



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 4, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

**3. The Farms at Cosgray at 5713 Cosgray Road
23-123INF**

Informal Review

Proposal:	Development of approximately 100 acres consisting of 153 single-family detached units.
Location:	West of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Barronsmore Way.
Request:	Informal review and feedback on a future development application.
Applicant:	Kiran Basireddy
Planning Contact:	Zach Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information:	614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-123

RESULT: The Planning and Zoning Commission provided initial comments for a new development proposal named The Farms at Cosgray. The site is 101 acres in size and located west of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Churchman Road. For the eastern portion of the site, several Commission members expressed support for a residential transition from Ballantrae to the CSX Railroad, as this would provide a suitable transition and use adjacent to the Ballantrae community. The Commission expressed interest in reducing the amount of units to align more with the density of Ballantrae, but also emphasized the sensitivity of the site due to the proximity of the railroad. For the remainder of the site, the Commission was hesitant to show support of residential on the west side of the railroad. Given that Envision Dublin is anticipated to provide new recommendations for this area, they did not want to commit to a development recommendation until the Community Plan update has been established. Overall, the feedback was positive for the proposed residential adjacent to Ballantrae, but wanted to remain open minded west of the railroad due to the upcoming Envision Dublin Community Plan.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Absent
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner II



- ~~4) That the applicant submit and obtain permanent sign permits for both wall signs through Building Standards.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 6-0]~~

- **Case 23-123INF – The Farms at Cosgray**

Request for Informal Review of a proposed development of approximately 100 acres consisting of 153 single-family detached units. The site is zoned R, Rural District and is located west of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Barronsmore Way.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Ferris, Ferris Planning and Planning, 4876 Cemetery Road, Hilliard stated that he is representing his client, Kiran Basireddy, a local developer, who has a similar project under construction in Orange Township. He is considering similar projects in Concord Township and a couple different product types in the City of Delaware. This product offers a quality transitional housing type for the older generation. Typically, they offer a condominium association community. However, staff has advised that fee simple, single-family home lots may be better received. They have no objection to that, but would need to create a homeowner association to provide exterior maintenance for the housing. The architecture is not conducive for families with children. Although they do not age-restrict the homes, the product lends itself to a 55+ population.

Mr. Ferris stated that the 101.4-acre site is located west of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Barronsmore Way, immediately adjacent to the Ballantrae Subdivision. The site is bisected by the existing railroad tracks. The eastern portion of the site has Cosgray Road frontage. The dwelling units would have setbacks from Cosgray Road similar to the development across the street. There would also be a similar entry feature with walls and ponds. There will be a 200-foot buffer along the railroad track that will include the existing tree row. The western site is more challenging as it currently does not have roadway access. The City's Community Plan contemplates a future Tuttle Crossing Blvd extension through this site; therefore, this will be a phased development, waiting until there are utility services for the western site. The architecture examples they provided are similar to those approved by the Orange Township planning commission. They are proposing three different home sizes with various front elevations and rear treatments.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review with nonbinding feedback from the Commission. The 101.4-acre site is zoned R, Rural district and located west of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Barronsmore Way, immediately adjacent to the Ballantrae Subdivision. The site was annexed into the City of Dublin in 2006 and includes an existing house and outbuildings. The CSX Railroad bisects the property creating two separated plots of land. The applicant is proposing development on both sides of the property, with the east side of the railroad being built first. East of the railroad (RR), the site has access to utilities and infrastructure that are located along Cosgray Road. West of the RR, the site is dependent on utilities and infrastructure that will occur with the extension of Tuttle Crossing. This site is located within the Southwest Area Plan, which anticipates the extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd. That will be the catalyst for development

