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Phone: (614) 478-1100

Contact: Paul Coppel

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Smith & Hale

37 West Broad Street
Suite 725
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Phone: (614) 221-4255

Contact: Jack Reynolds

LAND PLANNING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING:

EMH&T

5500 New Albany Road
Columbus, Ohio 43054

Phone: (614) 775-4710

Contact: Linda Menerey

Submittal – July 23, 2015

Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission

SECTION I – Development Overview

SECTION I
Development Overview

I. Introduction Statement
II. Rezoning Statement

SECTION II
Development Standards

I. Overall Development Standards
II. Sub Area Standards
Subarea A: Representative Single Family Design Elements, Exhibit A
Subarea A: Illustrations of Conceptual Neighborhood Character
Subarea B: Representative Condominium Design Elements, Exhibit B
Subarea B: Illustrations of Conceptual Neighborhood Character
III. Project Phasing

SECTION III
Exhibits

Illustrative Plan
Regional Context Map
Vicinity Map
Existing Conditions
Site Plan
Subarea Plan
Open Space and Connectivity Plan
Landscape Plan
Landscape Details (3)
Tree Survey (4)
Overall Utility Plan
Grading Plan
Preliminary Plat
AutoTurn Exhibit
Single Family Lots with Typical 3 Car Garage

SECTION IV
Appendix

Application
Adjacent Owners
Legal Description
Subarea Descriptions
Utility Feasibility Memo

I. INTRODUCTION TO BALLANTRAE WOODS

Ballantrae Woods is proposed as a 49.6 acre residential development located south of Cosgray Road and west of proposed Churchman Road. The southern portion of the property abuts lots in the Village of Amlin. The CSX railroad track is the western border of the site and is currently very active.

The site proposes 135 units for a gross density of 2.72 dwelling units per acre, well below the 5 units per acre permitted in the Community Plan. The Ballantrae Woods development will be easily accessible by the neighboring Ballantrae developments through extension of and connection to the overall street and pedestrian networks. The product mix is intended to provide two housing opportunities: traditional single family homes on lots and detached condominium homes. The development will be constructed as a single unified community that attracts residents of varying ages and family types.

Large setbacks are planned for open space along Churchman Road and the railroad tracks. Sidewalks and shared use paths link all the open spaces within the community and extend into the neighboring developments. Connections will be made to the Woodlands and Amlin Village via sidewalks and shared use paths. The woodlot as mentioned above will be preserved and a community green will be provided as a central gathering point within the condominium area.

The Cottages at Ballantrae Woods will embody the best of the past while looking forward to the future. The architectural vocabulary will take its cue from Central Ohio farm houses of the 1840's and 50's, a style known as Carpenter Gothic (aka Folk Victorian Style) (aka Gothic Revival). Homes of this era used elements such as porches and newly available technology of mass production to add individuality and personality to a simple and efficient floorplan. The scroll-saw and powered machinery of the mid-nineteenth century allowed builders to create intricate and varied facades on a simple building volume.

The Cottages at Ballantrae Woods will use the Carpenter Gothic vocabulary as the inspiration for this new neighborhood. The varied details of the elevations are crafted to add warmth and charm to the feel of the community. The stone bases of the cottages recall the field stone foundations of the old Ohio farmsteads. In lieu of wood planks for board and batten siding, the cottages utilize environmentally sustainable cement-board siding, a long-lasting material having the same look as wood but requiring minimal maintenance. Intricate and unique designs for trim boards, decorative headers and other architectural elements will be incorporated. The scale of building elements such as garage doors has been visually reduced and downplayed to become more human-scaled and is paired with fenestration elements that add interest and further reinforce the human scale of the overall elevation. Five different versions of the elevations add variety and create unity but not uniformity along the gently curving

streetscapes. To unify the unique architectural treatments (variations on a theme), each cottage is painted white to allow the landscape elements to dominate the neighborhood.

Ballantrae Woods Cottages has a focus to provide a different neighborhood that meets the needs of a changing market to provide for both family and active adults who may not want the traditional single family home any longer but still be part of a vibrant neighborhood located close to community services, shopping and work.

The single family home exteriors will be designed to be reminiscent of traditional architectural styles incorporating front porches, modest setbacks, emphasizing neighborhood interaction and walkability while de-emphasizing the garage as the predominant façade element. Materials will be unified between the single family and condominium homes.

II. REZONING STATEMENT

A. Explain the relationship of the proposed development to existing and future land uses in the surrounding area, the street system, community facilities, open space system, services, and other public improvements

The proposed Ballantrae Woods development is located east of the Conrail railroad tracks, north of the Village of Amlin, west of the Woodlands condominiums and the proposed Glen at Ballantrae development. It is located northwest of the Links at Ballantrae. The new development will utilize Churchman Road to access the community. Churchman Road is currently under design by the City of Dublin. The first phase of Churchman will be constructed south from Cosgray Road to Marmion Drive by Edwards Development and then the second phase will extend south to tie into Rings Road. The development will utilize a green buffer area along the Churchman Road frontage and preserve a wood lot and large buffer along the CSX railroad to provide large green spaces within the development. A central green is proposed within the detached condominium portion of the site. The new development will utilize existing sanitary sewer, water and storm water connections to serve the 49.6 ± acre subdivision.

B. State how the proposed rezoning and development relate to the existing land use character of the vicinity.

The proposed subdivision complements the condominium development located across Churchman Road and the housing in the Village of Amlin with the proposed condominium component of the plan. The detached condominiums will mirror the density and character of those adjacent areas. The single family housing site relates to the density and character of development taking place to the northeast of the subdivision (the Ballantrae subdivision areas). The proposed mixture of condominium and single family housing will mesh with the existing neighborhood character and provide a buffer to the railroad tracks to the west.

C. State how the proposed rezoning and development relate to the Dublin Community Plan. If the proposal is inconsistent with the Community Plan, then justify the proposed deviation from the Community Plan.

The Dublin Community Plan shows the subject area as mixed residential medium density on its future land use map. The text within the plan indicates that these areas will have greater walkability and pedestrian orientation with a maximum density of 5.0 du/ac. The proposed subdivision proposes walkability with short blocks, connection to a multi-use path along the railroad track and connections to Churchman Road and other developed subdivisions. The proposed gross density of 2.72 du/ac is well below the 5.0 dwelling units per acres specified in the Comprehensive Plan. No deviations are necessary from the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Explain how the proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Planned Districts [Code Section 153.052(B)]

(1) **Consistency with Dublin Zoning Code:** Yes, the proposed development is consistent with the purpose; intent and applicable standards of the Zoning Code as has been previewed

and studied by Dublin City staff to insure elements are meeting the appropriate sections of the Zoning Code.

(2) **Conformance with adopted plans:** Yes, the proposed development is in conformity with the Community Plan, Shared Use Path Plan, and Thoroughfare Plan as they apply to this site. All the applicable plan have been reviewed to insure the proposed density is within keeping the parameters of the Community Plan, that Churchman Road is completed and connected to existing roads to serve the area and that bikeway and pedestrian connections are created to insure walkability and ease of travel between the abutting neighborhoods. The three (3) connections to Churchman Road and subsequent connection to Cosgray and Rings Road will not overburden those rights of way or any other street connections in the area.

(3) **Advancement of general welfare & orderly development:** Yes, the proposed development advances the general welfare of the City and its immediate vicinity and will not in any way impede the normal and orderly development and improvements of the surrounding areas.

(4) **Effects on adjacent uses:** Yes, the proposed subdivision is appropriately located in the City so that the use and value of property within and adjacent to the area and safeguarded as there is residential housing to the northeast, east and south and the 138 units proposed on the site are appropriate to the area.

(5) **Adequacy of open space for residential development:** Yes, the proposed subdivision will have sufficient open space areas to meet the objectives of the Community Plan. There are large green spaces proposed along Churchman Road and the railroad right of way as well as the preservation of a large wood lot which will add to the open spaces area found with the subdivision.

(6) **Protection of natural features and resources**: The site has been primarily used for agricultural uses with the exception of the stand of trees located along the railroad tracks and under the proposed plan the trees will be preserved thereby respective of the natural features found on the site.

(7) **Adequate infrastructure**: Yes, adequate utilities, access roads, stormwater drainage, stormwater retention and all other necessary facilities will be provided with the development of the 49.6 acre tract.

(8) **Traffic and Pedestrian safety:** Yes, adequate measures will be taken to provide the necessary ingress and egress to the site. Three access points will be provided to Churchman Road, minimizing traffic congestion on the surrounding public streets. The plan for access to perimeter public street and interior street are designed to maximize public safety and to promote pedestrian and bike circulation throughout the subdivision and to other abutting subdivisions.

(9) **Coordination & integration of building &site relationships:** Yes, the relationship of the proposed housing units provides coordination and integration within the development. There will be two types of communities created within the subdivision that will each individually stand on its own as well as work within the larger context of the community and thereby maintain the quality image that Dublin is known for within the Central Ohio area.

(10) **Development layout and intensity:** The homes have been designed to be reminiscent of a village with smaller lots, traditional architecture, and an emphasis on the streetscape. A central green is proposed in the middle of the development. The single family lots are designed within the existing site features and appear almost as a small conservation development surrounded by green spaces.

(11) **Stormwater Management:** Adequate provisions are made for retention and release of stormwater off the site. The site is primarily flat and served as agricultural fields farming field before development. Manmade systems will be developed and installed to handle stormwater that is created by the development. There will be a single retention pond located in the southeast corner of the site for stormwater management

(12) **Deviations:** There are no deviations from the zoning code anticipated at this time. The site plan has been laid out to comply with all applicable zoning code and subdivision standards.

(13) **Design and Appearance:** The building designs will meet or exceed the quality of buildings in the surrounding area and all applicable appearance code standards of the city code. The developer proposes a traditional architectural style that will be unique to the area and provide an alternate architectural character in this area of the city.

(14) **Development Phasing:** The phasing of the subdivision will occur in an orderly manner with infrastructure developed to serve each phase and not disrupt any surrounding areas.

(15) **Adequacy of public services:** The proposed subdivision can be adequately served by the existing or planned public improvements as Churchman Road will be completed as a part of this development and thereby create a planned road connection between Rings Road and Cosgray Road without having to cross the railroad tracks. The development of the subdivision will not impair the existing public service systems provided for in the area.

(16) **Infrastructure Contributions**: The applicant's contributions to the public infrastructure are consistent with the Thoroughfare Plan. Phase 1 of Churchman Road will be constructed by Edwards Development from Cosgray Road to Marmion Drive concurrent with the construction of this development. The second phase of Churchman from Marmion to the portion constructed by the Links at Ballantrae is contained within the city's current Capital Improvements Plan. Required right of way for Phase 2 will be dedicated as part of the Woods at Ballantrae development to the City with terms of dedication to be determined. Churchman will create a new connection between Rings Road and Cosgray Road that will serve this development the adjacent Ballantrae community and larger area.

E. If a previous application to rezone the property has been denied by City Council within the last twelve months, list when and state the basis for reconsideration as noted in Code Section 153.234.

No application has been previously submitted for the property for consideration by the Dublin City Council.

SECTION II – Development Standards

I. OVERALL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

This development shall be in accordance with Dublin Code at the time of development unless noted otherwise in the overall development standards or subarea standards. Where conflicts occur between the Dublin Code and the Development Standards, the Development Standards shall be applied over the Code.

The following standards shall be applicable to subareas as noted.

A. Density: Total site gross density shall not exceed 2.72 dwelling units per acre based on 49.6± acres for a total of 135 dwelling units.

B. Model Homes and Sales Offices:

1. Model homes and sales offices shall be permitted within Subareas A and B in accordance with Dublin Code requirements.

C. Property Perimeter Setbacks: (All perimeter setbacks shall be exclusive of shared use paths and /or sidewalks.)

1. North Property Line (Cosgray Road) - 100' building and pavement setback. No single family lot may extend into setback.

2. West Property Line (Railroad Tracks) - 100' building setback (excluding Condominium Homes 65 and 73 which shall have a 70' minimum building setback due to the irregular property line) and 100' pavement setback (excluding a fire access/vehicular turnaround and potential future vehicular connection to Cramer Street/Amlin Alley). No single family lot may extend into setback.

3. South Property Line (Amlin Alley) - 25' building and 10 ' pavement/outdoor amenity setback.

4. East Property Line (Churchman Road Right-of-Way)

    a. Subarea A - Single family lots - 100' lot setback except for lots 1 and 3 which shall have a minimum lot setback of 45'

    b. Subarea B: Condominium homes 100' building setback and 70' private drive setback

D. Open Space:

1. Open spaces shall be provided, owned & maintained as follows:

Reserve	Acres	Ownership	Maintained By
A	±1.9	HOA	MOA
B	±4.4	City	City
C	±2.2	City	City
D	±2.6	HOA	MOA
E	±1.5	COA	MOA
F	±3.0	City	City
L	±0.5	COA	COA
P	±1.7	City	City
Q	±0.3	HOA	MOA
R	±0.1	COA	COA
Total	±18.2 ac		

MOA=Master Owner Association COA=Condominium Owners Association
HOA-Homeowner's Association City= City of Dublin

2. Summary of Reserve Maintenance Acreage:

   Condominium Owners Association ± 0.6 ac
   Master Owner Association ± 6.3ac
   City of Dublin ± 11.3 ac

3. Cosgray Road Open Space (Reserve A)

   a. Within the setback along Cosgray Road a landscape buffer extending along the rear of Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6 shall be provided. Existing healthy trees may be incorporated into the buffer where feasible. No portion of any lot may encroach into this space.

   b. An 8 foot shared use path connection shall be provided along Cosgray Road from Churchman Road to the railroad tracks as generally shown on the Preliminary Development Plan. This shared use path shall extend through the woods and connect with the proposed 8 foot shared use path located within the open space along the railroad tracks.

   c. A landscape plan for the buffer and shared use path alignment will be finalized at the time of Final Development Plan.

4. Railroad Open Space (Reserve B, C, and P)

   a. A setback along the west property line/railroad tracks, landscape buffer shall be required to provide both a physical and visual barrier to the active CSX

railroad track. The buffer shall not be required in the area of existing woods. The 8 foot asphalt shared use path shall be extended through this space connecting to the south property line with the intent to provide for future pedestrian access as Amlin redevelops.

b. This buffer shall be a minimum of 6' in height from proposed grade at installation.

c. Buffer treatments can be a combination of mounding, fencing and trees. Fencing need not be along the entire property line. Any fencing shall be limited to 6' in height.

d. A landscape plan for the buffer including any proposed fencing and the shared use path alignment will be finalized at time of the Final Development Plan.

5. Entry Features and Churchman Road open Space (Reserves D, E, F, & Q)

a. Entry features are permitted in each Subarea at entry points designated in the PDP with final design, location and landscape to be submitted for approval at time of Final Development Plan. The Conceptual Landscape Plan provides entry feature locations and conceptual imagery.

b. Entry features may be located within the setbacks in each Subarea but shall not prohibit clear sight distance or cause safety concerns.

c. Entry features may include but not be limited to fences, posts, columns, walls, trellises, gazebos, signs, landscaping, logos etc.

d. The entry feature designs and open space frontage along Churchman Road shall be landscaped in a manner reflective of the character of the adjacent Ballantrae development. Large vertical stone slabs shall be incorporated at entries along Churchman Road, augmented with trees, and landscaping.

e. Within the open space along Churchman Road, rock/rubble wall sections with informal character over time shall be installed and landscaping.

f. The edge of the stormwater pond shall be enhanced with sections of rock outcroppings and landscaping beds.

g. Detailed landscape plans for the entry features and Churchman Road open space will be finalized at time of Final Development Plan.

6. Subarea B Amlin Buffer:

A buffer shall be provided along the south property line at the rear of the condominium homes abutting Cramer Street - the Amlin alley. A concept has been provided as part

of the Preliminary Development Plan. The applicant will work with staff to identify the appropriate elements for this buffer with detailed plans to be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

7. Subarea B Central Green (Reserve L)and Existing Trees (Reserve R):

   A central green of approximately 0.5 acres shall be provided in Subarea B as shown on the Preliminary Development Plan. This green shall have a sidewalk of 4 feet along the perimeter and provide seating opportunities. Reserve R shall be provided, approximately 0.1 acres, for the purpose of preserving the 2 existing landmark trees.

E. Residents Association:

1. Applicant will establish a forced and funded Master Owners Association responsible for maintenance of Reserves A, D, E and Q.

2. A forced and funded Home Owners Association will be established for Subarea A.

3. A forced and funded Condominium Association will be established for Subarea B. This association will maintain all building exteriors and all other property owned by it including all private drives and open spaces.

4. Unless otherwise provided by Ohio law, control of all Owners Associations will be turned over to the residents when determined by the developer. Until such time, the developer will pay dues and fees on the property owned by it or subsidize budget shortfalls. All budgets will include line items for maintaining improvements and the condominiums owners' association budget shall include a reserve for repairing and replacing all private drives.

F. Tree Replacement:

1. An updated detailed tree replacement plan shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

2. With the exception of required street tree plantings and landscape requirements for single family, all other deciduous and evergreen tree plantings including the Churchman Road and Cosgray Road buffers, entry features and railroad buffer in excess of the code requirement may be counted toward tree replacement

G. Tree Protection:

The dimension for the critical root protection zones and fence details to protect landmark trees during construction shall be subject to the approval of the city Zoning Inspector.

H. Churchman Road Alignment:

Churchman Road as shown on the plan reflects the design currently provided by the City of Dublin. Design may change during final engineering.

II. SUBAREA STANDARDS

Subarea A

Subarea A is comprised of approximately 23.1 acres of single family homes located east of Cosgray Road and southwest of the proposed Churchman Road right of way.

A. Permitted Uses: Single Family Residential, one principle structure per lot

B. Density: A maximum of 45 residential lots.

C. Setbacks:

1. The front yard building setback shall be 20' from the right of way and shall not be required to be staggered
2. Corner lots shall have a 20' front yard building setback from both rights of way.
3. The side yard building setback shall be 5' per side.
4. The rear yard building setback shall be 20'.

D. Lot Width: 60' minimum at the front yard setback building line. Varied lot widths shall not be required.

E. Traffic, Access and Pedestrian Connectivity:

1. Open space and sidewalks shall be provided per the Preliminary Development Plan.
2. A demarcation shall be provided between the lots and shared use path approval accessing the open space. See concept shown on Sheet 8. Detailed plan shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.
3. The rights of way serving the single family homes shall be 50 feet. The pavement width shall be 28 feet as indicated on the plat.
4. Minimum centerline radii shall be 100 feet.

F. Architectural Requirements:

1. Architecture shall meet the requirements for the City of Dublin Appearance Code Section unless noted otherwise herein.

2. Character Statement:
The single family home exteriors will be designed to be reminiscent of traditional architectural styles incorporating front porches with modest setbacks emphasizing neighborhood interaction and walkability while de-emphasizing the garage as the prominent façade element. The architectural character shall incorporate vocabulary from traditional details. Continuity of elements and scale and the commonality of building materials will reinforce the architectural cohesiveness while providing architectural diversity.

