



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 17, 2025

### CALL TO ORDER

Rebecca Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the April 17, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website and that public comments on the cases were welcome from both meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Gary Alexander, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter  
Commission members absent: Kim Way  
Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Jenny Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Heidi Rose, Josh Reinicke

### ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Deschler moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 03-06-25 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 6-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call Way explained the hearing process that would be followed. She clarified for the audience's benefit that Case 25-014CP - Avery Crossing is a Concept Plan; therefore, only feedback would be provided to the applicant. No action would be taken on the proposal at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Call swore in staff and audience members who anticipated providing testimony.

Mr. Deschler excused himself from the Consent Cases.

## **CONSENT CASES**

- **Case 25-029AFDP - Dublin Scioto High School – Amended Final Development Plan**

A request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for minor site improvements to a multipurpose sports field. The 54.3 acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District (PUD): NE Quad and is located at 4000 Hard Road.

- **Case 25-030AFDP - Dublin Jerome High School – Amended Final Development Plan**

A request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for minor site improvements to a multipurpose sports field. The 87.6 acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District (PUD): Dublin Jerome High School and is located at 8300 Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Call inquired if any Commission member requested to move a Consent Case to the regular agenda for discussion. No Commission member requested that a Consent Case be moved to the regular agenda.

No public comments were provided on the Consent Cases.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Garvin seconded to approve the Consent Cases as follows:

Case 25-029AFDP – Dublin Scioto High School:

- Approve the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with a minor text modification and one condition:
  - 1) The applicant submits revised plans with a portion of the proposed hardscape removed to meet the maximum permitted lot coverage, subject to staff review and approval, prior to building permitting.

Case 25-30AFDP – Dublin Jerome High School:

- Approve the AFDP with one condition:
  - 1) The applicant submits a revised site plan noting all pavement setbacks and required screening details for the bleachers, subject to staff review and approval, at building permitting.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0.]

Mr. Deschler returned to his seat.

## **CASE REVIEWS**

- **Case #25-014CP - Avery Crossing – Concept Plan**

Request for review and non-binding feedback for a mixed-use development comprised of residential, commercial and open space. The 127-acre site is zoned R, Rural and located southwest of the Rings Road and Avery Road intersection.

## **Applicant Presentation**

Kolby Turnock, CASTO, 250 Civic Center Drive, Columbus, provided an introduction. Because it has been some time since they last presented this project to the Commission, he would like to provide some context on the revisions that have been made to the plan. His colleagues initially presented an Informal Review Plan to the Commission on October 20, 2023 and received great feedback. They also met with the Ponderosa homeowners association (HOA), Cramer's Crossing representatives and some representatives on the east side of Avery Road. They have been working over a year with City staff on revisions to the plan. One of the biggest changes is the alignment of the new Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension. After much discussion, they have identified an alignment that meets the goals of the Community Plan and helps enhance the development as a whole. He reviewed the items in the revised site plan that have been addressed since the previous review meeting and indicated that Ted Singer, Dimit Architects, will discuss the design-related items. Mr. Turnock stated that this is a conceptual plan; we are still in the fact-finding phase of the project. The primary change is the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension. Previously, it was a grid, rectilinear layout. The new layout emphasizes the curvilinear nature that is more common in this area of Dublin and is recommended by the Community Plan. From that point, they took another look at the greenways, particularly at how they could be incorporated into the central components of the plan. They looked at how to add some revised stormwater layouts into the open space. That began to create the framework for the revised development. They also addressed the mixed-use along Avery Road. There were some connection points with the existing Ponderosa community that were eliminated. There was an access from the existing community to the proposed extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard that has been removed. There is still a proposed connection to the new development, which is based on a life-safety issue, that could be further explored. Some of the uses that have evolved since last time are the uses in Subarea I, which is to the west of the existing Ponderosa community. Previously, it was identified as 'O' lot lines, single-family. Now, they have proposed three different product types, providing a variety of housing options. They have retained the rural character along Rings Road with the single-family homes, then transitioned to a more dense, attached townhome product. Additionally, there are some triplexes along the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard portion of the site. The multi-family, the most dense portion of the project, is to the south abutting the existing multi-family. At the previous meeting, there was discussion that there was too much density down there, so we reduced the buildings to smaller footprints and eliminated a floor, making them three-story buildings. During the past year, the site plan has been maneuvered significantly. They are looking forward to having the Commission's feedback on the revised uses, thoroughfare plan and street network.