happening in this area. That road extension is conceptually shown on the southwest corner of this site. An additional goal of the Southwest Area Plan was to increase housing variety and stock, preserve existing natural features, and to provide amenities and services that are currently lacking within this area and the nearby Amlin community. The Southwest Area Plan currently is being re-considered with Community Plan update (Envision Dublin), so it is possible the vision for the Southwest Area could change and the future land uses and road layouts could be modified. Those elements will be clearer when Envision Dublin is finalized later in 2024. The plan indicates a conceptual layout of the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. extension. The final configuration will not be known until it is studied. The Community Plan Future Land Use designates mixed-residential, Rural Transition, for this site. The typical density would be approximately 1.5 dwelling units (DU) per acre. The existing Community Plan encourages a mix of residential with small lots and significant open space. While Envision Dublin, the City's new Community Plan, is being developed, City Council adopted Interim Land Use Principles to guide development during this transition. These principles do not supersede Zoning Code requirements, but provide a clear policy document to supplement adopted plans and accepted planning practices in the interim. These principles are to be utilized similar to the recommendations of the Community Plan, as both are guiding policies and principles for the City. The principle pertinent for this development is Principle #6 – *Reserve Strategic Economic Assets*. This principle is intended to, "Protect long-term economic development interests and the fiscal health of the City by reserving high visibility corridors, such as freeways and railways for development that supports economic vitality and to restrict residential development from fronting these corridors." The existing Community Plan Future Land Use identifies a particular use here; however, the Interim Land Use Principles must be considered simultaneously. The primary question for the Commission is whether this proposed plan meets the City's expectations. While it does align with the designated Future Land Use, it is in conflict with Interim Land Use Principle #6.

The applicant is proposing 153 single-family lots on an approximately 100-acre parcel. The lots are proposed for patio homes, with approximately 62 acres of open space and pedestrian pathways through the development. On the east side of the RR, there are 63 lots with a density of 2.0 du/acre. The site on the west side of the RR has 90 lots with a density of 1.3 du/acre. The plan is consistent with several of the recommendations of the Southwest Area Plan including provision of buffers along the RR and Cosgray Road.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the following three discussion questions have been provided to guide the Commission's consideration tonight:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed residential use along the CSX RR?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed layout of the site?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the architectural inspiration for the development?

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired if all the homes would have front-loaded garages.

Mr. Ferris responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the anticipation was that they would be ranch-style homes.

Mr. Ferris responded that they would be 1.0-1.5 story homes; some may have bonus rooms or a second bedroom above.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the homes would have basements or be on concrete slabs.

Mr. Ferris responded that the homes would be slab on grade, no basements.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the Commission is intended to consider Phase 1 only at this time, due to the future roadway extension.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Commission should look at the site holistically, as that is what the applicant has requested. However, Phase 1, east side of the RR, could happen more reasonably at this time due to the existence of utilities. Phase 2 will be entirely dependent upon the layout of Tuttle Crossing Blvd.

Ms. Harter inquired how the two portions of the site would be connected. Would the development in Phase 1 and Phase 2 look the same?

Mr. Ferris responded that they would be two separate communities with no connection between the two. The communities will not look the same. By the time Phase 2 occurs, the architecture will have evolved.

Ms. Harter inquired if the proposed homes would be similar to the nearby Ballantrae patio homes.

Mr. Ferris responded affirmatively. Those homes are marketed to the same demographic.

Ms. Harter inquired if the garages would be one or two-car.

Mr. Ferris responded that all the garages would be two-car.

Mr. Way inquired if the applicant has considered attempting to get an easement from Cosgray Road to the west site, not crossing the roadway. There appears to be wetland on the south end of the property; is that a constraint?

Mr. Ferris responded that they have not done a formal wetland study. That wetland is from the standard GIS; it would need to be confirmed. Attempting to get easement access from Cosgray Road is a good suggestion. However, they still would not have utility service.

Mr. Way responded that presumably there are utilities along Cosgray Road.

Mr. Hounshell responded that there are utilities along Cosgray Road.

Mr. Way pointed out that there could be both utilities and roadway access from Cosgray Road.

Mr. Ferris responded that preliminary conversations with the Engineering Department determined that the only portion that is tributary to the sanitary utilities is the triangular area.