Style	General Description		
Four-sided Architecture	All sides of a house shall display a high level of quality and architectural interest. The majority of a building's architectural features and treatments shall not be restricted to a single façade. Blank facades are not permitted. All sides of a house should be articulated through the use of bays, insets, balconies, porches, or stoops related to entrances and windows.	Elements of 4 Sided Architectural	Houses must contain at least two design elements in any combination on all sides. All street-facing elevation must contain at least three design elements, in any combination. Provided further that all of the following must be met: • At least one design element must be present in each equal one-half vertical division of the subject elevation; • At least one design element shall occur from the first floor level to nine feet above the first floor level; • If there is any upper wall area greater than 24 feet wide and nine feet high (measured at nine feet above the first floor level), at least one design element must be located predominately at least nine feet above the first floor of the elevation. Acceptable design elements include: • A door of at least 17 square feet in area. • A window at least six square feet in area with window trim (at least a minimum 3 ½" board) or shutters. A set of adjacent windows, such as a double or bay window, count as one design element, however, horizontal bands of immediately adjacent window units count as one design element for every horizontal eight feet of run. • A chimney located along an exterior elevation • An articulated decorative gable vent of at least four square feet in area. • A porch. • A similar significant permanent architectural feature consistent with the style of the house. • Other appropriate design elements approved administratively.

Finish Building Materials		Primary	• Vertical or horizontal fibrous cement siding and panels shall be used except on areas with special design details as indicated on Exhibit A. • Horizontal lap siding shall be a minimum width of 6". • Board and batten siding if used must be as follows: Batten spacing shall be a minimum of 6" with a minimum of 1" wide battens on all facades. • Cultured stone when used must encompass the entire architectural element.
		Foundation	Cultured stone shall be applied from grade to a minimum height of 24" on all sides.
		Color	Primary façade colors shall be the following 2015 James Hardie colors: Artic White, Navajo Beige, Cobblestone, Pearl Grey, Light Mist, Sail Cloth, Sandstone Beiger, Monterey Taupe, Boothbay Blue, and Heathered Moss (or similar). Trim color shall be the 2015 James Hardie color: Artic White, other similar colors may be used subject to administrative approval.
Porches and Covered Stoops	A covered porch or covered stoop shall be required on all homes. A stoop shall be a minimum of 2' in depth and may be recessed. A porch shall be a minimum of 6' in depth. Porches and stoops shall be required to have one of the details shown on Exhibit A, or other architecturally appropriate detail approved administratively.	Form Options	Simple one story with low sloping roof, decorative elements. Larger more decorative porches with appropriate railing and detail.
		Columns	All porches shall have columns. Columns shall be a minimum of 8" square and constructed of smart siding, pvc.
		Railings	Railings shall not be required but if utilized must meet building code & constructed of aluminum, smart siding, pvc or vinyl, color to match columns
		Surface	Porch, stoop & walking surfaces may be concrete or pavers.
Windows and Doors		Window	Window style shall be white vinyl, single hung with 6/6, 9/9 with a minimum STC rating of 28. All windows shall have grid patterns used on all four sides of the home. Shutters or trim are required on all windows on all elevations. • Shutters if utilized shall be sized to fully cover the window and shall be operable or appear as such, and utilize appropriate shutter hardware including s-clips and hinges. Shutters shall be louvered, raised or flat paneled or board and batter and made of vinyl, painted synthetic, PVC or Hardiplank. Shutters may be counted as a design element. • Trim shall be required when shutters are not used. Trim shall be a minimum 3 ½" board around all sides of windows. Trim may be counted as a design element.
		Front Door	Door style shall be 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 panel fiberglass, solid of a single color door. Transoms with grids shall be optional above the front door.
		Garage Doors	Garage doors will be recessed a minimum of 5" from the garage façade. Garage doors shall be a maximum of 16' in width and maximum 9' in height. Garage doors shall be fiberglass, insulated and 32 panels.

Windows and Doors		Garage Doors	The initial installation or replacement of garage doors must be a low-contrast color that is the same, or similar in hue and tonal value as the primary color of the house. Garage door trim shall match garage doors or the primary trim color of the house. Trim shall be 5" minimum. All front loaded garages shall be located a minimum of 2' behind the front façade. A porch shall be considered part of the front façade as long as it has a roof. No more than two garage doors may be located on the same plane. The percentage of garage door opening to the overall front façade may not exceed 45% for a two car garage and 50% for three car garages.
		Special Elements on Windows and Doors	Special trim elements shall be required on windows and doors located on facades facing the street with detailing provided on Exhibit A.
Roof		Pitch	Main architectural roof of house shall be 6/12 to 12/12 pitch. Porches shall be 2/12 to 12/12 pitch.
		Material	Main roof material shall be a 30 year dimensional asphalt shingle of weathered wood color. Porch roof material shall be a 30 year dimensional asphalt shingle of weathered wood color or standing seam metal, colored silver, black or bronze.
Special Elements		Dormers	Dormers shall have, 6/12 to 12/12 pitch, and decorative elements on facia. See details shown on Exhibit A.
		Chimney	All exterior chimneys must extend full height, from ground and vertically past the eaves line. Cantilevered and shed-type chimneys are prohibited. Chimneys (including chimney's extending from the roof) must be finished in cultured stone to match the stone foundation.
		Trim – Facia and Soffits	Front facades shall have a minimum 6" overhang constructed of smartsiding, fibrous cement or pvc. Any gable without an overhang shall have a minimum 1" x 8" facia constructed of smartsiding, fibrous cement or pvc.
Architectural Diversity			A matrix will be provided to promote architectural diversity for the front building facades for single family homes at the time of Final Development Plan. The architectural diversity matrix shall provide as follows: No homes two lots to the left or right of the subject lot shall have the same front façade as the subject lot and No home directly across the street and two lots to the left or right of that lot shall have the same front façade as the subject lot. However, this requirement will not apply to situations in which the home across the street is facing on a different street.

3. Arrangement, configuration and minor changes to the architectural requirements may be approved administratively.

Subarea B

Subarea B is comprised of approximately 24.3 acres of residential housing located south of Subarea A and extending to existing homes in Amlin.

A. Permitted Uses: Residential housing composed of condominium homes accessed by private drives.

B. Density: A maximum of 90 residential units

C. Setbacks:

1. Building Setbacks

   a. The building setback from the boundary of Subarea A shall be 25', see plat.

   b. The front of the principal structure or porch shall have a minimum setback of 14' from the sidewalk.

   c. Where there is no sidewalk, the front of the principal structure or porch shall have a minimum setback of 14' from the back of the curb.

   d. A minimum distance of 12' shall be maintained between homes located side by side.

   e. A minimum distance of 45' shall be maintained between the primary structures of back to back homes. This distance shall be exclusive of patios or porches.

   f. A minimum distance of 20' shall be maintained between a home backing to the side of another home. This distance shall be exclusive of patios or porches.

   g. All front loaded garages must be setback a minimum of 2' behind the front façade. A porch shall be considered part of the front façade as long as it has a roof.

   h. For a side load or courtyard garage, the garage shall be setback a minimum of 14' from the back of curb or 14' from the sidewalk if one exists.

2. Patio/Outdoor Amenity Area Setbacks:

   a. Patios/outdoor amenity areas shall be setback a minimum of 10' from any Subarea B perimeter boundary, see plat.

   b. Patios/outdoor amenity areas shall be setback a minimum of 10' from any adjacent building, adjacent patio or private drive.

D. Landscaping Screening Patios & Amenity Areas: Landscaping and screening, including tree preservation, shall be in accordance with Dublin Code except as noted below or in the Section 1: Overall Development Standards

1. Condominium Homes Landscape:

   a. One tree per home shall be provided in the front yard.

   b. Landscaping shall be provided along the rear of homes B-1, B-2, B-5 and B-6 and B-31, B-32, B-35 through B-40 to provide additional screening between the single family lots and the condominium homes. A landscape plan shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

   c. Landscaping shall be provided along the sides of homes B-41 and B-54, and B-47 and B-48 to interrupt the view of the rear of the homes from the drive. A landscape plan shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

2. Patios/Outdoor Amenity Areas:

   a. Patios/Outdoor Amenity Areas shall not be greater than the width of the home and shall not extend greater than 15' from the rear building façade.

   b. Patios/Outdoor Amenity Areas may have screening, which shall be provided and approved at time of Final Development Plan.

   c. Privacy between outdoor amenity areas may be accomplished with building elements and/or other types of screening.

   d. Screening for outdoor amenity areas is permitted to a maximum height of 6 feet. Solid fencing may be permitted for the outdoor amenity area. Screening details shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

   e. Decks shall not be permitted as an outdoor amenity in this subarea.

E. Traffic, Access, and Pedestrian Connectivity:

1. A 4 foot sidewalk shall be provided on one side of the private drives as shown on the Site Plan – Sheet 4 and the Open Space and Pedestrian Connectivity Plan – Sheet 6.

2. Visitor parking, exclusive of parking in the driveway, shall be provided at a minimum of 1 space per every 4 units. If these spaces are parallel spaces, they may be 8 feet in width and 22 feet in depth, exclusive of the private drive. Applicant will work with staff to identify parking locations. Final locations shall be provided at time of the Final Development Plan.

3. The condominium homes shall be served by private drives contained within an access easement/reserve. These private drives shall be maintained by the Subarea B homeowners association and not the City of Dublin. Applicant shall work with the City Engineer to coordinate private drive signage to differentiate the private drives from the public streets.

4. Each driveway shall be a minimum length of 19 feet exclusive of sidewalks.

5. Shared driveways shall be permitted.

F. Miscellaneous Requirements:

1. All homes shall be limited to a maximum of 1 ½ stories. The building areas shown on the Preliminary Development Plan are conceptual and indicate the maximum building envelope for each home, exclusive of outdoor amenity area. Final home footprints shall be provided at time of building permit.

2. A conceptual building area diagram (similar to a plot plan) will be provided at time of building permit.

3. The applicant anticipates two locations for centralized mailboxes, which have been indicated on the Preliminary Development Plan. These will be coordinated with the post office and details shall be provided at time of Final Development Plan.

G. Architectural Requirements:

1. Architecture shall meet the requirements for the City of Dublin Appearance Code Section unless noted otherwise herein.

2. Character Statement:

   The architectural theme for the "Cottage" (condominium) homes will use the Carpenter Gothic vocabulary as the inspiration and character for this new neighborhood. Elevations will use varied details to add warmth and charm to the feel of the community. Stone foundations will be use to recall the field stone foundations of the old Ohio farmsteads. In lieu of wood planks for board and batten siding, the cottages shall use environmentally sustainable fibrous cement siding, a long-lasting material having the same look as wood but requiring minimal maintenance. Intricate and unique designs for trim boards, decorative headers and other architectural elements will be incorporated. The scale of building elements such as garage doors will be visually reduced and downplayed to become more human-scaled and paired with fenestration elements. To unify the unique architectural treatments (variations on a theme), each cottage will be painted white to allow the landscape elements to dominate the neighborhood.

Style	General Description	Carpenter Gothic	
Four-sided Architecture	All sides of a house shall display a high level of quality and architectural interest. The majority of a building's architectural features and treatments shall not be restricted to a single façade. Blank facades are not permitted. All sides of a house should be articulated through the use of bays, insets, balconies, porches, or stoops related to entrances and windows.	Elements of 4 Sided Architectural	Houses must contain at least two design in any combination elements on all sides. All private drive-facing elevation must contain at least three design elements, in any combination. Provided further that all of the following must be met: • At least one design element must be present in each equal one-half vertical division of the subject elevation; • At least one design element shall occur from the first floor level to nine feet above the first floor level; • If there is any upper wall area greater than 24 feet wide and nine feet high (measured at nine feet above the first floor level), at least one design element must be located predominately at least nine feet above the first floor of the elevation. Acceptable design elements include: • A door of at least 17 square feet in area. • A window at least six square feet in area with window trim of at least a minimum 3 ½" board. A set of adjacent windows, such as a double or bay window, count as one design element, however, horizontal bands of immediately adjacent window units count as one design element for every horizontal eight feet of run. • A chimney located along an exterior elevation • An articulated decorative gable vent of at least four square feet in area. • A porch. • A similar significant permanent architectural feature consistent with the style of the house. • Other appropriate design elements approved administratively.
Finish Building Materials		Primary	Vertical fibrous cement siding and panels with shall be required on all facades. Board and batten siding must be as follows: Batten spacing shall be a minimum of 6" with a minimum of 1" wide battens on all facades.
		Foundation	Cultured stone shall be applied from grade to a minimum height of 18" on all sides.
		Color	Primary façade and trim color shall be 2015 James Hardie Artic White., or other similar colors may be used subject to administrative approval.

Porches and Covered Stoops	A covered porch or covered stoop shall be required on all homes. A stoop shall be a minimum of 2' in depth and may be recessed. A porch shall be a minimum of 6' in depth. Porches and stoops shall be required to have one of the details shown on Exhibit B.	Form Options	Porches and stoops shall be simple, one story with low sloping roof and decorative elements as shown on Exhibit B. Larger more decorative porches with appropriate railing and detail.
		Columns	All porches shall have square columns. Columns shall be a minimum of 8" square and constructed of smart siding, or pvc.
		Railings	Railings shall not be required but if utilized must meet building code and be constructed of aluminum, smart siding, pvc or vinyl. Color to match columns
		Surface	Porch, stoop and walking surfaces may be concrete or pavers.
Windows and Doors		Window	Window style shall be white vinyl, single hung with 6/6, 9/9 with a minimum STC rating of 28. All windows shall have grid patterns used on all four sides of the home. Shutters or trim are required on all windows on all elevations. • Shutters if utilized shall be sized to fully cover the window and shall be operable or appear as such, and utilize appropriate shutter hardware including s-clips and hinges. Shutters shall be louvered, raised or flat paneled or board and batter and made of vinyl, PVC or Hardiplank. • Trim shall be required when shutters are not used. Trim shall be a minimum 3 ½" board around all sides of windows. Trim may be counted as a design element.
		Front Door	Door style shall be 2, 4, or 6 panel fiberglass, solid, of a single color door. Transoms with grids shall be optional above the front door with grids.
		Special Elements on Windows and Doors	Special trim elements shall be required on windows and doors located on facades facing private drives with detailing provided on Exhibit B. On facades without porches that face private drives a planter box shall be located below the window.
		Garage Doors	Garage doors will be recessed a minimum of 5" from the garage façade. Garage doors shall be a maximum of 16' in width and maximum 9' in height. Garage doors shall be fiberglass, insulated and 32 panels. The initial installation or replacement of garage doors must be a low-contrast color that is the same, or similar in hue and tonal value as the primary color of the house. Garage door trim shall match garage doors or the primary trim color of the house. Trim shall be 5" minimum. The percentage of the garage door opening to the overall front façade may not exceed 40%.

Roof		Pitch	Main architectural roof of house shall be 6/12 to 12/12 pitch. Porches shall be 4/12 to 12/12 pitch.
		Material	Main roof material shall be a 30 year dimensional asphalt shingle of weathered wood color. Porch roof material shall be a 30 year dimensional asphalt shingle of weathered wood color, standing seam metal colored black, silver or bronze.
Special Elements		Dormers	Gables over the garage roof area shall be 6/12 to 12/12 pitch with decorative elements on facia. See details shown on Exhibit B.
		Chimney	All exterior chimneys must extend full height, from ground and vertically past the eaves line. Cantilevered and shed-type chimneys are prohibited. Chimneys must be finished in cultured stone to match the stone foundation.
		Trim – Facia and Soffits	Front facades shall have a minimum 6" overhang constructed of smartsiding, fibrous cement or pvc. Any gable without an overhang shall have a minimum 1" x 8" facia constructed of smartsiding, fibrous cement, or pvc.
		Other	Simple gothic details shall be required on gable peaks and porches. Finials shall be optional. See Exhibit B.

3. Arrangement, configuration and minor changes to the architectural requirements may be approved administratively.

Subarea C

Subarea C is comprised of approximately 2.2 acres. This area is intended for the future right of way and extension of Churchman Road.

III. PROJECT PHASING

It is anticipated that the project will begin as soon as practicable and after all approvals are obtained. Phase 1 of Ballantrae Woods will start with overall mass excavation of the site, the extension of utilities, the stormwater management area, public roads, the single family lots in Subarea A and a portion of the site work/private drives necessary to sell condominium homes in Subarea B. The anticipated timing for the commencement of the project will be the first quarter of 2016. Depending on market conditions, the developer anticipates continuing with the balance of the condominium homes thereafter.

The ultimate timing and number of lots/units developed may be subject to change and will be determined at time of Final Development Plan.

BALLANTRAE WOODS- SINGLE FAMILY

SUBAREA -A

REPRESENTATIVE SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN ELEMENTS

OTHER APPROPRIATE ELEMENTS MAY BE APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

EXHIBIT A

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCITES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

F-1

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

F-2

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

F-3A

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

F-3

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-1

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-1
LEFT ELEVATION

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-1
RIGHT ELEVATION

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-1
REAR ELEVATION

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-2

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

M-2A

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

S-1

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

S-2

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS - SINGLE FAMILY

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOODS CHARACTER

SUBAREA -A

S-3

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCITES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

SUBAREA -B



REPRESENTATIVE CONDOMINIUM DESIGN ELEMENTS

OTHER APPROPRIATE ELEMENTS MAY BE APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

EXHIBIT B

JUNE 16, 2O15

ACOCK ASSOCITES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-1

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA -B

C-2

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-3

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-4

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-5

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-6

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS

BALLANTRAE WOODS- CONDOMINIUM HOMES

ILLUSTRATION OF CONCEPTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

SUBAREA - B

C-7

JUNE 16, 2015

ACOCK
ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTS

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
ILLUSTRATIVE SITE PLAN

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
1/1

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\00 Illustrative Site Plan.dwg Last Saved By: aflick 7/22/2015 11:10 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew 1/7/2015 2:53 PM
(No Xrefs)

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR

BALLANTRAE WOODS

REGIONAL CONTEXT MAP

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 300'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
1 /19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\01 Regional Context Map.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 8:15 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:40 AM (No Xrefs)

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
VICINITY MAP

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 200'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
2 /19

Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:40 AM (No
\\emhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\045\sheets\development plan\02 Vicinity Map.dwg Last Saved By: dflick, 7/16/2015 8:15 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew
Xref(s)

REVISIONS			
MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION	

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
3 /19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\03 Existing Conditions Plan.dwg Last Saved By: aflicik, 7/15/2015 8:15 AM Last Printed By: Flicik, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:40 AM (No Xrefs)



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
SITE PLAN

Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
4 /19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\04 Site Plan.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 8:14 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:41 AM (No Xrefs)



MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

REVISIONS

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
SUBAREA MAP

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 200'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
5/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\05 Subarea Map.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 8:15 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:41 AM (No Xrefs)



Open Space			
Reserve	Acres	Ownership	Maintained By
A	±1.9	HOA	MOA
B	±4.4	CITY	CITY
C	±2.2	CITY	CITY
D	±2.6	HOA	MOA
E	±1.5	COA	MOA
F	±3.0	CITY	CITY
L	±0.5	COA	COA
P	±1.7	CITY	CITY
Q	±0.3	HOA	MOA
R	±0.1	COA	COA
Total	±18.2/36.7% (Net of Churchman R.O.W.)		