Ted Singer, Dimit Architects, 14725 Detroit Road, Lakewood, reviewed the street typologies in the proposal, which are based on the City's design guidelines. The arterial street is the Tuttle Crossing extension; there are neighborhood boulevard streets that connect to existing road networks beyond the site's borders; and there are smaller neighborhood boulevards and private drives that allow vehicular access without having a multitude of garage-fronting properties. After the alignment of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard was settled upon, the uses and densities determined and the adjacencies of neighboring properties, they looked for various opportunities to distribute open space around the site to create buffers between existing communities and create central gathering places to accommodate stormwater management and create larger scale outdoor spaces, especially in the southwest corner adjacent to the existing forested parcel. There are 24+ acres of open space distributed around the development site. The open spaces consist of four main typologies. (1)

community gathering spaces - for the more dense mixed-use site to the south, and a central gathering space for the smaller-scale residential homes on the north side; (2) stormwater gardens distributed as buffers and active, natural landscapes to create zones and manage stormwater effectively; (3) natural landscape as edge conditions and the median of the Tuttle Crossing extension; (4) a larger, outdoor recreation space to allow for activities -- the central lawn is in the more residential, northern portion of the site. It is intended to create a sense of community between various housing types. Stormwater gardens will be both functional and create natural landscape buffers to the west of the existing Ponderosa community, between the new Tuttle Crossing extension and the residential community to the north. Native landscapes and buffer zones are utilized in different ways to create edges to the less-developed areas to the west and are also distributed along the Avery Crossing extension. They can provide different functions, such as gardens, natural landscape for biodiversity purposes, communal recreational fields (larger section of the parcel on the southwest corner). This would be a good place to add a trail connection. On the northeast corner of the site is the mixed-use zone providing some commercial uses and some different landscape elements more public in nature. There could be portions programmed for farmers markets and outdoor gathering spaces. The northeast corner provides the entrance point to the site. There are a variety of lower-density residential units on the northwest portion of the site that includes 4 housing typologies: single-family detached homes; duplexes; groups of four to six townhouses; and larger-scale, 3-unit triplexes on the south. The intent is to transition from the single family on the north to the triplexes on the perimeter and the townhouse development in the center resulting in a mixture of texture and density. This is a sizable development of 127 acres, and we wanted to avoid creating a mono-culture of one continuous housing type across the site. The goal was to create a mixture of styles with no dominant architectural style. The general feel would be vernacular to central Ohio with different shingle styles or farmhouse and craftsman elements creating a variety within the community that gives it a sense of place. It will not feel like a singular development. He reviewed the single-family lots on Rings Road. On the north side, there would be duplex townhouses; in the central area would be a cluster of 3-unit townhouses; on the south and west edge, would be a larger block of centralized townhouses. The commercial, mixed-use and multifamily would be on the Avery Road frontage and to the south of the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Will stated this is a Concept Plan review, where the applicant is seeking non-binding feedback only; no determination is provided. The purpose of the Concept Plan is to provide the opportunity for the applicant to receive high-level input on the proposed development and its alignment with the Community Plan in regard to land use, layout, streets, open space, and integration with the existing conditions and surrounding neighborhoods. Additional project information would be required if the application is moved forward. This proposed development type would require a rezoning, so applications for the future plans would need to be reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council. The 127 acre-site is located southwest of the intersection of Avery Road and Rings Road and is zoned Rural. This includes the 16-acre property along the west edge, which was added to the proposed site plan since the previous application. The site contains the existing 107-lot Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates, several tree rows and a large woodlot to the southwest. This site is located south of established single-family areas to the north along Rings Road including portions of Ballantrae and Cramer's Crossing. Areas to the southeast of the site are located within the City of Columbus. The site is not presently served by water or sanitary sewer. Utilities are intended to be included with the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard.