Mr. Hounshell responded that Engineering is currently doing a study in this area about feasibility of utilities and service needs.

Mr. Way stated the reason he asks is that the development of the western portion of the property will be Phase 2. However, the future Tuttle Crossing Blvd. extension is not funded at this time. He is inquiring if, rather than waiting a long time for Phase 2, there might be way to obtain utility and roadway access so Phase 2 could occur sooner. The east portion of the site has access and utilities, so the Commission can consider it. However, it is difficult for the Commission to provide input for a proposal for all of the property. There are too many variables. From a land use standpoint, the updated Community Plan will determine the future of this entire area. If the applicant could obtain an easement and get access to Cosgray Road to the south of the RR, that would make development of the western site possible sooner.

Mr. Fishman stated that there is a need to be very creative with development in this area. Several years in the future, Dublin does not want this development to be referred to as the little houses next to the RR track. He also believes this area is within the Dublin School District, so the housing may attract single parents with children who will need to be in Dublin schools. Although the Community Plan recommended residential development in this area, his opinion has always been that it would better to have commercial development than residential next to a railroad track.

Ms. Call stated that she believes the adjacent Ballantrae subdivision is within the Hilliard school district. They are aware and involved in the Envision Dublin planning process.

Mr. Ferris responded that he believes it is in the Hilliard school district.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Harter stated that the RR is very close. She would need to understand the safety component in regard to placing residential next to a RR. In addition, Dublin could be involved in the future Amtrak expansion. We need to know more about that opportunity when considering development in this area. There may be associated Federal rules of which the Commission needs to be aware. She would prefer to see side-loaded garages, landscaping for privacy and concrete driveways. In addition, she believes each home should be very individual; it should not look like a house across the street. The nearby Ballantrae subdivision has many features that could be incorporated in this development. On Riverside Drive, there are several different patio home communities, yet they all look different. The applicant needs to work on making the development look different.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the RR is a divide when looking at land use, and a logical divide between residential development and something else. When looking at the area plan map, it would make sense to extend the Ballantrae character to the RR tracks and complete that triangular section that extends up to Darree Field, Shier Rings Road and the Innovation District. He does not think adding a different type of use would make sense. It would put emphasis on Cosgray Road to be more than a residential street through this area, to which the Ballantrae residents may object. The applicant's idea for the east side of the RR is the correct approach; the land use fits. However, the other side of the side of the RR tracks could be something different. Having spent some time studying this area, he believes the alignment of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard will have a significant impact on what might happen here. He still believes creating a village around the Amlin community remains a good idea. Transitioning from Amlin Village to the north, there is the Innovation District. There is now the possibility of the extension of the passenger rail system in this area, and nearby communities are planning other uses, such as commercial, in the area west of the RR tracks. There is a transitional land use occurring that cannot be determined until the extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd. is clarified. In summary, he believes the site east of the RR should fit with the character of Ballantrae and the undeveloped parcel north of the site could be developed in a number of ways. Following the completion of the Community Plan update and the new area plan, the Commission may have better awareness of the intent for this area. Because the future of the area will change dramatically, it is important for the Commission to keep an open mind.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant has submitted a nice package for an attractive community. The tentative architecture has been tested within the Delaware County area, and the material palette can be adjusted to mesh with the Ballantrae community. However, we are grappling with the uncertainty of some very major elements in this area, such as the Tuttle Crossing extension and the potential railway system. Therefore, Commissioners are uncomfortable with approving development on the west side. On the east side, residential development does seem appropriate. It may be necessary to consider the two parcels separately.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is not supportive of the proposal for a large number of small houses adjacent to a RR track. The proposal is for too many dwelling units within that space, which does not fit the character of Ballantrae or Amlin. The plan is more consistent with the MI units further down the road within a much smaller development. He recognizes that this is a challenging site, but it is essential for the applicant to come up with something much more creative, less dense, and more reasonable for placement next to the RR tracks.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would be supportive of residential development on the east side, but not on the west side. The proposed design for the east is nice but boring. Maybe that makes sense as it is next to the RR. However, the Commission consistently asks applicants to raise the bar in their proposals. He has no objective to the proposed density, but would like to see something more upscale for the proposed patio homes. He is unsure if there would be a market for that next to RR tracks. However, the 765 KV power lines extended through the Tartan development, which has multi-million dollar homes, did not negatively impact their market value. Although a railroad exists here, the site is very well sited next to Ballantrae. A more upscale development would not have front-load garages, and would be something different than the traditional lining within cul de sacs, perhaps with more unique architecture. An urban pocket neighborhood within a suburban setting could be potentially interesting.