HOA = HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION
COA = CONDOMINIUM OWNER'S ASSOCIATION
MOA = MASTER OWNER'S ASSOCIATION
CITY = CITY OF DUBLIN

LEGEND
4' SIDEWALK
8' SHARED USE PATH
(ALIGNMENT TO BE DETERMINED AT FDP)

OPEN SPACE REQUIRED

SITE AREA	49.6 x .02 = ±.992
LOTS/UNITS	135 x .055 = ±7.425
TOTAL REQUIRED	±8.417
OPEN SPACE DEDICATED TO CITY:	±11.3

KEY — MAINTAINED BY
COA
MOA
CITY

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
OPEN SPACE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY

EMH&T
Engineers • Architects • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
6/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\06 Open Space and Pedestrian Connectivity.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 2:14 PM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/15/2015 11:32 AM (No Xrefs)

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
LANDSCAPE CONCEPT

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
7 /19

\\CMHDATA01\Project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\Development Plan\07-08 Landscape Concept and Details.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/23/2015 8:25 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/15/2015 8:21 AM (No Xrefs)



Typical Condo Layout - Courtyard Garage
Scale: 1"=20'



Typical Condo Layout - Front & Side Load Garage
Scale: 1"=20'



4' Pedestrian Sidewalk
Scale: 1"=5'

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
LANDSCAPE DETAILS

EMHT
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
8/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\07-08 Landscape Concept and Details.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 8:24 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)



Churchman Road Section
A-A'
No Scale



Churchman Road & Glens at Ballantrae Section
B-B'
No Scale



Churchman Road & Glens at Ballantrae Section
C-C'
No Scale



Railroad Buffer Section
D-D'
No Scale



Key Plan
Scale: 1" = 300'

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
LANDSCAPE DETAILS

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
As Noted

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
9/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\07-08 Landscape Concept and Details.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 8:24 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)



Amlin Alley/Cramer Street
Conceptual Buffer
Scale: 1"=30'

*NOTE: THIS CONCEPT IS FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY. APPLICANT WILL WORK WITH STAFF TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE SCREENING AT REAR OF CONDOMINIUM HOMES BACKING TO CRAMER STREET AND PROVIDE PLAN AT TIME OF FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.



AmlinAlley/Cramer Street
Conceptual Buffer
Section A
No Scale



Amlin AlleyCramer Street
Conceptual Buffer
Section B
No Scale

Key Plan
Scale: 1" = 300'

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
LANDSCAPE DETAILS

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll-free: 888.775.5648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
As Noted

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
10/19



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
TREE SURVEY

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 60'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
11/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\11-14 Tree Survey and Notes.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/14/2015 12:42 PM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
TREE SURVEY

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 60'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
12/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\dwg\04Sheets\development plan\11-14 Tree Survey and Notes.dwg Last Saved By: dflick, 7/14/2015 12:42 PM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)

#	Common Name	Scientific Name	Size (dbh in)	Stems/tree	Condition	Indicator	Landmark
1	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	20	1	Good	Deciduous	
2	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	16	1	Good	Deciduous	
3	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	26	1	Poor	Deciduous	*
4	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	24	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
5	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10,17,15,17,15	5	Good	Deciduous	
~~6~~	~~Crabapple~~	~~Malus coronaria~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
7	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
8	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
9	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
10	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
11	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6,6,4	3	Good	Deciduous	
12	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
13	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
14	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
15	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
16	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
17	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
18	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
19	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
20	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
21	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
22	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
23	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
24	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
25	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
26	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
27	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	10,10	2	Fair	Deciduous	
28	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	9,8	2	Fair	Deciduous	
29	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
30	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	10,7	2	Fair	Deciduous	
31	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	10,9	2	Fair	Deciduous	
32	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
33	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
34	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Poor	Deciduous	
35	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	13,9	2	Fair	Deciduous	
36	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
37	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
38	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	10	1	Good	Deciduous	
39	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	56	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
40	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	62	1	Good	Deciduous	*
41	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
42	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
43	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	16	1	Fair	Deciduous	
44	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~45~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
46	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	14	1	Poor	Deciduous	
47	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	22	1	Poor	Deciduous	
48	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	16	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~49~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
50	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	9,9,7,7,8	5	Poor	Deciduous	
~~51~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
52	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
53	Bradford Pear	Pyrus calleryana	13	1	Fair	Deciduous	
54	Bradford Pear	Pyrus calleryana	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
55	Bradford Pear	Pyrus calleryana	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~56~~	~~Bradford Pear~~	~~Pyrus calleryana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
57	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	19,19,10	3	Poor	Deciduous	
58	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	16	1	Poor	Deciduous	
59	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	15	1	Poor	Deciduous	
60	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
61	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
62	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
63	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7,6,6	3	Fair	Deciduous	
64	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	11	1	Poor	Deciduous	
65	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
66	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
67	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	12,10,12,14	4	Poor	Deciduous	
68	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	25	1	Poor	Deciduous	*
69	Persimmon	Diospyros virginiana	14,11,12	3	Fair	Deciduous	
70	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	14,11,12,11,13	5	Fair	Deciduous	
71	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Poor	Deciduous	
72	Box Elder	Acer negundo	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
73	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	18,9	2	Fair	Deciduous	
74	Douglas Fir	Pseudotsuga menziesii	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
75	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	9,9	2	Fair	Deciduous	
76	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	
77	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	13	1	Dead	Deciduous	
78	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	15	1	Good	Deciduous	
79	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	15,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
80	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
81	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
82	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
83	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
84	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
85	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
86	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
87	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
88	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
89	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
90	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
91	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
92	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
93	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
94	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
95	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
96	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
97	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
98	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
99	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
100	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	15	1	Good	Deciduous	

101	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
102	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
103	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	
104	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
105	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	9	1	Poor	Deciduous	
106	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	12	1	Poor	Deciduous	
107	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
108	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
109	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
110	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
111	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Poor	Deciduous	
112	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
113	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
114	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
115	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
116	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	
117	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	16	1	Good	Deciduous	
118	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
119	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
120	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
121	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	12	1	Good	Deciduous	
122	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
123	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	22	1	Good	Deciduous	
124	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	14	1	Good	Deciduous	
125	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
126	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
127	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
128	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6,6,6	3	Good	Deciduous	
129	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
130	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
131	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
132	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
133	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
134	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8,8	2	Good	Deciduous	
135	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	13,15,15	3	Good	Deciduous	
136	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
137	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
138	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
139	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
140	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
141	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
142	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
143	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
144	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
145	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
146	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
147	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
148	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
149	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
150	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
151	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
152	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
153	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
154	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
155	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
156	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
157	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
158	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	8,8	2	Fair	Deciduous	
159	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	14	1	Fair	Deciduous	
160	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
161	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Poor	Deciduous	
162	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
163	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
164	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
165	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	10	1	Good	Deciduous	
166	Mockernut Hickory	Carya tomentosa	14	1	Good	Deciduous	
167	Osage-Orange	Maclura pomifera	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
168	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	15	1	Poor	Deciduous	
169	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
170	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	15	1	Poor	Deciduous	
171	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	14	1	Poor	Deciduous	
172	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	20	1	Good	Deciduous	
173	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
174	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	18	1	Poor	Deciduous	
175	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	16	1	Poor	Deciduous	
176	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
177	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
178	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
179	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
180	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
181	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	7,7,7,7	4	Fair	Deciduous	
182	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	9,7	2	Fair	Deciduous	
183	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	9,7,7	3	Poor	Deciduous	
184	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10,7,7,7	4	Fair	Deciduous	
185	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	18	1	Fair	Deciduous	
186	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
187	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	16	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~188~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~16~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
189	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	13	1	Poor	Deciduous	
190	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	6	1	Poor	Deciduous	
191	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
192	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	46	1	Good	Deciduous	*
193	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	11,13	2	Poor	Deciduous	
~~194~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~15~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
195	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	11,16,15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~196~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~197~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~198~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~199~~	~~Red Mulberry~~	~~Morus rubra~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
200	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	

201	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	15	1	Poor	Deciduous	
202	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	10	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~203~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~204~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~205~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~206~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~207~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~208~~	~~Red Maple~~	~~Acer rubrum~~	~~10,9~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
209	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	40	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
210	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
211	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
212	Washington Hawthorn	Crataegus phaenopyrum	29	1	Good	Deciduous	*
213	Washington Hawthorn	Crataegus phaenopyrum	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~214~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
215	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	10	1	Poor	Deciduous	
216	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	18	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~217~~	~~Red Mulberry~~	~~Morus rubra~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~218~~	~~Red Mulberry~~	~~Morus rubra~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
219	Red Maple	Acer rubrum	16	1	Good	Deciduous	
220	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	13	1	Good	Deciduous	

228	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
229	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8,6	2	Poor	Deciduous	
230	American Elm	Ulmus americana	15,12,8	3	Fair	Deciduous	
231	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	15,12,8	3	Fair	Deciduous	
232	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12,12,12,9	4	Fair	Deciduous	
233	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
234	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
235	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
236	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
237	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	42	1	Good	Deciduous	*
238	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
239	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
240	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
241	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
242	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
243	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
244	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	22	1	Good	Deciduous	
245	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	18	1	Good	Deciduous	
246	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	36	1	Good	Deciduous	*
247	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	24	1	Good	Deciduous	*
248	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	22	1	Good	Deciduous	
249	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	46	1	Good	Deciduous	*
250	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	23	1	Good	Deciduous	

271	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	16	1	Good	Deciduous	
272	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	12,12,13	3	Good	Deciduous	
273	Douglas fir	Pseudotsuga menziesii	10,8	2	Good	Coniferous	
274	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
275	Douglas fir	Pseudotsuga menziesii	13	1	Good	Coniferous	

281	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8,8,8	3	Fair	Deciduous	
282	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	12	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~283~~	~~Sugar Maple~~	~~Acer saccharum~~	~~24~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
284	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
285	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	14,10,9,9	4	Fair	Deciduous	
286	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	16	1	Fair	Deciduous	
287	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
288	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	52	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
289	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	12	1	Fair	Deciduous	
290	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
291	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
292	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	7	1	Poor	Deciduous	
293	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	52	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
294	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	10	1	Poor	Deciduous	
295	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
296	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	52	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
297	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
298	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
299	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	16	1	Fair	Deciduous	
300	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	

301	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
302	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	14	1	Fair	Deciduous	
303	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~304~~	~~Silver Maple~~	~~Acer saccharinum~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
305	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
306	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
307	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	14,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
308	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~309~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~310~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~311~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
312	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12,8	2	Fair	Deciduous	
313	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
314	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
315	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	
316	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	12	1	Fair	Deciduous	
317	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7,7,8	3	Fair	Deciduous	
~~318~~	~~Silver Maple~~	~~Acer saccharinum~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~319~~	~~Silver Maple~~	~~Acer saccharinum~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
320	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	20,17,7	3	Fair	Deciduous	
~~321~~	~~Silver Maple~~	~~Acer saccharinum~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
322	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	40	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
~~323~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~324~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~325~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~326~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~327~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~328~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~329~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~330~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
331	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	13,13	2	Fair	Deciduous	
~~332~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~333~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~334~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
335	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
336	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	16	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~337~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~338~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~339~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~340~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~341~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12,15~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
342	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12,15	1	Fair	Deciduous	
343	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	6,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
344	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~345~~	~~Black Cherry~~	~~Prunus serotina~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~346~~	~~Red Mulberry~~	~~Morus rubra~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~347~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~348~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
349	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7,7,8	3	Poor	Deciduous	
350	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	52	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
351	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	16,7	2	Fair	Deciduous	
~~352~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~353~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~354~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~355~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~356~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
357	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
358	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8,10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
359	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
360	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
361	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
362	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	45,45	1	Fair	Deciduous	*
363	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	10	1	Fair	Deciduous	
364	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	10,6	2	Poor	Deciduous	
~~365~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~366~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10,6~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~367~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6,6~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~368~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8,8,8,10~~	~~4~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~369~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9,7~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~370~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9,8~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~371~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~372~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~373~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~374~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~375~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~376~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~377~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~378~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~379~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~380~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~381~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~382~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~383~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~384~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~385~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~386~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~387~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~388~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~389~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~390~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~391~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~392~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~393~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~394~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~395~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~14~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~396~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~397~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~398~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~399~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~400~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	

Legend:

~~DEAD~~ Dead Trees

* Landmark Trees

Breaks in numbering of trees are the result of trees removed for Churchman Road Construction after Tree Survey was performed; or, trees to be removed for future Churchman Road Roundabout; or, trees outside of property limits.

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
TREE SURVEY NOTES

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
13/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\11-14 Tree Survey and Notes.dwg Last Saved By: afilcik, 7/14/2015 12:42 PM Last Printed By: Filcik, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)

~~401~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~402~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~403~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~404~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~405~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~406~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~407~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~408~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~409~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~410~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~411~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~412~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~413~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~414~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~415~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
416	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	6	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~417~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~418~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~419~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~420~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~421~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~422~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~423~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~424~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~425~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~426~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~427~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~428~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~429~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
430	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
~~431~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~432~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~433~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~434~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~435~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~436~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
437	Washington Hawthorn	Crataegus phaenopyrum	8,6,4	3	Good	Deciduous	
~~438~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10,9~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~439~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~440~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~441~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~442~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~443~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
444	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~445~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~446~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~447~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~448~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~449~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13,8~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~450~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~451~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
452	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	16	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~453~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~454~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
455	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	9	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~456~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~457~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~458~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
459	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	13	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~460~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~461~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~462~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
463	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
464	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	13	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~465~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
466	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	15,11,20,11	4	Fair	Deciduous	
~~467~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13,7~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~468~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~469~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~470~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8,4~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~471~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~472~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
473	Crabapple	Malus coronaria	12	1	Poor	Deciduous	
474	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	12	1	Good	Deciduous	
475	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	13,13,11,10	4	Good	Deciduous	
476	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	8,8,9	3	Good	Deciduous	
~~477~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~478~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
479	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
480	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
481	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
482	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	7,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
483	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	10,10	2	Poor	Deciduous	
~~484~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
485	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	12	1	Good	Deciduous	
486	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	23	1	Good	Deciduous	
487	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	11,8	2	Good	Deciduous	
488	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	20	1	Good	Deciduous	
489	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	17	1	Fair	Deciduous	
490	Red Oak	Quercus rubra	12	1	Good	Deciduous	
491	Red Mulberry	Morus rubra	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~492~~	~~Red Mulberry~~	~~Morus rubra~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
493	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	12	1	Good	Deciduous	
494	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	12	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~495~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~496~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~497~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
498	Black Cherry	Prunus serotina	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~499~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~13~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~500~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
501	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~502~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~503~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8,10~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~504~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~505~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~506~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~507~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~508~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~509~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~510~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
511	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
~~512~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~513~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~514~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~515~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~516~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~517~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~518~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6,8~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~519~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~520~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~8~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~521~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7,9~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~522~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~523~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~524~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
525	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
526	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	14,13	2	Good	Deciduous	
527	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
528	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
~~529~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
530	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
531	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	12	1	Fair	Deciduous	
532	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
533	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	9	1	Good	Deciduous	
~~534~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7,7~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
535	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	14	1	Good	Deciduous	
536	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
~~537~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
538	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	15	1	Good	Deciduous	
576	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
577	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
578	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
579	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	20	1	Fair	Deciduous	
580	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
581	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	6	1	Poor	Deciduous	
582	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
583	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	11	1	Fair	Deciduous	
584	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	9,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
585	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
586	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
587	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,7	2	Poor	Deciduous	
588	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
589	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
~~590~~	~~Eastern Cottonwood~~	~~Populus deltoides~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
591	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
592	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	13	1	Good	Deciduous	
593	Eastern Cottonwood	Populus deltoides	8	1	Good	Deciduous	
594	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
595	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,6	2	Good	Deciduous	
~~596~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~17~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
597	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Poor	Deciduous	
598	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
599	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
600	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,6	2	Fair	Deciduous	
~~601~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~12~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~602~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~10~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
603	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
604	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9,9,9	3	Fair	Deciduous	
605	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9,7	2	Fair	Deciduous	
606	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12,8,10,13,6,6	6	Fair	Deciduous	
607	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12	1	Poor	Deciduous	
~~608~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~6~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~609~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7,7~~	~~2~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~610~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
611	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
612	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	6	1	Poor	Deciduous	
613	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
614	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	25	1	Good	Deciduous	*
~~615~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
~~616~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~9~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
617	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	8,6,7,9	4	Fair	Deciduous	
618	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	11	1	Good	Deciduous	
619	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	10,7	2	Good	Deciduous	
620	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
621	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9,9,6,7,6,9,7,7	8	Fair	Deciduous	
~~622~~	~~Sugar Maple~~	~~Acer saccharum~~	~~7~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
623	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	7,7,9,7	4	Fair	Deciduous	
624	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
625	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	8	1	Fair	Deciduous	
626	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
627	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	14	1	Fair	Deciduous	
628	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	19	1	Fair	Deciduous	
629	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	13	1	Fair	Deciduous	
630	Slippery Elm	Ulmus rubra	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
631	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	10	1	Poor	Deciduous	
632	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
633	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9	1	Fair	Deciduous	
634	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Poor	Deciduous	
635	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9,10,10	3	Fair	Deciduous	
636	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	13,14	2	Fair	Deciduous	
~~637~~	~~White Ash~~	~~Fraxinus americana~~	~~11~~	~~1~~	~~Dead~~	~~Deciduous~~	
638	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Fair	Deciduous	
639	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
640	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Good	Deciduous	
641	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7	1	Good	Deciduous	
642	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	9,7,4	3	Good	Deciduous	
643	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	12,11,11	3	Fair	Deciduous	
644	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	6	1	Fair	Deciduous	
645	Silver Maple	Acer saccharinum	7,7	2	Fair	Deciduous	

Legend:

~~DEAD~~ Dead Trees

* Landmark Trees

Breaks in numbering of trees are the result of trees removed for Churchman Road Construction after Tree Survey was performed, or trees to be removed for future Churchman Road Roundabout, or trees outside of property limits.

Tree Survey Data:

Total Trees: 575 Trees (7,533 Caliper Inches)

(*Includes Landmark Trees: 19 Trees - 819Caliper Inches)

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
TREE SURVEY NOTES

EMHT
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Fax: 614.775.4800
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
14/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\11-14 Tree Survey and Notes.dwg Last Saved By: dflick, 7/14/2015 12:42 PM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM (No Xrefs)



LEGEND

Existing Utilities

ST	Storm Sewer
SA	Sanitary Sewer
W	Water
E	Underground Electric
C	Underground Communication
G	Gas
UGL	Underground Street Lighting
OHE	Overhead Electric/Communication

Proposed Utilities

STM	Storm Sewer
SAN	8" Sanitary Sewer Main
WM	Public Water Main
DWS	Private 4" Domestic Water Service
FPM	Private 8" Fire Protection Main

*Note: Churchman Road ROW is under design by the City of Dublin and is subject to change.

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR

BALLANTRAE WOODS
OVERALL UTILITY PLAN

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
15/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\15 Overall Utility Plan.dwg Last Saved By: sking, 7/14/2015 11:16 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:45 AM
(No Xrefs)



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
GRADING PLAN

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.EMH&T
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
1" = 100'

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
16 /19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\16 Grading Plan.dwg Last Saved By: sking, 7/14/2015 11:21 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:46 AM (No Xrefs)

Reserve Ownership and Maintenance Data

Reserve	Acres	Ownership	Maintained By
A	±1.9	HOA	MOA
B	±4.4	City	City
C	±2.2	City	City
D	±2.6	HOA	MOA
E	±1.5	COA	MOA
F	±3.0	City	City
G	±4.4	COA	COA
H	±0.9	COA	COA
I	±1.4	COA	COA
J	±3.2	COA	COA
K	±2.0	COA	COA
L	±0.5	COA	COA
M	±1.6	COA	COA
N	±1.3	COA	COA
O	±1.9	COA	COA
P	±1.7	City	City
Q	±0.3	HOA	MOA
R	±0.1	COA	COA
S	±0.7	COA	COA

HOA = HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION
COA = CONDOMINIUM OWNER'S ASSOCIATION
MOA = MASTER OWNER'S ASSOCIATION
CITY = CITY OF DUBLIN





TYPICAL 28' B/B PUBLIC STREET SECTION - (SINGLE FAMILY)
50' R/W
Not to Scale
Ballantrae Woods Drive



TYPICAL 23' B/B PRIVATE DRIVE SECTION - (CONDOMINIUMS)
(See Plan for Sidewalk Location)
Not to Scale

Inchcape Lane	**Frances Drive**
Foreland Lane	**Colling Drive**
Eva Loop N. & S.	**Glenapp Lane**

PAVEMENT LEGEND

1. Item 448, 1.25" Asphalt Concrete, Surface Course, Type 1, Pg 64-22, Medium Traffic. *
2. Item 448, 1.75" Asphalt Concrete, Intermediate Course, Type 2, Pg 64-22, Medium Traffic.
3. Item 301, 3" Bituminous Aggregate Base Course
4. Item 304, 6" Aggregate Base
5. Item 204, Subgrade Compaction
6. Item 653 – 3" Topsoil Furnished And Placed
7. Item 659, Seeding And Mulching

REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
PRELIMINARY PLAT

Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE: JULY 23, 2015
SCALE: 1" = 100'
JOB NO. 20140749
SHEET 17 /19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\17 Preliminary Plat.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 7/15/2015 3:02 PM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:46 AM (No Xrefs)



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
BALLANTRAE WOODS
AUTOTURN EXHIBIT

EMHT
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 Toll Free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
As Noted

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
18/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\18 Auto Turn Exhibit.dwg Last Saved By: sking, 7/14/2015 11:23 AM Last Printed By: Flicik, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:46 AM
(No Xref(s))



REVISIONS

MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCHOTTENSTEIN HOMES

CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO
PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR

BALLANTRAE WOODS

SINGLE FAMILY LOTS WITH
TYPICAL 3 CAR GARAGE

EMH&T
Evans, Mechwart, Hambleton & Tilton, Inc.
Engineers • Surveyors • Planners • Scientists
5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, OH 43054
Phone: 614.775.4500 toll free: 888.775.3648
emht.com

DATE
JULY 23, 2015

SCALE
As Noted

JOB NO.
20140749

SHEET
19/19

\\cmhdata01\project01\20140749\Dwg\04Sheets\development plan\1 Typical Lot Exhibit.dwg Last Saved By: aflick, 5/14/2015 10:55 AM Last Printed By: Flick, Andrew, 7/22/2015 10:47 AM
(No Xrefs)

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JULY 9, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. Ballantrae Woods **Cosgray Road**
15-004Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**
Preliminary Plat

Proposal: Rezoning of 49.6 acres from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae, Subarea S) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the potential development of the site with up to 138 units and approximately 17acres of open space. The site is located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations.

Applicant: Schottenstein Homes, represented by Linda Menerey, EMH&T.

Planning Contact: Devayani Puranik, Planner II

Contact Information: (614) 410-4662, dpuranik@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Victoria Newell moved, Cathy De Rosa seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan application because it complies with the rezoning/preliminary plat criteria and the existing development standards with in the area, with nine conditions:

1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan;
2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association;
3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing;
4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office;
6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection;
7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text;
8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B; and
9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

*Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

JULY 9, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. Ballantrae Woods
15-004Z/PDP/PP

Cosgray Road
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Preliminary Plat

RESULT: A recommendation of approval will be forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Steve Stidhem	Absent

MOTION #2: Victoria Newell moved, Chris Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Preliminary Plat application because it complies with the preliminary plat criteria, with one condition:

1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to the City Council submittal.

*Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: A recommendation of approval will be forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Bob Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Steve Stidhem	Absent

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Devayani Puranik

Devayani Puranik
Planner II

Chair Newell said there were three cases eligible for the consent agenda this evening (Case 1, 2, and 3). She said they will take the cases in the order of Case 3, 2, 1 and 4. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes will reflect the published order.]

1. Ballantrae Woods **Cosgray Road**
15-004Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**
Preliminary Plat

Ms. Newell said the following application is a request to rezone 49.6 acres from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae, Subarea S) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the potential development of the site with up to 135 units and approximately 18 acres of open space. She said the site is located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks and the application is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations. She said the Commission will therefore need to make two motions.

Devayani Puranik said there was a copy of correspondence that was received from one of the neighbors distributed tonight on a green paper. She gave a quick update from the last review. She said the last review was on May 21st where the application was tabled. She said that Final Development and Final Plat will be the last step of the PUD rezoning process following this review.

Ms. Puranik said the parcels north of Rings Road are located within Washington Township (Amlin) and to the east of the site is Ballantrae development (Woodlands and Links). She said Churchman Road is a connector between Cosgray and Rings Road which is the eastern boundary of the site.

Ms. Puranik said the development text has been updated and reorganized with added details. She said many of the conditions are now resolved through the new development text including the Commissioner comments such as architectural elements, details, and materials. She added that the applicant has also provided illustrative examples of the details within the text. She said the Preliminary Development Plan and Plat have been updated to include the open space, maintenance responsibilities, setbacks and reserves information. She added that the tree survey is also updated to reflect the changes from the Churchman Road right-of-way project. She said the traffic study has been updated and the applicant is working with staff to address some of the additional comments received from the Franklin County Engineers office.

Ms. Puranik said there are no major updates regarding the Site Plan since the last review. She explained that the site is approximately 49 acres with the northern portion of the site proposed for 45 fee simple single family homes and the southern portion for 90 detached condominium units served by private drives. She said they are providing about 18 acres of open space out of which 11 acres will be dedicated to the City when they are required to provide approximately 8.4 acres.

Ms. Puranik said the comments from the last review focused on the architecture of the single family homes where the Commission wanted to see more details and materials and the revised development text includes those details. She added that the illustrative examples include details and elements of traditional architecture such as brackets, gable details, garage details, and the façade renderings show a lot of those details such as stone and planter boxes reflected as well. She said the text provides a list/menu of the details that will be handed to potential buyers with all the options for the windows, doors, stoops, porches, gables, and garages that they will be able to choose.

Ms. Puranik said there are no major updates regarding the architecture of the condominium units with it being the carpenter gothic farmhouse character which was appreciated during the last review. She added that the details are included in a similar list of details within the development text.

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, said the only remaining issues were the architectural details for the single family homes. He said that their updated text clearly includes all of the items that were illustrated on the drawings.

Ms. Puranik said based on the analysis the proposal meets the review criteria with nine conditions:

1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan;
2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association;
3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing;
4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office;
6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection;
7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text;
8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B; and
9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

Ms. Puranik said the Plat now reflects all the setbacks, reserves and all the information that was missing before including a maintenance table. She said the application meets all the review criteria. She concluded by recommending approval for the Preliminary Plat with one condition:

1) That any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to the City Council submittal.

Mr. Miller asked about the treatment between the alley and the property line.

Ms. Puranik said a fence was proposed in the first proposal which is now replaced with a landscape wall and the design will be finalized with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell asked for public comment.

David Patch said he lives in One Miranova in Columbus, Ohio, but owns two lots and houses in Amlin. He mentioned that his mother lives at the corner of Churchman and Rings Road. He said he likes Amlin character and has only seen the revised plans for the proposed development that day and talked with staff and the applicant. He said that some of the issues are addressed but he has not seen any additional details. He added that the proposed development character looks beautiful. He said he owns two of the lots where units 75 or 76 are within the proposed development and has an interest in the property.

Mr. Brown said he read the letter that Mr. Patch sent and most of the concerns were addressed and he hoped he would be pleased with the revisions.

Ms. Newell said the architecture has changed especially for the single family residences with submission. She asked if these are the actual designs of the front of the buildings as shown on the new representations and pictures in the text.

Mr. Coppel clarified that the development text requires the incorporation of the design elements as illustrated.

Ms. Newell said the only comment she has is about the window placement on elevation F1 and the placement, windows, detailing, and structure over the garage, which can be improved, but thought the building elevations have improved overall.

Ms. De Rosa agreed with the improvements and appreciated the harmonious blending with the condominium architecture with improvements.

Ms. Newell said she likes the simplification of materials such as siding and stone on the collection of buildings which

Ms. Newell said this is a consent case and asked the applicant if they agreed to the following nine conditions:

1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan;
2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association;
3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing;
4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office;
6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection;
7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text;
8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B; and
9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan application, with nine conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Newell said the Preliminary Plat has one condition and asked if there is agreement to the condition:

1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to the City Council submittal.

Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes, agreed.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Preliminary Plat with one condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission

Planning Report

Thursday, July 9, 2015

Ballantrae Woods

Case Summary

Agenda Item	1
Case Number	15-004Z/PDP/PP
Proposal	Rezoning of 49.6 acres from R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae, Subarea S) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for 138 single family dwellings (45 fee simple lots and 90 detached condominium units) and approximately 17 acres of open space.
Request	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan under the Planned District provisions of §153.050, and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a preliminary plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 152.
Site Location	East of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks.
Owner/Applicant	Schottenstein Homes, represented by Linda Menerey, EMH&T.
Case Manager	Devayani Puranik, Planner II | (614) 410-4662 | dpuranik@dublin.oh.us
Planning Recommendation	***Approval of the rezoning with preliminary development plan with nine conditions; and*** ***Approval of the preliminary plat with one condition.***

In Planning's analysis, the rezoning with preliminary development plan proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria and the existing development standards within the area. The proposal for the preliminary plat complies with the preliminary plat criteria and a recommendation to City Council for approval of both requests is recommended.

Preliminary Development Plan Conditions

1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan.

2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association.
3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing.
4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit 82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office.
6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection.
7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text.
8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B.
9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

<u>Preliminary Plat Condition</u>

1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to the City Council submittal.



City of Dublin

15-004Z/PDP/PP
Ballantrae Woods
Cosgray Road

0 250 500
Feet

Facts	
Site Area	49.6 acres (2.2 acres for Churchman Road right-of-way)
Zoning	R, Rural District and PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District (Ballantrae, Subarea S)
Surrounding Zoning and Uses	All land to the east and north is zoned PLR, Planned Low Density Residential as part of Ballantrae. Adjacent development includes the Woodlands at Ballantrae, a multiple family development. The farmland west of Cosgray Road is zoned R, Rural District. Land between the CSX railroad tracks and Cosgray Road west of the property line, and land to the south are part of the Amlin, Washington Township outside of City of Dublin corporate boundary.
Site Features	• The site is currently being farmed. • The site includes a large mature tree cluster in the northern portion. There are also mature trees along the west property line and the railroad tracks. Landmark sized trees are also present on the property. • Parcels to the west and south are currently in Amlin, Washington Township. The character of the area is village residential with limited commercial uses along Rings Road. • CSX railroad tracks run along the west property line. These tracks are currently very active.
Site History/Case Background	2001 The northern portion of the site is part of Ballantrae, Subarea S, approved in 2001 as a 70-unit condominium development with specific development standards for setbacks, landscaping, street network and architecture. 2014 Planning encouraged the applicant to reach out to the Ballantrae neighbors in anticipation of the proposed development. The applicant conducted a neighborhood meeting on September 9, 2014. This Planning and Zoning Commission informally reviewed a proposal on September 18, 2014. The Commission was in support of the overall concept and provided positive feedback regarding the proposed uses and density. Commissioners generally supported the proposed architecture, and while they did not see a need to integrate the condominiums with the single family homes, the Commission preferred a greater degree of connectivity. Commissioners also requested a larger open space for the condominium

Facts

area and emphasized the importance of screening from the railroad tracks and providing more access to the open spaces.

A 2.7 acre annexation was approved in 2014 to include a portion on land along the south property line from Washington Township to the City of Dublin.

2015
A Concept Plan was presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 2, 2015. The Commission supported the concept and provided positive feedback regarding the proposed uses and density. The Commission was concerned about the fence treatment for the property line between the proposed development and the Village of Amlin to the south, and suggested a buffer that would be visually appealing from both sides of the property line.

The Commission members noted the architectural concepts presented at the informal review meeting had better character and details. The Commission asked the applicant to reconsider the elevations to include the elements from the concepts presented at the informal review. The predominant use of natural materials, such as stone, was supported and the Commission found it gave a unique, quaint character to the condominium concepts presented at the informal review. The Commission members recommended revising the layout adjacent to the roundabout for consistent setbacks.

Additionally, the Franklin County Engineer's Office voiced their concerns about the quiet zones for the CSX railroad tracks and stated that establishing quiet zones is a multijurisdictional process and takes a long time to implement. Franklin County maintains the Rings Road railroad crossing, and is not currently in support of a quiet zone. The Commission members provided additional input on the issue to ensure the developer makes the significant use of the railroad clear to the potential buyers at the time of sales.

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the rezoning application and preliminary development plan and preliminary plat on May 21, 2015. The proposed architectural theme (Carpenter Gothic) for the condominium subarea was appreciated. The Commission cautioned the applicant to reflect the architectural details represented on the illustrative concepts in the development text to ensure the intent of the quality and unique architecture is met. The Commission suggested the applicant reconsider the architectural styles for the single family subarea to balance the quality of the architecture in terms of materials and details with the condominium subarea. The Commission mentioned that the project is on the right track

Facts	
	but would benefit by revising the development text and single family subarea architecture. Majority of the conditions recommended for the details to be finalized prior to the final development plan are reciprocally resolved.
Update	Since the Planning and Zoning Commission review on May 21, 2015, the applicant has been working with staff to address the Commission's concerns. In summary, the applicant has made the following revisions: • Updated the standards of the development text to incorporate many of the conditions previously proposed as development requirements. • Addressed Commission discussions in terms of architectural elements, materials, and architectural details by revising the development text and providing illustrative examples for both subareas. • Updated the preliminary development plan and preliminary plat to include open space and maintenance responsibilities and setback information. • Updated the tree survey to include the changes due to Churchman Road right-of-way. • Updated the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) to address the comments by the City Engineer. The applicant is working with the staff to finalize the developer participation for the construction of the Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road construction project. In addition, Engineering staff contacted the Franklin County Engineer's Office to explore the vehicular connection to the right-of-way to the south. The Franklin County Engineer's Office supports the shared-use path connection to the right-of-way within their jurisdiction in Amlin, but not a vehicular connection.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Process	Rezoning to a Planned Unit Development requires approval of a development text to serve as the zoning regulation; the Zoning Code covers all requirements not addressed in the development text. A preliminary development plan is also required. The proposed development text establishes a new Planned Unit Development District (Ballantrae Woods). The text creates three subareas and includes development regulations that apply to the entire site.
Proposal	This proposal includes 45 fee simple single family lots and 90 detached condominiums on 49.6 acres with a net residential density of 2.72 du/ac.
Community Plan *Future Land Use*	The recommended future land use for this site is Mixed Residential Medium Density which is described having greater walkability and pedestrian orientation at a village scale, at a density of up to 5.0 dwelling units per acre. This would permit up to 245 units for this site. The proposed 135 units are at a density of 2.72 units per acre. 

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Community Plan *Southwest Area Plan (Avery to Railroad Focus Area)*	 This site is within the Southwest Area Plan (Avery to Railroad Focus Area) which recommends that the Village of Amlin's unique and quaint character be protected as adjacent development occurs. Future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area. Construction of the Rings Road bypass (Churchman Road) will also provide an opportunity to create clear gateway features that will further signify the special importance of the village area. The Plan recommends establishing a roadway network that preserves existing character. The existing rural roadway network will not be sufficient to meet future needs of the area. The Plan notes that regional and local connectivity is needed to maintain Dublin's standards for quality, and considers visual character of the roadway with variable width medians, greater setbacks, landscape treatments and other techniques to maximize aesthetic benefit.
Layout	 The site is divided in three subareas. The 45 units in the north section are single family fee simple ownership (Subarea A) and the remainder as condominium ownership (Subarea B). Subarea C, with 2.2 acres, will be dedicated for the Churchman Road right-of-way. Access to Churchman Road is from three points, with two public streets, one near the center of the site opposite Marmion Drive in Ballantrae and the new Ballantrae Woods Boulevard serving Subarea A. The third access point is a private drive at the south end of the site serving Subarea B. Approximately 18.1 acres of open space is within the setbacks of the adjacent roads, a central green area in Subarea B, and the buffer along the railroad tracks. A larger portion of the site in the northwest corner is heavily wooded and is incorporated into a reserve. A stormwater retention basin is proposed at the southern tip of the site.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Development Details	Subarea A This portion of the development is 23.1 acres with 45 fee-simple single family lots in the north of the site. The development text does not require a minimum lot size or depth. The required lot width is a minimum of 60 feet at the building line. Front and rear yard setbacks are 20 feet and the required side yard setback at 5 feet. Subarea B This subarea is 24.3 acres with 90 detached condominiums units in the south portion of the site. The front yard setback is 14 feet for from the sidewalk or from the back of curb if there is no sidewalk. A minimum of 12 feet is required between homes and 45 feet is required between the backs of homes, exclusive of patios. Sides of homes adjacent to the rear of a home are required to be 25 feet. Subarea C Subarea C is 2.2 acres provided for right-of-way for Churchman Road
	Setbacks The text requires a 100-foot setback along the railroad tracks, with the exception of condominium lots 65 and 73 that are permitted a setback of 70 feet due to property boundary irregularities. Condominiums adjacent to single family homes and condominiums along the south boundary must maintain a 25-foot setback, while patios are required to maintain a minimum of 10 feet from single family homes and the southern property line. A 100-foot setback is required along Churchman Road. Lots 1 and 3 are shown at a 45-foot setback from Churchman Road on the preliminary plat. Previously, this decrease was addressed in the Churchman Road Open Space section. The applicant has since updated the development text to address staff concerns.
Architecture	The Commission had expressed concerns about the proximity of the proposed development to the active at-grade railroad tracks and the impact (visual, sound, vibrations) on day-to-day life of the residents during the previous review. The updated development text includes the 100 feet railroad buffer with minimum 6 feet tall mounds, trees and fence to mitigate the visual impact and also the windows sound transmission class (STC) level details. Staff recommends exploring further the use of the windows with higher STC levels to match the recommended levels for sound abatement for the windows facing the railroad tracks. The Planning and Zoning Commission also expressed concerns regarding the architectural styles for the single family subarea and urged the applicant to balance the quality of the architecture in terms of materials and details with