Ms. Call stated that perspective matters. The future Land Use plan for this area was established with the thought that this area should be transitional to the rural neighborhood that existed further to the west. She does not believe the proposal for the east side meets the intent of a rural transition area. The recently approved Interim Land Use Principles assist in considering development proposals between the old and new Community Plans. One of the principles is for Dublin to be the most connected city. The proposed plan presents a challenge to meeting that principle, because of the railway, the lack of utilities and lack of connectivity. Mr. Way has suggested a way in which that might be remedied. Since the request is for an Informal Review, one suggestion would be to investigate as to whether that condition can be overcome. Are we looking at a 30-acre development or, potentially, a 100-acre development? The positive elements of the proposal include the preservation of tree rows and the overall open space. However, one of the challenges is the existing RR. She and Mr. Way serve on the Envision Dublin committee and are aware the west side will change from the intent for a rural transition area. A university center now exists in the northern area that extends to the Costco site. The Innovation District is transforming and has the potential for a mini city within that area. In the southwest, there also is the opportunity for the Amlin community to become a mini city center. This is no longer a rural transition area; it is a city center to city center transition. At the beginning of 2024, the Commission does not yet know what the new Community Plan will identify for this area; we do know it will be different than anticipated 15 years ago. The Envision Dublin meetings are open, and she would invite the applicant to attend and hear some of those discussions, which are beginning to identify what we anticipate developing on the west side of Dublin. She inquired if the applicant had any questions for the Commission, understanding that this is an Informal Review.

Mr. Ferris responded that they appreciate the feedback. He appreciates that the Commission sees the site as two separate areas. The RR does not concern them, as he has designed developments for Romanelli & Hughes, which are located 20-30 feet away from railroads. The recent development in Powell is next to a very busy RR; 200 feet provides a good buffer. However, the portion of the site on the west side is more difficult. The property owner will determine whether he wants to develop just 30 acres and hold the remaining portion until there is a future opportunity. The owner

has the ability to do that, since there are no stakeholders involved. They appreciate the Commission’s feedback on the residential portion.

DISCUSSION

- **Building Materials Database**

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh presented background on the effort to compile a Building Materials Database. The building materials discussion began with the June 2022 Joint Work Session. PZC members expressed concerns with the adequacy and longevity of the building materials within the Bridge Street District (BSD). Commission members expressed interest in acquiring additional building material analysis to enable them to make informed decisions on development proposals. They requested a database containing information about building materials and access to architectural expertise. Staff hired an architectural consultant in 2023 to provide professional architectural services and a supplemental review of materials. At the 2023 Joint Work Session, staff provided an update on their work on a database. Tonight’s presentation is of a database of PZC-approved building materials for the last 10 years within all zoning districts. This information is intended to be used as a reference for future development proposals for the same or similar building materials. The database is an easily trackable tool that includes case history and administrative details. Staff will evaluate proposed building materials against the database and provide recommendations. Ms. Singh presented and described images taken of building material longevity issues observed during the Commission’s recent BSD walking tour. Although the materials approved were high quality and appropriate for the development, issues are becoming apparent. For example, calcium silicate masonry is one of the primary materials approved and is holding up well, except in a few places. A few unsightly stains are seen at a few locations within Block A, where the stone is used as an edging/wall to the landscaping areas. We can infer that the moisture within the green pockets caused the stains on the masonry and thus the material application at a similar location in the future should be discussed and measures to avoid this should be taken into account. [Reviewed other incidences of issues with building materials used in the BSD.] Staff requests feedback on the following discussion topics:

1. Does the database and brief analysis of the Block A, B, C and D meet the expectation of the Commission?
2. Is the approach to analyzing the building materials appropriate?
3. What are the other details that should be included within the database?
4. Other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Mr. Schneier inquired and Ms. Singh provided clarification of how staff would use the database for new development proposals.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the database included hundreds of building materials.