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	the condominiums shown at the May review. The Commission appreciated the Gothic Carpenter style proposed for the condominium subarea but had cautioned the applicant to translate the details from the graphics in the development text. As a result of the Commission's concerns, architectural standards make up the most significant update to the development text. The applicant has detailed permitted home styles and provided illustrative examples of these styles, specific design elements details. The development text includes architectural requirements for each Subarea as well as conceptual character drawings to illustrate the intended character. Details are discussed below.
Architecture Subarea A	The updated development text includes character descriptions indicating that the home design will follow the "Traditional" vocabulary. This provides for visual consistency by use of natural tone colors, materials, and traditional design elements. These design elements will also help to tie the Subarea A with Subarea B while maintaining their separate identity. The buildings will incorporate at least two or three design elements as listed in the development text along all four sides, depending on the building location (four-sided architecture). Either covered stoops (2 feet deep) or porches (6 feet deep) with specific decorative elements such as square columns, railings, and surface are required on all homes. Porch roof material is a 30 year dimensional asphalt shingle of weathered wood color or standing seam metal, colored silver, black or bronze. Permitted cladding materials are vertical or horizontal fiber cement siding, cultured stone, and board and batten siding. Cultured stone when used as a cladding material must encompass entire design element. Cultured stone is required from grade to minimum 24 inches along all sides. Specific natural tone color palate is used for the homes in Subarea A. All windows have either shutters or minimum 3½ inch trim. The illustrative concepts show the windows with grids along all elevations. This detail should be incorporated within the development text, minimum for the street facing façade. The front doors are single solid color fiberglass doors. All homes have minimum two-car garages. All garages are set 2 feet behind the front façade. A front load garage has a minimum driveway length of 19-feet exclusive of sidewalks. No more than two garage doors are located on the same plane. Garage doors have options for either decorative elements above or decorative brackets or transoms. The garage door color will complement the main structure.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	The proposed standard for the garage door opening for front facades is maximum 45% for a two-car garage and a maximum of 50% for a three-car garage. The Appearance Standards of the Zoning Code limit the percentage for garage door openings of more than 18 feet to 36 feet to 45%. Planning previously recommended the garage door openings meet the Appearance Standards. However, the Planning and Zoning Commission agreed with the deviating from the Appearance Standards where the third car garage has a greater setback. Permitted roofing materials include 30-year dimensional asphalt shingles with weathered wood color. Roof slopes is minimum of 6/12 except for the porch roofs, which is consistent with the Appearance Standards. Other special elements include dormers, chimneys, trim, fascia, and soffits. An architectural diversity matrix is provided for the front building facades for the single family homes. Outdoor amenities such as patios are permitted.
Architecture Subarea B	The architectural vocabulary for the “Cottages” in Subarea B is from the Central Ohio farmhouses, a style known as “Carpenter Gothic.” The character of Subarea B varies from single story to a maximum of one and a half stories in height. The material palette is consistent with the Subarea A and includes fiber cement siding and boards and batten siding. Cultured stone is required along all sides for up to 18 inches from grade. A specific shade of white will be used for all the cottages to provide backdrop for the landscaping colors. Either covered porch or stoop is required for all homes with specific standards for roof form, columns, railings and surface. All windows have either shutters or minimum 3½ inch trim. Special trim elements as listed on the illustrative concepts are required for windows facing the private drive. The homes facing the private drive without porches will have a planter box below the window. The illustrative concepts show windows grids along all elevations. This detail should be incorporated within the development text, at least for the private drive facing façade. The front doors are single solid color fiberglass doors. All homes in this Subarea have minimum two-car garages with front-loaded or auto-court access. All front-loaded garages are set a minimum of 2 feet from the front façade and have a minimum of driveway length of 19 feet from the back of the sidewalk or the curb where no sidewalk is present. Side

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	load or auto-court garage are set back 15 feet from the sidewalk or the curb where no sidewalk is present. Garage doors will have options for either decorative elements above or decorative brackets or transoms. The garage door color will complement the main structure. A maximum 40% of garage door opening will be allowed for the front façade. Garage doors will include decorative elements such as windows, panels, hardware, etc. Shared driveways are permitted. Permitted roofing materials include 30-year dimensional asphalt shingles with weathered wood color. Roof slopes is min. 6/12 except for the porch roofs which is consistent with the Appearance Standards. The development text is updated to include the architectural and decorative design elements to address the concerns of the staff from previous review. Outdoor amenities such as patios are permitted. The patios may not be greater than the width of the home and are limited to 15 feet deep. Building elements and/or other types of screening will be used for the privacy between outdoor amenity areas. Maximum 6-foot in height solid privacy fencing. Screening details will be finalized with the final development plan. The development text does address decks as an outdoor amenity. In other developments in the city it has been challenging for staff to monitor the uniformity of outdoor amenities for condominium units. To prevent this the applicant should clarify the development text by specifically not permitting decks.
Traffic & Access	The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) as required for a rezoning application. The TIS should be finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing. Churchman Road along the eastern property line will connect to Cosgray Road to the north and Rings Road to the south, with roundabouts at the Rings Road and the Cosgray Road intersections as future phases. All three entrances include left turn lanes with the construction of Churchman Road. The north half of Churchman Road between Cosgray Road and Marmion Road is expected to be constructed first, followed closely by the south half, which includes a roundabout at the intersection of Rings Road. A roundabout at the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is not yet programmed for construction, and may not be needed for several years, however, necessary right-of-way must be dedicated by the applicant. Other infrastructure improvements will be needed based on the final traffic study and will be finalized with the final development plan or in a separate infrastructure agreement.

Details	Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
	The applicant should continue to work with the staff to finalize financial contributions for off-site intersections to the satisfaction of City Engineer. The proposed road for Subarea A, will be a public street (50-foot right-of-way) while those in the Subarea B will be private drives (43-foot easements). Private drives will be maintained through the forced and funded condominium association fees established by the developer. The private streets are adequate to handle the traffic requirements in Subarea B. The proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road must be modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northernmost intersection. At the informal review in September 2014, the Commission members expressed their concerns regarding the private drives with a preference to provide public streets for the entire development. Council has also expressed concerns in the past regarding the future maintenance costs borne by a limited number of property owners. The 90 condominium owners will be responsible for maintaining the private drives for Subarea B through a forced funded association. The applicant has included a requirement in the development text to distinguish the private drives by using different street sign colors or other appropriate means as permitted by Engineering. The network of private drives provides access to residential units and open spaces. To improve the connectivity for the emergency response, incident management, and more access points, Staff had recommended a vehicular connection between Inchcape Lane and Eva Loop South. However, the layout is not changed based on the Planning and Zoning Commission preference for not having a private drive abutting the green buffer area and units 65 and 73 at the May 21st review. A pedestrian access is available by a shared-use path toward Rings Road to the south. A shared-use path connection will be constructed along the north side of Churchman Road. The applicant is responsible for constructing a shared-use path along the roundabout and west property line in accordance with the City of Dublin Bikeway Plan, accessing the open space (Reserve B), and continuing along the railroad buffer area along the west property line. Engineering contacted the Franklin County Engineer's Office regarding the pedestrian and, potentially vehicular, connections to their existing right-of-way in Amlin. The County supports the shared-use path, but not a vehicular connection. A network of sidewalks is also shown on the plan within both subareas. All public streets have sidewalks on both sides of the street; all private drives

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	have sidewalks along at least one side. The applicant is responsible for constructing the sidewalk on the south side of Churchman Road along the site frontage. The applicant needs to coordinate the sidewalk connection between unit 82 and Cramer Street in Amlin with the Franklin County Engineer's Office. The site plan also shows the parallel parking spaces for the visitor parking within Subarea B at the ratio of 1 per 4 units. These spaces do not appear to be in convenient, useable locations. In addition, head-in parking should be the preferred parking arrangement, especially along the narrower sections of private drives. The applicant has agreed to work with the staff to finalize the parking locations for the final development plan. Centralized mailboxes locations and related parking for Subarea B will be detailed with the final development plan.
Open Space	 Approximately 18.1 acres of open space are created with 11.2 acres dedicated to the City. Reserve 'B' is 4.5 acres in Subarea A and has existing mature tree cover and paths. This reserve will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin. Four acres are provided in Reserves 'C' and 'P' in the setback from the railroad. These will have combination of mounds, trees, and fence to buffer and screen from railroad tracks. A shared-use path provides north-south connectivity. These reserves will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin to ensure public safety and allowing public use of the shared-use paths. Reserves 'D' – 'F' witth 7.5 acres, including the Churchman Road setback at the front of the site. The entry feature designs and open space frontage along Churchman Road will be similar in character to the adjacent Ballantrae development. Large vertical stone slabs will be incorporated at entries along Churchman Road and augmented with trees and landscaping. The rock/rubble wall sections with informal character will also be installed for the Churchman Road frontage. Reserve 'F' includes a stormwater detention area. This reserve will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin. Reserve 'L' is a .5 acre central green in Subarea B intended as a passive recreational space.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	A buffer is provided along the south property line at the rear of the condominium homes abutting Cramer Street - the Amlin alley. A concept has been provided which includes a combination of shrubs, deciduous, and evergreen trees. The buffer design may benefit from using a more diverse palette of plant materials. The applicant has agreed to work with staff to identify the appropriate combination of plant material for the buffer for final development plan. The two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B should be incorporated within the maintenance responsibilities by appropriate homeowners association.
Landscaping and Screening	Detailed landscaping plans will be provided for Churchman Road setback and entry features, Amlin buffer, railroad tracks buffer, and Cosgray Road setback at the final development plan. These areas will have a combination of mounds, trees, fences, dry stacked walls, and other features. In addition, staff is recommending no-mow areas for the east side of railroad track buffer abutting the railroad property line to augment the buffer. This possibility will be reviewed with the final landscaping plan. In addition to the setback and buffer landscaping, screening and landscaping is provided between single family homes and detached condominium units. The landscaping is also provided for the back-to-back detached condominium units to augment the outdoor amenity area screening. Landscaping and screening is provided where rear yards of the detached condominium units are visible from the drives. The edge of the stormwater pond will be enhanced with sections of rock outcroppings and landscaping beds. Detailed landscaping plans will be finalized at the Final Development Plan.
Tree Preservation	Trees in good condition within the reserve will be preserved. Additional trees will be preserved and added within the buffer areas as required by the Code. The Tree Survey is updated to reflect the changes due to Churchman Road right-of-way. The proposal includes the preservation of two landmark trees, a 56-inch Silver Maple and a 62-inch Red Oak near the southern border with Amlin, between Units 78 and 79 in Subarea B. The construction protection zone should but at least 25 feet on all sides of these trees, but, at a minimum should be at the drip line for the tree canopy. The applicant has agreed to work with staff to identify the protection zone for critical root zone at construction.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Utilities	Sanitary Sewer This site proposes that public sanitary sewer main be installed with this development to serve the residential units. This network of sewer will ultimately connect into an 8-inch sanitary sewer main located near Marmion Drive. Water Access to public water will be provided by connecting to two 8-inch water mains that will be constructed with the Churchman Road Improvements. New public water main and fire hydrants are proposed to be installed to serve the Single Family section of the development. The condominium section of the development will have access to public water through a master metered private water and fire protection system. Stormwater Management Stormwater management is provided by creating a retention basin located at the southeast portion of the site. In addition, public storm sewer is proposed along with storm structures placed at appropriate intervals throughout the development.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Process	Section 153.050 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval for a rezoning/preliminary development plan (full text of criteria attached). Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.
1) Consistency with Dublin Zoning Code	**Criterion met:** This proposal is consistent with the purpose, intent and applicable development standards of the Zoning Code requirements except as modified in the proposed development text.
2) Conformance with the adopted plans	**Criterion met:** The Community Plan shows the land use for the site as Mixed Residential Medium Density at a typical density of up to 5.0 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development is within the recommended density. The proposed development establishes the pedestrian and bike connections as recommended in the Bikeway Plan and Southwest Area Plan. All attempts have been made to preserve existing tree cover and woodlots as recommended in the Southwest Area Plan.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
3) Advancement of general welfare and orderly development *Condition 1*	**Criterion met with Condition:** This proposal is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding areas. The streets and paths within the development contribute to the walkability and connectivity. The Churchman Road setback will be enhanced with the landscaping similar in character to the Ballantrae development. The preserved woodlot and central green open space will provide active and passive recreational opportunities to the residents and general public. The proposed development is adjacent to the very active at-grade railroad tracks. The applicant should make this fact clear to the potential buyers during sales. The applicant is providing certain sound transmission class (STC) level windows but encouraged to use windows and exterior walls with higher STC ratings for sound abatement for the side of the homes facing the railroad tracks.
4) Effects on adjacent uses	**Criterion met:** The development is appropriately located within the city and is compatible with existing development while providing housing options.
5) Adequacy of open space for residential development	**Criterion met:** The applicant has provided sufficient open space for this community and the city as a whole. An appropriate mix of passive and active open spaces has been programmed. A demarcation will be provided between the lots and public paths accessing the open space to ensure that the paths are for public use. The central green is provided as an amenity to the residents in Subarea B as do the woodlot in Subarea A.
6) Protection of natural features and resources *Condition 2*	**Criterion met with condition:** The development text requires tree replacement per Code. The lots and proposed infrastructure are laid out to preserve tree stands, and natural vegetation to the greatest extent possible. The two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B should be incorporated within the appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate homeowners association. The applicant is proposing to preserve other landmark trees in good condition.
7) Adequate infrastructure	**Criterion met:** Infrastructure is adequate interior to the site and the applicant is providing stormwater management facilities.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
8) Traffic and pedestrian safety *Condition 3, 4, 5, 6*	**Criterion met with Conditions:** The site plan shows a network of public streets and private drives. The Subarea A will be served by the public streets and Subarea B will have private drives. The proposed street and path system will accommodate adequate pedestrian and bike circulation so that the proposed development provides for a safe, convenient and non-conflicting circulation system for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. The TIS has been updated since the last review but should be finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's Office concerns prior to the City Council hearing. Other infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements should be resolved based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The applicant needs to coordinate the sidewalk connection between unit 82 and Cramer Street in Amlin with the Franklin County Engineer's Office. The proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road must be modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection.
9) Coordination & integration of building & site relationships	**Criterion met:** The proposed development coordinates the relationship of proposed lots and the sensitive areas of the site. A majority of the homes have open space access within 400 feet. The buildings are laid out in order to protect as much existing tree cover as possible. Staff is concerned about privatizing the open space with the single family homes backing to the preserved woodlot. The applicant has agreed to clearly mark the public shared-use path entrances to this open space to open it to the public.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
10) Development layout and intensity	**Criterion met:** This proposal does not hinder the orderly development of land within the city. The density, use, setbacks, open space and public infrastructure are consistent with the Community Plan. The proposed layout includes streets in accordance with City standards including shared-use paths and sidewalks as well as adequately sized tree lawns. Street connectivity as discussed in the Community Plan is provided within the development and to surrounding neighborhoods and with the inclusion of the street connections and the possible future Rings Road connection. The proposed streets and paths within the development and the connections proposed contribute to the walkability and connectivity.
11) Stormwater management	**Criterion met:** Adequate provision is made for stormwater management, storm drainage within and through the site to maintain usual and normal swales, water courses and drainage areas.
12) Community benefit	**Criterion met:** The proposal will provide additional housing options**.** The detached homes intended to target empty nesters provides an additional housing option that can encourage multi-generational living within Ballantrae. The proposal preserves many of the natural features on this site, and the proposed layout creates an attractive public realm by providing ample open space. The Churchman Road setback will be enhanced with landscaping complementing the existing Ballantrae character. Pedestrian and vehicular connections will improve after the Churchman Road-Cosgray-Rings connector is completed.
13) Design and appearance *Condition 7, 8*	**Criterion met with conditions:** The fee simple single family homes (Subarea A) are designed according to "Traditional" design style. The natural tone color palate and additional design elements provide visual and design consistency. The proposed architecture for the detached condominiums (Subarea B) creates a cohesive neighborhood with specific architectural details. The development text should include illustrative concepts showing the window grids along all elevations for the facades facing the streets or drive. The development text is silent on decks as an outdoor amenity. The development text should specifically prohibit decks.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
14) Development phasing	**Criterion met:** The anticipated timing to begin construction is the first quarter of 2016. Phase 1 will start with mass excavation, the extension of utilities, stormwater management, public roads, the single family lots in Subarea A and a portion of the site work/private drives necessary to sell condominium homes in Subarea B. Depending on market conditions, the developer anticipates continuing with the balance of the condominium homes thereafter.
15) Adequacy of public services	**Criterion met:** There are adequate services for the proposed development existing and/or planned. Necessary public improvements will not impair the existing public service system for the area.
16) Infrastructure contributions *Condition 9*	**Criterion met with Condition:** The applicant should continue to work with the City to finalize the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project for the final development plan. The applicant should continue to work with the Engineering staff to finalize financial contributions for off-site intersections based on the final traffic study.

Recommendation	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Approval	In Planning's analysis, this proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria and the existing development standards within the area. Approval with six conditions is recommended.
Conditions	1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels than provided are explored for sound abatement prior to the final development plan. 2) That the two landmark trees between unit 78 and unit 79 within Subarea B are incorporated within appropriate open space reserve and maintenance responsibilities by appropriate home owners association. 3) That the traffic study is finalized to address additional staff and Franklin County Engineer's concerns prior to the City Council hearing. 4) That the infrastructure improvements and financial contributions to off-site improvements will be made based on the final traffic study and incorporated into the final development plan or a separate infrastructure agreement, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. 5) That the proposed sidewalk connection to Cramer Street next to unit

Recommendation	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
	82 is coordinated with the Franklin County Engineer's Office. 6) That the proposed mounding near the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road is modified to accommodate intersection sight visibility for the northern most site intersection. 7) That the windows with grids detail is incorporated within the development text. 8) That the decks are not permitted as an outdoor amenity for Subarea B. 9) That the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibility for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project is finalized for the final development plan.

Details	**Preliminary Plat**
Plat Overview	The proposed preliminary plat subdivides 49.7 acres of land into 45 fee simple single family lots (Subarea A), 7 reserves for the detached condominium residential units (Subarea B), 9 reserves of open space, and 2.2 acres for Churchman Road right-of-way. All streets within Subarea A are public with a typical residential section with 50-foot rights-of- way. Sidewalks are included on each side of the street. Rights-of-way for Churchman Road and Ballatrae Woods Drive are provided. Private drives within Subarea B have 43-foot access easements. Sidewalks are included on one side of the drives. The preliminary plat shows existing conditions, proposed development sections and includes setback requirements, lot depths and widths as well as the appropriate development standards. The plat includes the open space acreages with ownership and maintenance responsibilities.

Analysis	**Preliminary Plat**
Process	The Subdivision Regulations identify criteria for the review and approval for a plat. Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.
Plat Information and Construction Requirements *Condition*	**Criteria met with Condition:** The applicant has included all necessary information and construction requirements appropriately on the preliminary plat. The applicant should ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat, are made prior to City Council submittal.

Analysis	**Preliminary Plat**
Street, Sidewalk, and Bike path Standards	**Criteria met:** The plat includes a street section for the streets. Sidewalks and shared-use paths are provided throughout the development.
Utilities	**Criteria met:** The plat makes appropriate provisions for utilities.
Open Space Requirements	**Criteria met:** The Subdivision Regulations require the dedication of 8.41 acres of open space based on the size of the site and the maximum number of units proposed. The plat includes Reserves “B,” “P,” and “F,” which range from railroad buffer to large open space with the woodlot. Approximately 11.3 acres within these reserves will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin. There is total of 18.1 acres of open space. The Churchman Road open space (setback) will be owned and maintained by the home owners association.

Recommendation	**Preliminary Plat**
Approval	This proposal complies with the preliminary plat criteria and a recommendation to City Council for approval of this request is recommended with one condition.
Conditions	1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat, are made prior to City Council submittal.

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

MAY 21, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

3. Ballantrae Woods **Cosgray Road**
15-004Z/PDP/PP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**

Proposal:	A single-family residential development on 49-acre site to include up to 138 units at a total density of 2.78 units per acre and approximately 17 acres of open space. The site is located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Chapter 152, the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicant:	Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes.
Representatives:	Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale and Linda Menerey, EMH&T.
Planning Contact:	Devayani Puranik, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4662, dpuranik@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to **TABLE** this application for a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat was **TABLED**.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II

Mr. Stidhem inquired about a barrier or fencing between this and the housing on the behalf of the residents. Mr. Hunter responded there are no plans for a fence.

Mr. Schottenstein said the entry feature has not been designed yet and promised to work with the neighbors. He said they are considering a community garden, also where the residents can plant their own vegetables on individual plots.

For another resident, Mr. Stidhem asked what stage is this designed because it appears to have been presented to the residents as a final design and it is clearly not the case.

Mr. Hunter confirmed this is a Concept Plan.

Mr. Brown said the Commission is representing the residents but at the same time, it is an opportunity to create a nice buffer between you and what Hyland-Croy Road is going to be. He encouraged the residents to keep an open mind and work with the developers. He encouraged the developers to work with the residents particularly on the entrance and what it means to their neighborhood; it is not just their backyard, this is the entry because of the situation with ODOT.

Ms. Salay encouraged the developers to be sensitive to the neighbors considering your own home and what you would want to live next to.

The Chair called for a five minute recess.

3. Ballantrae Woods — Cosgray Road
15-004Z/PDP/PP — Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development District for a single-family residential development on a 49-acre site, east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks. She said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat for the lots, reserves, and rights-of-way.

Devayani Puranik presented the site and said this development has been reviewed several times. She noted a Cosgray Rings Road connector is proposed along eastern property line - Churchman Road. She said east of Churchman Road is the Links at Ballantrae, a multi-family development and further east is the Woodlands at Ballantrae. She said parcels along southwest corner of the property are within Washington Township in the Village of Amlin, which is outside of the Dublin corporate boundary. She described the character of this area as village residential with limited commercial activity along Rings Road where a pizza shop is located. She said the existing tree cover is present within the northern section and mature tree rows are present along the railroad tracks.

Ms. Puranik stated this case was presented informally to the PZC on September 18, 2014. She said the Concept Plan was presented on April 2, 2015. She said today's stage is the first formal stage to establish a Planned Unit Development. She said depending on the Commission action this evening, it could move forward to City Council for final approval.

Ms. Puranik explained there are two zoning classifications for this site. She said the northern portion of the property is zoned PLR-Planned Low Density Residential and the southern portion of the site is zoned R-Rural.

Ms. Puranik presented the Future Land Use/Southwest Area Plan maps. She said the Community Plan recommends "Mixed residential- Medium Density" for this site, which is meant for walkable, pedestrian

oriented, village scale development up to 5 units per acre for density. She said this site is also part of the Southwest Special Area Plan, which recommends preserving Amlin's quaint character as adjacent development occurs. She noted future residential development should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and surrounding area. She said the plan provided recommendations for preserving the natural features and integrating woodlots and fencerows in the design. She said the plan also recommends establishing a roadway network that preserves existing character and regional and local connectivity should be maintained.

Ms. Puranik presented the Concept Plan presented at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting in April, 2015. She noted the total acreage for the site is 51 acres; out of which 4.6 acres are for Churchman Road right-of-way. She said the Commission suggested a buffer and consistent setbacks. She said the comments also focused on the architecture requesting more detail.

Ms. Puranik said the applicant is proposing a combination of single-family and detached condominium development for this site. She pointed out the northern section: Subarea A, which consists of 23.1 acres for 45 fee-simple single-family lots and Subarea B is 24.3 acres for 90 detached condominium lots within the southern section. She said the proposed density is less than presented in April. She said the density is now 2.72 units per acre and the approximate open space is 18.1 acres. She said Subarea C is the right-of-way for Churchman Road, south of Marmion Drive. She said the family homes will be served by a public street and the condominiums will be served by private drives. She said a 100-foot buffer is proposed from Churchman Road. She pointed out the main stormwater retention pond. She said the existing wood lots around the northern portion of the site will be preserved.

Ms. Puranik presented the main revisions from the April 2nd plan including the revisions for Lots 43 and 44, single-family road alignment, and tree preservation. She said there are now consistent setbacks from Cosgray Road and Churchman Road. She said a condominium unit was removed to preserve two landmark trees.

Ms. Puranik presented the Open Space Plan and noted the sidewalk connectivity and bike path connections. She said the applicant is proposing three different homeowner associations: Subarea A (HOA), Subarea B (COA), and Master's Owners Association (MOA). She pointed out that the street frontage area is to be owned and maintained by the MOA, the blue area is the City's responsibility that includes the stormwater pond as well as the railroad track buffer, and the center half acre is the condominium green to be maintained by COA. She said the private drives within the condominium subarea are also to be maintained by the COA.

Ms. Puranik presented the conceptual Landscape Plan with details to be finalized with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Puranik presented the architecture for the single-family, fee-simple homes in three different styles: Traditional, Craftsman, and Victorian. She said the primary materials proposed are cementitious siding, and secondary materials are stone/brick. She noted three-car garages will be included in some of the elevations.

Ms. Puranik presented the proposed architecture for the condominiums, which is Carpenter Gothic – Farmhouse character. She described the front elevations with gable accents, porches, brackets, etc. which include several details. She said all condominium units will have two-car garages. She said the primary material is cementitious siding but it is white and used in different forms and textures.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, introduced the project team. She explained they are down three units overall, the density is down a bit, and the open space up. She said they heard the last time that the proximity to Cosgray Road was an issue and where they made the biggest change. She said they eliminated the mid-

block crossing. She said a lot of details need to be worked out with the bikeway plan. She indicated they created a more green buffer by Amlin.

Ms. Menerey said through this process they have received a lot of feedback. She said the architecture section now contains a diversity matrix. She said there are still 14 conditions, 11 of which are pretty simple but wish to discuss three or four of those left.

The Chair invited public comment.

Mike Wallen, 5016 Foxtail Drive, Hilliard, Ohio, said he is the administrator for Northwest Chapel and owns property that borders this proposal. He requested more trees and bushes along Amlin as it is an alleyway.

Ms. Puranik went over the 16 criteria for the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Review. She said the first 9 are either met or met with condition, #10 is about private drives and have been a concern of the Commission specifically about the financial burden on residents for maintenance. She said 11 and 12 are met but #13 is Design and Appearance, which have not been met: single-family architecture; materials for both products; and the third car garage exceeds the width for frontage. She said the applicant has provided three options for three-car garages that fit the lot but does not fall within the restricted 45% requirement. She said criteria 14 – 16 are met. She explained that Staff believes that criteria 10 and 13 are very important to the review of this application. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to resolve those issues, but at this point Planning is recommending disapproval of the case.

Ms. Puranik said the Preliminary Plat meets criteria so approval is recommended but it is related to the Development Plan.

Ms. Puranik presented the 14 possible conditions:

1) That the proximity to active railroad tracks is clearly stated in writing during the sales process and the options to install windows and exterior walls with higher STC levels for sound abatement are explored prior to the Final Development Plan;

2) That the applicant works with Staff to identify the appropriate combination of the plant material and landscaping elements for Amlin and railroad buffer;

3) That the applicant works with the Staff to finalize the access points through the woods and the shared-use path alignment by taking updated right-of-way lines for Cosgray Road roundabout and Churchman Road into considerations;

4) That the applicant works with the Staff to finalize the appropriate dimension of the protection zone and fence details to protect the landmark trees' critical root zone during construction;

5) That the tree survey and replacement plan is updated to reflect the changes due to Churchman Road construction for the Final Development Plan;

6) That the traffic impact study is updated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to a City Council hearing of the rezoning to address the comments listed by the City Engineer;

7) That the applicant differentiates the private drives visually by using different street sign colors or other appropriate means as permitted by Engineering;

8) That the applicant works with Staff to finalize locations for additional visitor parking in Subarea B;

9) That the applicant provides a vehicular connection between Inchcape Lane and Eva Loop to improve connectivity;

10) That the two fee-simple, single-family lots (#44 and #45) south of Ballantrae Woods Drive adjacent to the detached condominiums are replaced with the detached condominiums for consistent setback and streetscape at the main entry point to the development;

11) That the setback deviations for all lots and screening details for outdoor amenities, are clarified in the development text in the appropriate section for each Subarea;

12) That Subarea A architecture and Design Matrix be revised to show a dominant masonry front façade for all homes, and that these details and accents illustrated on the conceptual elevations for single family homes and detached condominiums are clearly reflected in the architectural design guidelines;

13) That the three-car garage percentage in Subarea A is limited to 45% per the Appearance Standards as opposed to 50% per the development text; and

14) That the applicant work with the Staff to finalize the construction plans, right-of-way dedication, and responsibilities for Phase 2 and 3 of the Churchman Road project.

Chris Brown inquired about the three-car garage percentage. Ms. Puranik confirmed the calculation was based on the percentage of the front elevation.

The Chair asked the applicant if they wanted to do the presentation on the architecture.

Paul Coppel, co-owner of Schottenstein Homes asked to respond to the 14 conditions and the three reasons for Planning's recommendation of disapproval and part of that will include a full presentation of the architecture. He said the first big issue had to do with the private drives in the condominium section. He said he does not know of any condominium project that has public streets. He explained their whole concept in that area is to have the yards, buildings, and roofs maintained by the condominium owner's association. He said the drives will be built to Dublin standards and the association will be fully funded. He said they have prepared a full maintenance budget for the drives as well as replacements to establish proper reserves. He stated they are fine with conditions 1 through 8 and 9 is the vehicular connection. He said they have completed a concept to do that but believe what they have proposed is better. He said with his plan, the units are siding to the railroad area and the only way to connect would be to have the units front on the railroad area and believe that is an inferior plan. He addressed condition 10 and said they could return those to two condominium units. He said conditions 11 and 14 are fine. He said George Acock will address conditions 12 and 13.

George Acock said in order for these condominiums to be a success, they all needed to have the same materials, details, and a consistency of quality throughout the whole condominium development. He said this was important unlike the single-family homes where the residents will want the homes custom built to their preferences. He said there will be a lot of options available to make the homes unique and individualized. He explained continuity of architecture will be seen with the condominiums by using a Carpenter-Gothic style, which came about with the scroll saw. He said this saw easily mass-produced interesting architectural details in the 1800s. He indicated this can all be replicated today on the computer generated machines to keep the cost down. He said the applicant raised the first floor of each of the units about 18 inches so the stone base can be emphasized and they ended up with a very delightful cottage look. He added with all this detail, the eye does not go directly to the garage and softens the scale and emphasizes the other elements. He noted for the single-family garages, they have exceeded the garage requirement by three feet, which equates to 48% instead of 45% but the driveway does not relate to the third car garage as those are set back and with proper landscaping, that third

garage will not be noticeable in a couple of years. He said they have included the third garage because they found it is in demand in today's market. He indicated it is an important element to have for additional storage.

Mr. Coppel said the remaining issue on the single-family units was the predominance of stone. He explained the applicant is going to offer stone options on all of those homes but in a style a little differently than the neighboring communities. He indicated the applicant may have caused confusion with staff by listing cementitious siding as the predominant material but they are amenable to amending that statement to say "and/or stone". He said they are going to allow the market to dictate it.

Mr. Acock said from an architectural standpoint what is important is that the stone is used for protruding elements that would make a nice statement to the street. He indicated it would be great to have an all-stone house but people are not going to pay that much money.

Cathy De Rosa requested the price points for the condominiums.

Mr. Coppel responded they anticipate three different condominium sizes: the smallest starting slightly under $300,000; the middle size being $325,000; and the largest with all options will be offered at $375,000. He said the single-family homes will be low $300,000 and average around $400,000.

Amy Salay inquired about the size of the homes.

Mr. Coppel said the smallest home size is 2,200 square feet and the largest is around 3,100 square feet or possibly up to 3,500 square feet.

The Chair invited public comment since she had allowed the applicant to speak again. [Hearing none.]
Chris Brown said the Commission can get hung up on brick and stone. He said Carpenter-Gothic is one of his favorite styles of all times. He said he is slightly refreshed from what he normally sees in Dublin; it is a nice change of pace. He indicated it would make a very quaint condominium community and would like to see it carried through to the single-family side. He stated he is not opposed to cementitious siding as a material and not opposed to the percentages; he likes the stone foundations. He said he understands the market demand for three-car garages. He said it is important that it be balanced with the entire façade of the house. He said it should not appear as the main presentation on the façade. He said three-car garages in Dublin are hard to come by. He said he can be supportive if it is tucked back and treated in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Brown addressed condition 9; he said that connection is not crucial. He said for condition 10, he believes it is more appropriate to have Lots 44 & 45 be part of the single-family homes and not the condominiums and then Lots 43 and 42 balance off with Lot 44. Overall, he said the conditions staff recommends do not really strike him as deal breakers at all. He concluded he loves the architecture that is a nice change of pace from the typical development.

Ms. De Rosa stated she also very much liked the architecture of the condominiums. However, she said she did not quite feel the same about the single-family homes. She requested more prescribed brickwork or percentages of brick. She said she likes the continuity of the condominiums but would like to see the single-family illustrations with brick. She indicated richness is missed on the single-family homes and the absence of detail will make if feel more monotonous than quaint. She said she likes the latest version of Lots 44 & 45. She said she likes the change made on the first few parts of the lot; it is a nice improvement. She said she did not understand where the parking is for the condominiums.

Ms. Menerey said on the old plan, they showed parallel spaces on streets; Staff asked them to remove those but she will work through that at the Final Development Plan.

Ms. De Rosa said she did not feel strongly either way about the connector.

Mr. Brown said he agrees with Ms. De Rosa. He indicated the single-family architecture does not stand out as much as the condominiums. He said some improvements can be done using the proper proportions. He said sometimes gables get lost in elevations as opposed to renderings and he would like to see more of the intent in the final plan.

Bob Miller stated he was in total agreement with Mr. Brown and Ms. De Rosa.

Ms. Salay said she was in agreement as well. She said she would like to see more stone on the single-family homes; she does not like the all siding all the time look. She indicated she loved the architecture for the condominiums. She inquired about the detail and thought it would require a lot of painting and upkeep over the years. She asked if that will be the responsibility of the HOA.

Victoria Newell responded that it would occur about every ten years.

Ms. Salay noted the window boxes on a couple of these and no landscaping but if the stone foundation can be seen in some places that would be important. She said she loved the detailing of the plant material in the window boxes but does not know how you make that happen because somebody will need to water the plants. She concluded the details improved this proposal.

Steve Stidhem concurred; he really liked the window boxes with flowers. He said he visited the area and asked if Cosgray Road could be connected to Rings Road as an option.

Tina Wawszkiewicz answered that is a public Franklin County right-of-way and not incorporated into the City of Dublin. She explained that at the time the applicant annexed the piece of land adjacent to that, they asked if there would be vehicular connectivity and indicated that would not be their preference.

Mr. Stidhem asked for clarification on who made that statement. Ms. Wawszkiewicz said Franklin County Engineers Office.

Mr. Stidhem said he agreed with 46 and 45. He said the biggest issue was the train sound. He emphasized some sound proofing into the buildings and suggested clear communication for the prospective buyers.

Ms. Newell said she really liked the architecture of the condominiums in the design sketches presented. As an architect, she said there are some really great looking details and scroll work and does not want to see that get lost when it gets constructed. She said the text is not really protecting is currently. She inquired about how some of those features were actually going to be constructed on the elevations. She said she likes buildings when they can be constructed all in one material and is not against cementitious siding. After reviewing the text and the illustrations, she said she was left with the impression that the single-family homes would be predominantly siding, also. She indicated she would be fine if developed with the same character, if that is what the applicant is going to stick with. She suggested other elements to be offered besides cementitious siding and stone. She said the designs need to go further and text needs to reflect that as well. She said she is fine with the locations of the single-family Lots 44 & 45; it makes a much nicer entry and makes this feel more like a community. Unless there is an issue with fire access or engineering, she said the connection is not better for the residents. She said it would take away buffer space. She stated she liked the improvement at the other entry drive. She concluded she was still in favor of this project.

Mr. Coppel said the applicant heard what the Commission said about the single-family homes and thought maybe the problem was with the way they presented the elevations. He believes the Commission

will be pleased with their submission at the Final Development Plan. He asked that the application be moved forward with the conditions and that a recommendation of approval be made to City Council.

Ms. Newell said if her vote was requested tonight with the text in front of her, she would vote no. She said she likes this project and would like to see it move forward but is not comfortable voting when the architectural details are not there. She said sometimes the property is not developed and then the Commission is stuck with that text.

Ms. Salay agreed and asked if the Preliminary Plat could be moved along. The Chair said it could not be moved forward.

Ms. Salay said she would like to see this application tabled.

Mr. Miller agreed.

Ms. De Rosa said the applicant is so close to achieving a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Menerey requested suggestions as to how the Commission would like to see the development text refined. She said it would be really helpful if they could spend a few minutes discussing what specific things would make this Commission more comfortable with the current verbiage.

Ms. Newell said an example of a community of all siding is Seaside in Florida. She said it is completely sided with very unique buildings that have a lot of great architectural detail. She said she would be happy if the applicant came up with a community that was using a mix of stone and siding to develop that character. She said pictorial examples were needed for the text. She said if there are to be central features of the single-family homes, show those examples and that those options are available.

Ms. Menerey said Avondale Woods text includes a sketch showing some of the gable detailing and detailing on the stoop cover.

Mr. Brown said he agreed with what Ms. Newell was saying. He said the example of Seaside, FL is one of his favorite places and one of the first really great form-based architecture zoned communities that was so successful. He said there is such a great feel to the entire community and they defined it in their text in conjunction with diagrams. He recommended the applicant pin it down; establish and define a character and it will be easy to agree to.

Ms. Menerey said they choose to table the application if that is the choice of the Commission.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Brown made a motion, Ms. Salay seconded, to table this application for a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Communications
Ms. Husak said there are some projects coming up that might prompt a second meeting in July. She said there is only one meeting currently scheduled for that month. She said the proposed dates are July 16th, or 21st and requested responses via email.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:51 p.m.

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

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF ACTION

APRIL 2, 2015

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

1. Ballantrae Woods **Cosgray Road**
15-004CP **Concept Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and feedback for a residential development on 49.6 acre site to include 138 units at a total density of 2.78 units/acre. The site is located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks.
Request:	Review and non-binding feedback of a concept plan under the provisions of the Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicant:	Schottenstein Homes, Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale LLC.
Planning Contact:	Devayani Puranik, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4662, dpuranik@dublin.oh.us

RESULT:

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____
Devayani Puranik
Planner II

"eclectic" to "balanced" and to correct page 9, second paragraph from the bottom and insert "Fly ash composite" before the word siding.

Motion and Vote
Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the March 12, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Chair Newell briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She determined that due to the request of citizens that Case 2, NE Quad, Subarea 3, Treplus Communities would be heard first. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

1. Ballantrae Woods **Cosgray Road**
15-004CP **Concept Plan**

The Chair said the following Concept Plan application is a request for review and non-binding feedback for a residential development on a 49.6-acre site to include 138 units at a total density of 2.78 units per acre located east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks.

Devayani Puranik presented the site and noted the surrounding neighborhoods. She said in November, 2014, an annexation was approved to include this portion of the land from Washington Township to the City of Dublin. She said the northern portion of the site is currently part of the Ballantrae PUD, Planned Unit Development. She said the northern portion of the site was approved in 2003 for 70 condominium units. She said the southern portion of the site is zoned Rural District. She said a future application intends to combine these two zoning categories into one single PUD. She noted the existing tree cover and tree rows shown on the aerial view. She said the character of the surrounding area is residential and limited commercial activity along Rings Road.