Ms. Singh responded that it included much less than 500 materials.

Mr. Way noted that many times the issue is not due to the material but to its installation. Either the detailing was not done correctly or the contractor did not install it correctly. If items are not installed correctly, water will find a way to wash down a building material and create staining.

Ms. Call stated that Planning and Building department staff coordinate efforts. As the database is created, are certain issues being flagged that are commonly due to incorrect installation and are they being communicated to the Building Department staff, so that they look for those issues during their inspections? If an item is not installed correctly, the building should not receive a permit. Ms. Singh responded that Planning staff would be coordinating efforts with Building Standards.

Ms. Call inquired if the database would be accessible to applicants, so they can make themselves aware early of concerns with building materials.

Ms. Singh responded that is a great idea. The database could be a great resource for applicants, as well. Staff would work on including that access.

Mr. Way inquired if the City used peer review of construction documents, or does the responsibility fall entirely on the Building Department to review and comment on drawings to the applicant.

Ms. Rauch responded that City employees review the documents, but there are also consultants involved in review of certain applications.

Mr. Way stated that with peer reviews, the documents are reviewed independently, not driven by clients, budgets and deadlines. They are looking at them from the perspective of constructability, durability and water tolerance.

Mr. Way stated that performance was referenced as a category for evaluating building materials. How is performance defined?

Ms. Singh responded that in most cases, the material performance has been good, but the material choice in that particular location was not appropriate.

Mr. Way noted that would be the functionality of the material. He believes sustainability also is a category that should be considered and would recommend that the database include a sustainability rating for materials.

Mr. Fishman stated that using certain materials next to others can create a disastrous result. He believes consultants should be involved in these reviews, as it requires an individual with considerable expertise to be aware of those issues.

Mr. Supelak stated that the database should be a useful tool without becoming overwhelming. Many different bricks exist, each involving a very different chemistry and method. At this point, the database is a draft. The question is how it can become a useful tool for all parties in the review process without becoming a quagmire by attempting to capture everything. LEED is a widely used green building rating system, so it is not necessary to re-invent the wheel in that area. The Commission has concerns about certain composite wood products. It would be beneficial to collect intel on that and on materials that have not worked well in our community. If they have not, were items missed on the drawing set, material selection or installation inspection? In his view, although the database can be a useful tool, there is also the danger of it becoming too overwhelming.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates staff's work on collecting the database; however, it will be necessary to have a consultant with expertise involved in the review.

Ms. Harter stated that she appreciates staff's time and effort on this project. She believes the PZC walking tour was beneficial to the Commission's awareness, and Mr. Ford, the architectural consultant, has been very helpful. She likes the suggestion to make the database available to applicants and homeowners.

Ms. Call stated this is a tool that previously the Commission did not have. With this database and the architectural consultant, the Commission is better prepared to consider building materials in future development applications. The database includes approved and installed materials; however, there are newer building materials, which the Commission has not yet seen. Although they have been used elsewhere, they have not yet been used in the City of Dublin. Historically, the Commission has hesitated approving the use of new building materials in the City. She would suggest that the first time one is proposed, it should not be the primary material on a large-scale building. Perhaps the consultant would be able to identify a potential pilot project for a new material. It could be tested on a City building or in a limited placement to assess its performance over a period of time and in various weather conditions. She appreciates the database, which will provide the Commission a usable tool it did not have previously.

COMMUNICATIONS

The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 18, 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council