Ms. Puranik presented the Future Land Use map from the Community Plan, which recommends "Mixed Residential-Medium Density" as a walkable, pedestrian oriented, village scale development for a density of up to five units per acre. She explained this site is also part of the Southwest Area Plan, which recommends preserving Amlin's quaint character as adjacent development occurs. She added future residential development should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area. She said the plan provided recommendations for preserving the natural features and integrating woodlots and fencerows in the design. She said the plan also recommends establishing a roadway network that preserves existing character and that regional and local connectivity should be maintained.

Ms. Puranik provided an overview of the Planned Unit Development Process. She said this application was informally reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 18, 2014. She explained the current Concept Plan stage is similar to the Informal Review and if the application were to move forward, the next step would be the Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Puranik presented existing photos of the site, which is still being farmed as seen from Woodlands of Ballantrae. She noted the tree rows along the railroad tracks as well as a street that is used as an alley by the Village of Amlin residents.

Ms. Puranik showed the proposal as presented to the Commission in September of last year. She said it included two subareas, one for single-family lots and one for detached condominiums. She reported the Commission was supportive of the overall concept of the plan. She said comments were made on the open space to be more usable and accessible to the entire development as well as public streets for the benefit of the entire development.

Ms. Puranik presented a map outlining Subareas A and B for this proposal, which is very similar to what was presented and reviewed last year and noted the future 2.2 acres for the Churchman Road right-of-way. She explained Subarea A is about 22.5 acres with 46 fee-simple-ownership, single-family lots and Subarea B is 25 acres with 92 detached condominium units resulting in a density of 2.78 units per acre. She said similar to last year, a 100-foot buffer from Churchman Road is proposed and noted the few lots where there are changes as well as the 100-foot setback along the railroad tracks. She said a six-foot fence is proposed along the southern property line and the buildings sit about 25 feet from that property line. She added a large stormwater basin is proposed at the southeastern tip of the site.

Ms. Puranik presented a map showing the Open Space and Circulation Plan for the site. She pointed out that public streets are proposed for Subarea A and private drives are proposed for Subarea B. She said approximately 17.5 acres of open space is proposed that includes the tree cover area, buffers, setbacks, stormwater and central green area. She indicated the 4.5 acre tree cover area will be owned and maintained by the City of Dublin and the rest will be the responsibility of the Homeowner's Association. She noted the red lines indicate the sidewalks for pedestrian connectivity and will be provided along both sides of the street for Subarea A and on one side for Subarea B. She said the blue lines are for the proposed bike paths, which enter the development along Marmion Drive, cross the drive to enter the open space, and continue along the railroad track buffer to the south. She added the applicant is also proposing paths through the tree preserve, which are marked with yellow dotted lines.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, Ohio 43054, reiterated this was reviewed by the PZC last September and after receiving feedback and putting in a lot of work the applicant thought it was time to present to the new Commission before moving to the next step. She complimented Devayani for her overview of the proposal. She said the top part was part of Ballantrae but the whole piece will be developed. She reported the applicant completed the annexations next to Amlin. She said it will also facilitate the Churchman Road extension from Cosgray Road to connect to the portion of the roadway provided with the Links of Ballantrae development. She said this piece is not part of the City of Dublin schools but rather Hilliard City Schools.

Ms. Menerey said the preservation of the woodlot and a lot of open space has been shown on a number of different plans. She reiterated there is a 100-foot setback that is continuous from the railroad tracks within the single-family section and how that can be treated has been described in the development text. She said there is a transition to Amlin, which has changed in that area from what was shown before. She said it is proposed as one community with two distinctive products.

Ms. Menerey noted the single-family portion, which feels like a typical Dublin project, a curbed linear street, a public street, typical lot sizes, but with architecture that is a little different. She pointed out the fixed entrances and at the mid-point entrance there is the ability to have detached condominiums on one side and single-family homes on the other. She said the upscale condominiums are geared to someone that has lived in Dublin and wants to move within Dublin but downsize. She said every unit is 400 feet or less from open space. She said the connectivity of paths is good and the entire community is linked. She reiterated the density number is well-below what is recommended in the Community Plan and the open space is just under 40% and does not include all the green space behind each of the units. She said it is well-defined in the development text as to who maintains the various green spaces.

Ms. Menerey referred to the Conceptual Architecture drawings and said George Acock has been working with EMH&T on these and has new drawings to present tonight, which are an evolution of what is in the Commission's package.

Claudia Husak said materials now being presented were not included in the Commission's packet and was not reviewed by Staff but since this is a Concept Plan, they can be distributed.

Ms. Menerey showed elevations with various material options. She said in the detached condominium area, the applicant wants to have a more cottage look of one or one and a half story units. She said in the single-family homes, they would do a ranch unit but believe it will be predominantly two-story homes. She said when Mr. Acock made his presentation last fall the theme of this neighborhood would be more reminiscent of historic neighborhoods. She provided a review page-by-page showing the various materials and color options including brick, stone, stucco, wood siding, and Hardi-plank with the primary materials as stone and cementitious siding. She said a diversity matrix was included in the development text. She concluded by saying she welcomed feedback from the Commission.

Ms. Puranik said in the Planning Report, there is a list of items that Staff would like to address if this application were to move forward to the Preliminary Development Plan and she presented a few highlighted issues on a slide. She said Staff is recommending:

- The dead end turnaround at the west end of Inchcape Lane should be eliminated and a connection provided through to Eva Loop for improved connectivity.
- Lot 3 in Subarea A should be removed to maintain a consistent setback along Churchman Road and avoid proximity to the roundabout.
- Unit B-86 should be removed to avoid a very awkward maneuvering to enter the garage/driveway.
- The City Engineer has determined that pedestrian and shared-use path crossings should be moved to intersections and not cross at mid-block.
- The Bikeway Plan shows a connection through the site on the east side of Cosgray Road, from Churchman Road to the railroad tracks; this route should be included in the plan.

Ms. Puranik presented the discussion questions:

1. Is the overall development character appropriate?
2. What should be the character of the open spaces?
3. What should be the nature of the street network?
4. Is the proposed architectural concept appropriate for the proposed Subareas?
5. Other considerations by the Commission

Ms. Puranik referred to question one and asked if the plan should have two significantly different looks - does the condominium area need a completely different look than the single-family area or should it be more integrated.

Ms. Puranik referred to question two and asked if the applicant should consider the possibility of providing a larger, central open space that could be identified with, and used by both subarea residents.

Ms. Puranik referred to question three and said the plan shows a network of public streets and private drives and asked for feedback on the private drives.

Ms. Puranik referred to question four and said Ms. Menerey provided updated architectural concepts but asked the Commission if this was appropriate.

Amy Salay inquired about the width of the lots. Paul Coppel, co-owner Schottenstein Homes, 140 Mill Street, Suite A, Gahanna, Ohio, said the single-family lots are 62 feet wide.

Ms. Salay asked if the cottages were two or three bedroom units. Mr. Coppel said there would be three different plans, small, medium, and large. He said the medium and large will have upstairs storage units.

Ms. Menerey said minimum square footages would be discussed at the next step. She thought the applicant was proposing 1,600 square feet for the condominiums, 2,000 square feet for the ranch single-family, and 2,200 for the two-story single-family home.

Bob Miller asked the applicant to describe the central green and asked about the activities intended for that area. Mr. Coppel said the development is empty-nester targeted so it will not have playground equipment. He said it is largely just a green and the applicant has not yet decided on a gazebo or seating. Ms. Menerey said this green is now a half-acre when before it was just a tenth of an acre and was set up now as the focal point so the units all look out onto that green space.

Chris Brown asked about Staff's suggestion about the roof lines. Ms. Puranik said in the previous concepts, the condominiums looked like they had all the same height without changing the height of the rooflines.

Steve Stidhem asked if this development was close to a park in any way such as a playground for the single-family homes. Ms. Husak said the Links at Ballantrae was the closest playground.

Mr. Miller asked about the fences that were evidently an issue previously. Ms. Salay said a fence was not talked about before. She said they talked about how to integrate the area in Amlin.

Mr. Coppel said the applicant was trying to distinguish themselves from Amlin. Ms. Salay asked about the location of the fence.

Ms. Menerey said one thing that may be a little confusing is the piece that was annexed at the bottom. She said some of those lots did not have frontage on the road; they had their frontage on the alley. Ms. Salay said there are right-of-way challenges in Amlin.

Ms. Salay wanted to know Staff's opinion of a six-foot fence. Ms. Devayani said the character of the area is very different than the proposal and the applicant does not wish to integrate or associate with.

Ms. Husak said a fence has been used for screening at Avondale Woods against a railroad track as a psychological/physical buffer; nobody really expects that to be a noise barrier. She said Staff had discussions with the applicant regarding how to best address that. She said the other option would be to locate the drive on the south side and have the units north of that be a natural area or incorporate the alley that is already there.

Ms. Devayani said the zoning inspector recommended using a combination of evergreens, shrubs, and deciduous trees to create a fence as a buffer between this development and Amlin.

Ms. Salay said she does not have a huge objection to a fence because of the location but the maintenance of the fence has to be considered and if it is wood, the condo association would have to support that.

The Chair invited public comment.

Brent Welch, representing the Franklin County Engineers Office, 97 Dublin Road, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, said they do not have an issue with the land use or the zoning but just wanted to make the Commission aware they have been working with the City of Dublin on instituting quiet zones along the railroads for the at-grade crossings. He said he is aware not of it in this particular area yet but there are some down the line and apologized he did not have all the details. He said they have found at other crossings that it has been rather extensive to achieve and gets expensive. He said it does not seem likely that if a quiet zone were requested it would be supported given its proximity to the Cosgray Road crossing with CSX or the Rings Road crossing. He said they are looking into it because there have been complaints from other residents in the established sections of the Ballantrae subdivisions. He said they wanted to get on the record to say that they have looked at it and it just does not seem very likely for them to support that at this time. He said they will get back with engineering on the bike paths. He said there are no immediate plans to extend the bike path through Amlin.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Welch to define a quiet zone.

Mr. Welch said a railroad is required to sound their horn at at-grade crossings but there is a blast of the horn between 20 – 15 seconds prior to a crossing and then there is a pattern that they are supposed to follow until the train reaches the at-grade crossing. He said there are railroads all throughout this area and some of the residents have expressed concern over the noise. He said unfortunately, it is very expensive to properly mitigate for a quiet zone.

Tina Wawszkiewizc said there were some investigations to at least pursue a consideration of a quiet zone in this area including five crossings. She explained one is under the City of Dublin's jurisdiction, it is the crossing at Cosgray Road at the north or west end of this site. She said three of the crossings are in the jurisdiction of Franklin County, one of them at the south end of this site, at Rings Road, and they also have Hayden Run Road and Houchard Road and Avery Road, which is under the jurisdiction of the City of Columbus. She said in order for that whistle requirement to be waived, there has to be some supplemental safety measure implemented at the crossings so people are not driving around the end of a gate and putting themselves in harm's way. Creating that physical barrier she said, is what makes a quiet zone expensive. She indicated the barrier could be two arms on each side of the road as opposed to just one arm; or to physically separate one side from the other with a curbed median. She said the other concern from the Franklin County perspective is at the intersection of Hayden Run and Avery Road that backs up to the point of the crossing at certain times of the day when traffic is heavy. She said if gates were installed, there is potential of a vehicle getting caught between two gates, which is an obvious safety concern.

Ms. Husak added that even with a quiet zone in place, it is up to the discretion of the train engineer to sound the horn.

Ms. Wawszkiewizc said the other noise that will continue to occur is the clanging of the bells in the gate system.

Don Neilson, 6934 Forest Haven Loop, Dublin, 43016, indicated the Planners have done a very good job with the houses and putting curbed linear streets in for the single-family homes and asked why not for the condominiums. He said the condominiums are in rows and very close together, appearing like an army barracks. He said he was also interested about the space between the condominiums. He said he likes the 100-foot setbacks both from the railroad and from Churchman Road. He asked if the Commission could consider the same sort of setback to the Woodlands area on the other side. He asked why the new folks get the setback and the residents that have already paid for their houses do not. He brought up the discussions about stadium and train noise. He said the train will honk twice, as there are two crossings, and they are made to be very loud. He suggested that before the City agrees to put more population close to the railroad, there needs to be coordination with the other communities and counties and whoever is involved in those crossings and control that noise or the City should expect to continue to get complaints. He said the Woodlands are farther away but in the middle of the night the trains can still wake you up. He said he heard the City engineer say it was too expensive but having Dublin as a high quality community with good quiet zones is also important to the people that want to live in quality housing.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Salay said it looks to her like Lots 3 – 7 are very close together. She said she is envisioning being in the backyard of Lot 6 and have Lots 4, 5, and 3 right there. She indicated it is not as good as it could get; definitely Lot 3 should be removed. She asked that all those lots be reconfigured. She inquired about the setbacks.

Ms. Puranik confirmed that Lot 7 is 50 feet from Cosgray Road.

DRAFT

Ms. Salay emphasized the more space the better. She said the horns from the trains are very loud and the community needs to come together and talk to City Council about the need for the quiet zones and partnering with the county to get those created. She said it really affects the quality of life. She said she lives a mile and a half to two miles from here and in the dead of winter, the horns can be heard as well as the roar of the train going down the track and she can only imagine how loud they get closer than that. She has heard from residents of Ballantrae for years that speak of the noise.

Ms. Salay asked about the retention basin and if it was the only stormwater feature necessary and if it is wet all the time or dependent on the weather. Ms. Puranik said it is a wet pond. She said she has discussed other possible locations with the applicant but the drainage of the site is all going south. Ms. Salay said the Public Service Committee is working on something; she would like to see the City adopt that pond and to be responsible for maintaining it.

Ms. Salay said she is curious about the private drives. She said Council is really sensitive due to maintenance and long-term costs to the homeowners. She asked why private drives were chosen. Mr. Coppel said they wanted private drives because of the intimate feel desired for the condominium community.

Ms. Salay inquired about the width of the private drives. The applicant answered the pavement width is 22 feet.

Mr. Coppel said because the drives are narrower, it affects the yield. He reported the applicant is already well under the 5 units per acre. He said it is going to be a zero maintenance community. He said we are going to mow the grass, take care of the exterior elevations, the roofs, and snow removal will be part of that. He said there will be a condominium association with dues and they are setting aside reserves for sealing, maintaining, and eventually resurfacing the streets. He said the applicant expects the overall condominium fees to be about $250 – $300 per month.

Ms. Salay said the pizza shop in Amlin is adjacent to D76 and D77. She said those homeowner's should be made aware of the close proximity of that restaurant as well as the train horns.

Mr. Coppel said the applicant has had a lot of discussions with Staff about the train situation and supports a quiet zone but have been informed that is not going to happen tomorrow. He said the applicant plans to create a mound with a forest by the railroad tracks to buffer but it will not take care of the whistle. He said they plan to put everyone on notice of the noise as part of their documentation.

Ms. Salay indicated she was really excited the first time she saw the architecture because there was a lot of stone. She said it is important to do the front treatments with mostly masonry at a minimum. She said she understands the applicant wants to give the consumer options because of financial concerns. She said the best communities in terms of longevity and appearance have a mix of materials consisting mainly of stone and brick on the front and not just masonry on the water table. She said she is not interested in seeing siding in the single-family area. She said connectivity was not such an issue as this is not a community where there will be through traffic. She said Lots B67, 68, 74, 75 will be much nicer if that road is not connected. She said normally she supports connectivity but in this case does not believe it would do much.

Ms. Menerey said Alan Perkins looked at the stub and the applicant widened the pavement and he felt comfortable with that length and turnaround.

Ms. Salay said this also has an extra place for people to park. She said a resident asked about the location of Churchman Road and asked how that right-of-way was determined and if it could be pulled away a little bit from the Woodlands. Ms. Husak said the roadway was included in the Ballantrae

development when that started in the early 2000s. She explained the setbacks off that roadway were established at that point, also.

Chris Brown said Cosgray Road may not be busy now but someday it will be. He said Lots 7 and 8 are a little close. He indicated he understands what the applicant is trying to do with the layout of the condominium area. He reiterated that he has lived in a zero-lot line house where he looked at a blank wall, but that side was completely landscaped so his dining room looked out at something nice, and did not care about the other side. He said when looking at all the single-family lots with free standing homes in Dublin, most of the side yards are negligible and almost a missed opportunity. He recalled it was a wonderful way to live, especially for a little house.

Mr. Brown said he is glad the path connects to Amlin but understands the fence. He said he anticipates Amlin to grow up eventually as the southwest area plan develops.

Mr. Brown said he loves some of the elevations that Mr. Acock has prepared architecturally. He said he is not opposed to siding but opposed to the quantity of siding. He indicated he loves it in a Greek Revival Form. He noted one elevation with a porch but sees a free-standing door there that could be roofed over, included in a porch, or some other added interest to the front of those. He said it is a street-connected unit and would love to see that personal connection where there is a front porch and somebody is sitting out front. He said where he lived before the elderly folks liked to sit out front as well as the younger ones and he got to know all of those people and those were the only ones he really got to know. He indicated it was a great thing so he encouraged the applicant to explore that more. He stated overall, he is not opposed to this proposal but suggested more refinement. He said the two condominium units that face Ballantrae Woods Drive are kind of odd, as they appear to just be left out there.

Deborah Mitchell said her only comment would echo what Ms. Salay said about the use of stone or masonry for the condominiums. She indicated the more siding the more she thinks of army barracks.

Cathy De Rosa asked Staff about the zoning and plans for retail in that area. Ms. Puranik said the Southwest Area Plan envisions how the character would be for the Village of Amlin. She said it is not part of the City of Dublin but it is in Washington Township. She said if and when it annexes to the City the vision would be to have a mixed-use village center in that area.

Ms. De Rosa said she loved the point that everyone is a few hundred feet from some green space. She said compared to the last plan discussed tonight, that felt incredibly tight, even though the houses are small and the cottages are small, the way this is laid out, it is quite nice. She said she liked the connectivity of the bike paths.

Bob Miller said this was a great project. He reported he has visited the site, twice. He said he would not live there but only because of the trains. He said he would like to see a definition of the fence area. He said he lived in Dallas, Texas, long enough to have these board fences in his head and does not like it. He said if there was a different way to put a barrier up, he would prefer it.

Steve Stidhem said he thinks the proposal is great. He asked if there was an option to make the buildings better insulated to reduce noise. He said behind Lots 1 and 2, there is a large green space. He said he is partial to parks and believes there is potential for a lot of kids in that area and asked if something could be added in there for kids or around Lots 17, 18, 20, and 21.

Victoria Newell said overall she liked this concept. She said she had concerns with Lots 1 – 7. She noted a roundabout at the intersection at Lot 7 that has a side yard and back yard that will face the roundabout and stated more clearance would be better. She understands the landscape plan is not fully developed at this point but how those lots and corner are treated is important.

Ms. Newell indicated she still has concerns carried over from the first plan with regards to the fence line along Amlin. She reiterated her comment that the fence needed to be treated sensitively and what she meant was it did not just become a fence line. She said now units are running straight along that fence with little room for landscaping. She said the fence needs to become an amenity, possibly with masonry, and not just a barricade.

Ms. Newell indicated the green space is a little bit better than it was before. She said she likes this arrangement because it feels more like a green space in this particular scheme.

Ms. Newell said she has the same comment as Ms. Salay in regards to the stone. She said after reviewing the original sketches, she envisioned a lot more refined architectural details. She said she understands the new elevations were just presented this evening but there appears to be a little less detail as the elevations are getting developed. She said it is important to have a mix of materials between the stone and the siding. She recalled the presentation from before where porches were envisioned for a lot of these buildings and wanted to have the street connection. She said that was one of the features she had really liked and yet tonight she is seeing less porches and less character. She said given the close proximity of the zero lot line, the porches are critical. She encouraged the applicant to expand upon that. She concluded that overall she is supportive of the project.

Mr. Brown inquired about the bike path where it cuts across between Lots 18 and 19. He asked what issue Staff has with that. Ms. Wawszkiewicz said from engineering's perspective, having a crossing at the point of vehicular intersection reduces the number of conflict points and increases driver awareness that a pedestrian or cyclist may be in the street.

Mr. Brown said it is on a curve and the drivers may not see them coming but he said he does not always believe that is a deal breaker. Ms. Wawszkiewicz said it does not have to be; we can overcome it. She said the first preference is to consolidate those conflict points at intersections.

Mr. Brown said he would like to see as much connectivity to that green space as can be achieved.

Ms. Menerey referred to the exhibit with the red circles that noted the plan revisions and inquired about the comment made about the circle over the south drive. Ms. Puranik responded it is the sidewalk link that is missing. Ms. Menerey said they would revise the plans to include that link.

2. NE Quad, Subarea 3, Treplus Communities — Wyandotte Woods Boulevard
15-024INF — Informal Review

The Chair said this application is a request for an informal review and feedback for a proposed 86-unit multiple-family development on a vacant property within Wyandotte Woods Subdivision located west of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway within NE Quad PUD, Subarea 3.

Jennifer Rauch said this is an Informal Review for a site located on the southwestern portion of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, adjacent to the new roundabout. She stated the site was zoned as part of the NE Quad in 1994 as Subarea 3, which permits multiple-family dwelling units with a density indicated in the text of 120 units with this proposal at a total of 86 units. She said there are setbacks and buffering requirements as well as minimal architectural standards. She indicated the informal review will provide review and feedback prior to the applicant submitting a Final Development Plan application.

Ms. Rauch said this site has extensive history stating that from 2007 - 2010 an application was submitted for a multiple-family development that had 19 -20 buildings located throughout the site with an internal loop road with extensive stormwater ponds. She reported the Planning and Zoning Commission

City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

3. Ballantrae, Subarea S and Liggett Property **Cosgray Road**
14-083INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	A potential residential development of 141 residences consisting of with detached condominiums and single family lots on approximately 49 acres, east of Cosgray Road and the Conrail railroad tracks.
Request:	Informal review and feedback on a potential future rezoning application.
Applicant:	Schottenstein Homes, represented by Jack Reynolds and Paul Coppel.
Planning Contact:	Devayani Puranik, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4662, dpuranik@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission provided informal comments and feedback on a proposal for a potential residential development of 141 residences consisting of detached condominiums and single-family lots on approximately 49 acres, east of Cosgray Road and the Conrail railroad tracks. The Commission generally favored the proposal and provided positive feedback regarding the proposed uses and the proposed density. Commissioners preferred public streets for the development; were supportive of the proposed architecture; did not see a need to integrate the condominiums with the single-family homes but preferred connectivity; requested a larger open space for the condominium area; emphasized the importance of screening from the railroad tracks; and providing more access to the open spaces.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Devayani Puranik.

Devayani Puranik, Planner II

The Chair said there were three motions and three votes before them.

Mr. Close said the difficulty with this project, when dedicating more than 40 percent of the value to open space, is that there are constrictions on what can be done. He said 37 lots is about where the applicant can make this happen. He estimated Romanelli & Hughes Building Company have 40 percent of the lots already reserved and understands architecture can be a matter of taste, but with those comments in mind, he asked the Commission to table this application.

The Chair said to provide clear direction, the Commission is not necessarily asking the applicant to lose any lots, but maybe reconfigure the way the structure might be set on the lot.

Mr. Close said the reality is these homes are going to be $700,000 and up as they are proposed now. He said if they lose another lot, then economics stop working.

The Chair said that was not the request of the body here.

Mr. Close said they can fix the driveways and look into the architecture.

Ms. Kramb said she was fine with the number of lots as this is what the Commission decided upon in the Preliminary Development Plan so she expected these would be tight.

Mr. Close said he understood what was said about side elevations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was not as much the lots themselves as it is the setting of the structures on the lots, what we have seen, and what we might like to see.

The Chair asked if there was a motion on the floor to table this application.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to **table** this application for a Final Development Plan and Final Plat. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

3. Ballantrae, Subarea S and Liggett Property **Cosgray Road**
14-083INF **Informal Review**

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a potential residential development of 141 residences consisting of with detached condominiums and single family lots on approximately 49 acres, east of Cosgray Road and the Conrail railroad tracks.

Devayani Puranik said this is an informal review for Ballantrae Subarea S and Liggett property for residential development. She presented the site, which is located east of Cosgray Road, north of Rings Road, east of CSC railroad tracks and a Cosgray Rings Road connector is proposed along eastern property line of Churchman Road. She showed where the Links at Ballantrae are located east of Churchman Road consisting of a multi-family development and where the Woodlands at Ballantrae are further east. She explained that all the parcels along the southwest corner of the property are within Washington Township, Village of Amlin, outside of Rings Road.

Ms. Puranik said the character of these areas is large lot residential with some limited commercial activity along Rings Road. She said the northern portion of the property is zoned PLR-Planned Low Density Residential, Ballantrae Subarea S and a 70-unit condominium development is approved as part

of that PUD, and the lower portion is zoned R-Rural. She said the applicant is processing a parallel application to annex the southwest corner of the site from Washington Township.

Ms. Puranik presented the existing conditions showing: the site still being farmed as seen from Woodlands at Ballantrae; the view of some mature tree rows along the railroad tracks from the southwest corner; and the view of the road south in the township that is essentially used as an alley by the village residents.

Ms. Puranik presented the Community Plan (future land use plan) that recommends Mixed Residential Medium Density land use that is five units per acre. She said the areas are anticipated to have greater walkability and pedestrian orientation at a village scale and are part of the Southwest Area Plan. She said the Village of Amlin has a unique and quaint character that should be protected as adjacent development occurs and future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area. She indicated the Plan also shows linkages from the site toward east to Churchman Road and from the development south to Rings Road for easy access to Village Center.

Ms. Puranik presented the proposed site plan that showed three entrances off of Churchman Road, one of which is a continuation of Marmion Drive through the Woodlands at Ballantrae. She explained the total site is 51 acres of which 4.6 acres are for Churchman Road. She said the proposal consists of 47 single- family lots within the northern section of the site and 94 detached condominium lots within the southern section. She stated that density is 3.01 units per acre. She said the setback along Churchman Road is 200 feet, along the railroad tracks is 100 feet, and 30 – 50 feet is proposed along the southern property line. She said a total of 14 acres of open space is provided, which includes the existing tree cover.

Ms. Puranik said the first discussion point relates to the layout of the site. She said since the Community Plan is recommending: mixed residential, medium density, more walkable/pedestrian friendly, and should integrate the single-family lots with condominium units as opposed to two separate isolated sections for single-family and condominium units. She said the plan also talks about integrating open space as part of the development and having the connectivity of pedestrian links.

Ms. Puranik noted the second discussion question, which refers to the character of the western and southern setback. She said the Commission recently approved 100-foot setbacks from the railroad tracks, which included the buffer that is a combination of mound/fences and landscaping. Regarding the southern setback, she said the Plan recommends that The Village of Amlin's unique and quaint character should be protected as adjacent development occurs, and future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area.

Ms. Puranik said the third discussion question relates to the street connectivity. She said entrances are provided along Churchman Road and if this project were to move forward, another connection would be necessary around the western setback. She explained that Engineering recommended that all right angle turns be avoided and to rework the network around the central gazebo area. She said Planning and Engineering is recommending public streets for the entire development for simplifying maintenance responsibilities. She added the stormwater detention pond will have to be reworked to provide adequate distance between Churchman Road and the ponds. She said the Southwest Plan illustrates connection from the site to Rings Road to the south and a pedestrian connection might be beneficial for the residents of proposed development to walk to Village Center as envisioned development occurs.

Ms. Puranik addressed the fourth discussion question and presented the proposed architecture for single- family homes. She said the elevations are two-story homes with porches, garages with arches, and dormers and the materials are stone and cementitious siding. She said detailing reflects village

character and most of the elevations have front loaded garages while there is an auto-court access option. She presented the proposed architecture for the detached condominiums. She said they are a story and a half ranch style with the majority of the elevations having front loaded garages. Again, she said the detailing reflects village character like the single-family homes and material treatments are consistent creating rhythmic patterns.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant was present and would like to add to the presentation.

Paul Coppel, co-owner of Schottenstein Homes, said this was their first venture in the City of Dublin, although not new to the area. He said Schottenstein Homes is named after his partner, Steve and their genesis is MI Homes as Steve was COO for that organization for many years. He reported that they have one project currently in the Dublin school district but not in the City of Dublin. He said between the current four projects, they plan to close between 90 and 100 homes this year. He said their intention with this project is to do something that satisfies the existing neighborhoods in Ballantrae. He indicated they have had meetings with the leadership of the two Ballantrae Homeowner's Associations. He said Linda Menerey would go over the plan and respond to some of the concerns along with Jack Reynolds and George Acock.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said one thing this plan achieves is connectivity through Churchman Road, the pedestrian ways, and open space. She said they have extensive buffers and corrected Ms. Puranik's statement about setbacks; the setback off of Churchman Road and the railroad track is actually 100 feet. She said there is a varied setback along the Amlin alley, from 30 – 50 feet. She said they took into account all the surrounding areas. She highlighted the single family homes in the north portion, which follow the typical Dublin style and in the lower, condominium area they made the transition to what was happening in the Amlin neighborhood. Ms. Menerey said she believes they can work within the stormwater ponds and wanted to keep those along the frontage as a design amenity to give recognition to this particular area. She noted that most of the houses front Churchman Road, with a large setback providing green space.

George Acock, Acock Associates Architects, Columbus, Ohio said he resides in Granville, Ohio. He said they are trying to provide affordable housing in a way that is consistent with the architecture that has been built in small towns. He said in the 50s & 60s, when TV and air conditioning appeared on the scene, things changed. He said people pulled their car into the garage that was the first element you saw, living in the family room in the back of the house, and porches were removed. He said they are trying to bring porches back and soften the power of a 16-foot garage door in appropriate scale to what he considers regional architecture that is very simple, mostly wood houses with 15-foot front setbacks. He said this will provide a neighborhood feel to promote engagement amongst neighbors; it will feel like a community. He said they have designed simple materials and proportions including standard windows and details that have been around for a long time, proving to be charming.

Mr. Coppel showed samples of the plot plans of the two varying kind of products, pointing out the single- family elevations and the condominiums. He said they have deemphasized the garage and added porches in all of them. He said their target market for these condominiums is obviously mature adults or empty nesters, and that the markets for those now are detached units and not attached units. He stated many of the people that respond to this analysis do side-yard outdoor living whereas we think it is better to have rear-yard outdoor living in those detached units. He said they are trying to provide a little different architecture than Ballantrae but be very compatible with no exposed foundations and using all natural materials.

The Chair invited public comment from anyone that would like to speak on behalf of this application. [Hearing none.]

Richard Taylor asked for clarification on the different plans.

Mr. Acock noted the first ones they were working on and said they will use those but it is the same type of style and floor plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the last four elevations are the same. Mr. Taylor confirmed they were all single-family units.

Ms. Menerey clarified that some of the elevations were mislabeled. She pointed out, some were condominiums, one that could be both elevations, and there are a couple that are the single-family style.

Mr. Taylor said at some future date with an update to this proposal, he would like to see for the detached condominium units maybe show a few of those in context because they are not going to sit isolated the way the elevations are currently shown. He would like to see how 7 – 10 units would play together on streetscape.

Ms. Menerey presented a line drawing that reflects what Mr. Taylor requested. Mr. Taylor said it gave him a whole different prospective.

Ms. Menerey presented the single-family board.

Mr. Taylor said he appreciated the small town perspective. He stated in the overall site plan he sees some contradictions to what Mr. Acock said about the small town arrangement. For example, he said, in the center of the attached condominiums, there is a really tiny green space with a gazebo and this should be much larger. He said he was a little confused about the reason for the big setback off of Churchman Road, which put all of that green space, the pods, and everything on the outskirts of this development, which further isolates it from the rest of the community. He said bringing those things into the middle, make them amenities for the whole neighborhood to enjoy and allow this development to push out to the borders a little bit more and possibly engage more fully with the communities next door. He said the existing grove of trees looks like it is remaining untouched. He asked if there was some way to rearrange the street network to run along the borders of that grove to provide an amenity for all instead of as a backyard for a few. He said there is a grove of trees in the middle of Brandon Way neighborhood and the streets run on several sides of that and is heavily used by the residents. He indicated the paths are very informal as they are not paved. He concluded he liked the concept and the density that is being proposed that is less than what is allowed, but believes the applicant could go further in making this more village- like and using the green spaces and amenities that are accessible to everyone as opposed to pushing to the perimeter and isolate the whole community.

John Hardt said he agreed with Mr. Taylor as the fundamentals are headed in the right direction. He said he appreciates that the density is less than what is allowed. He noted on the drawings received in their packet there is a space across from the proposed road, where the road appears to pass within a few feet of the drive-way of the development on the other side and he wondered if that was accurate or not. He said if it is he suggests Churchman Road not to be straight. He said that is an oddity that needs to be resolved.

Mr. Hardt addressed the discussion questions. He said he agrees with the applicant that he does not think it makes sense to integrate the single-family homes and condominiums with each other but he said it does make a lot of sense to connect them to the different areas not only to each other but to things outside this development getting more connectivity to the streets.

Mr. Hardt inquired about the 30-foot setback to the south and asked if the whole area should be oriented so that the pattern of development and the streets respect the layout of Amlin. He said the residents of Amlin may think that is a horrible idea but he thought there is an opportunity to take the charm that is already there and expand on it rather than turning your back to it.

Mr. Hardt said the level of detail they are looking at for architecture is heading in the right direction. He is concerned that when seen all together, there are a lot of different variations of detached condominiums that all have the same rooflines. He encouraged the applicant to mix the rooflines up and get the massing a little bit different; varying the material is not going to be sufficient.

Mr. Hardt said the western setback along Cosgray Road should more or less match what is north on Cosgray Road to the balance of Ballantrae. He said the south 100-foot setback that is the railroad track, is appropriate, generally. He indicated he assumed the trees that were there today would be protected, maintained, and augmented.

Amy Salay agreed about providing access to the woods and perhaps having a bike path available to everyone. She indicated she is concerned about the proximity of the railroad tracks because the sounds of the train horns can be so loud and interruptive into family life. She suggests as development continues, the Commission consider a railroad quiet zone. She said she would like to see the green by the gazebo expanded. She is not in favor of any private streets; she wants Dublin standard public streets. She said single-family units and condominiums should be mixed. She said she loved the architecture, the detail, the idea of the village, but wants to make sure the front porches are actually deep enough to be useful. She indicated some of the front porches in Dublin neighborhoods are so narrow you can barely fit a chair. She questioned the term “affordable”. She would like to see a limit on the use of cementitious siding and prefers the mix of Hardieplank and stone. She said all lap siding might be preferable to some prospective residents because it would less expensive than all stone. She asked if Churchman Road has to be straight because it looks strange here. She said she is pleased that the applicant has met with the neighbors.

Todd Zimmerman said it is nice to see the decrease in density from five units per acre to three units per acre. He addressed the discussion questions:

1) He asked if integration could be changed slightly without giving up the density ratio or green space.
2) He said he is all for the mounds, evergreens, or whatever if it is possible to keep the mature trees but is really not a fan of fencing as it is not natural and becomes a maintenance issue down the road.
3) He would like to see public streets for both projects.
4) He likes the architecture and housing stock, something that Dublin does not have.
5) He would like to see a matrix of the detached condominiums so we could have a good mix of variation for the 94 condominium units at the end. He suggested working with Staff to achieve this variety.

Amy Kramb said the two products do not need to be integrated, there needs to be more connectivity. She said her biggest issue was having <u>useable</u> open space. She noted the wonderful tree grove that only the 15 lots that back up to it will see. She said with the ponds up front, she thinks access may be limited. She said when the applicant comes back, she wants to see the sidewalks; walking paths; bike paths; how residents will be able to get around the site; and how the residents would be able to get down to Rings Road to use the open space. She does not like the southern end how it backs up to Amlin. She suggested a better transition or treatment there than putting up a bunch of vegetation and starting this new development. She said the architecture was going in the right direction, and she was generally supportive of the concept, density, and location.

Victoria Newell said the two products do not have to be intermixed in terms of integration but she would like to see the pedestrian connections intermixed and developed little further. She would like the green space at the gazebo larger. She said the sites along Amlin should be treated sensitively. She questioned the setbacks and the buffer along the railroad tracks.

Ms. Menerey explained it was a hand-drawn sketch that Ms. Newell was referring to which was not to scale and would ensure the 100-foot setback by the railroad tracks.

Ms. Newell continued, for developing the internal green space, the setback off of Churchman Road can be reduced. She said she really liked the porches.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she admittedly did not drive through the site so she does not know what the back of the adjacent properties look like. She indicated the alleyway does need to integrate into something that was not going to add value. She said she wanted to drive through the site before making much of a statement at the next step. She stated she agreed with everything that had been said by her fellow Commissioners and appreciates the use of materials and the historical perspective on the architecture. She indicated 'what is old should become new again' in most situations and seems appropriate here.

The Chair said she would give the applicant time respond if there were any questions or needed clarification.

Mr. Coppel said he just had one question on the land plan. He said he thought there was a consensus of the Commission that the setback be reduced along Churchman Road.

The Chair said for the point of clarity, what she thought the applicant heard this Commission say was that they wanted a larger, useable green space that would be consistent with the type of architecture shown and are willing to give some other green spaces to accommodate that. She said she also heard from several of her fellow Commissioners there was an opportunity to interact with the grove of trees, either by relocating the street or by putting a bike path through there.
The Chair called for public comment from anyone that wanted to address this Commission with regards to this application.

Patrick O'Brien, 5646 Marmion Drive, said he resided exactly across the street from Churchman Road as proposed. He said the Woodlands of Ballantrae residents have been very comfortable with this project on a whole because of the existence of this 100-foot buffer along Churchman Road. He said they have attached housing and this is 147 units to contrast with the existing 64 units. He said the green space and water effects are significant and aesthetically and functionally isolating the Woodlands from whatever the applicant has in this project, which we know is not going to be attached like the existing product. He said the idea of converting some of that buffer space into the gazebo type area is very nice in terms of just that project on its own but it does not necessarily reflect the entrance of people on the other side of the street. He said there needs to be a balancing of interests when that is redesigned.

Don Seager, 6890 Foresthaven Loop, said he was a resident of Woodlands of Ballantrae and was on the Woodland's and Ballantrae's Boards. He reported they liked the 100-foot setback and do not want to see that changed. He said he agreed to put a bike path through the grove of trees but would not want a street to mess up the trees. He suggested that Amlin not be integrated as they are not cute little houses. He said he agreed with making the streets larger as there are issues with private streets. He emphasized the setback is what they like.

The Chair said for the point of clarity, the Commission does not necessarily want to put something through these woods, just provide access to the perimeter of them.

Ms. Newell said she wanted to clarify an earlier comment; she did not want to see a wall of landscaping not treated sensitively and should not be one big wall between this project and Amlin but rather a nice amenity.