Those details have yet to be determined by the applicant. The applicant previously appeared before the Commission on October 20, 2023. The Commission expressed support for the proposed uses but raised concerns that the densities exceeded the Community Plan recommendations in some areas. The Commission was not supportive of the proposed character of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension stating that it should better reflect what was in the Special Area Plan. The Commission also was not supportive of the extension of Bonanza Lane through the Ponderosa neighborhood and its connection to the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. At that meeting, the Commission recommended the applicant meet with the residents of Ponderosa following the meeting. The developer did meet with them, as well as the Cramer's Crossing HOA representative and neighbors along the north side of Rings Road and east of Avery Road. Since the October 2023 application, City Council adopted an updated Community Plan. The Plan's Future Land Use (FLU) recommendations for this site include Mixed-Use Neighborhood fronting Avery Road and Mixed-Residential density for the remainder of the site. The intent of the Mixed-Use Neighborhood is to create a walkable and auto-accessible neighborhood with services located near existing and future residential. Principle uses include office, personal services, commercial/retail and eating/drinking. Supporting uses include single-family and multi-family residential. Buildings are recommended to be one-three stories, residential-scaled and street-facing, store front entrances along sidewalks, and a mix of horizontal and vertical uses. The residential mixed-density is envisioned to be a walkable neighborhood marketable to all age groups with a variety of housing types, integrated to adjacent entertainment and employment areas. Principal uses are single-family and multi-family residential. Residential density should be between 3 and 12 dwelling units per acre (du/acre) with a variety of housing types. The Thoroughfare Plan makes recommendations for this site including the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. This is identified as a corridor of significance with heightened green setbacks, curvilinear design and a more parkway treatment with water features. Rings Road is recommended to maintain a two-lane section and preserve its existing rural character and identity. Avery Road is recommended to be widened to four lanes with roundabouts at Rings Road and at Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. The proposed development generally aligns with the Community Plan's multi-modal plan at this point, but a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) should be done with the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), should the development proposal move forward. While the Future Land Use (FLU) Plan ensures compatibility and coordinated growth throughout Dublin, in key areas of the City where substantial development or redevelopment is likely, Special Area Plans provide illustrative frameworks for additional design guidelines for developments. The Special Area Plan recommendations for this area include establishing a mixed-use neighborhood node along Avery Road; transitioning future residential with less intense residential near Rings Road; preservation of the Ponderosa neighborhood; the extension of Tuttle Crossing as a signature parkway; the incorporation of tree rows and other natural features into the site design; and the use of a large woodlot within the Avondale Woods Reserve as a backdrop for a future park space and potential trailhead.

Mr. Will stated that the applicant has updated the proposed development concept, organizing it into four subareas. Subarea 1 contains 52 acres of single-family residential; Subarea 2 contains the existing Ponderosa development; Subarea 3 contains the Neighborhood Mixed-Use area along Avery Road; and Subarea 4 contains Multifamily Residential south of the proposed extension of Tuttle Crossing. The proposed density of the Subarea 1, single-family, is 6 du./acre.; Subarea 4 multifamily is 13 du./acre. Subarea 1 meets the recommended FLU density of 3-12 du./acre, while Subarea 4 exceeds it.

Mr. Will noted that the updates to the proposed residential area since the October 2023 meeting include the reduction in height of the proposed apartments from 4 stories to 3 stories and reducing their footprint to a smaller scale. Larger lot, single-family homes are now adjacent to Rings Road and the existing neighborhoods to the north, and a greater variety of residential types across the site are included and better integrated to one another. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines are applicable to Subarea 1. Their intent is to foster character and sense of place in future single-family neighborhoods through landscape design, architecture and lot layout. Subarea 1 contains four single-family home lot types – single-family, duplex, townhome and cluster homes. Details for these lot layouts need to be further defined if this proposal proceeds. The development will be consistent with the vernacular architecture of central Ohio. Within the Neighborhood Mixed-Use subarea, the applicant is proposing one to three-story commercial and residential buildings organized along the street and open spaces and 112,000 square feet (SF) of development. The proposed layout is generally consistent with the FLU land use characteristics. The proposal includes 24.5 acres of open space on the site. Since the October 2023 Informal Review, the applicant has provided an open-space framework plan. Updates to the open space framework that align with the Community Plan include the park-like character along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, additional open space, neighborhood greens and gathering places throughout the subareas, and a park space that has a backdrop to the woods south of the site. Additionally, the area proposed for stormwater ponds has been increased. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines require that retention and detention areas be high quality and amenitized to qualify toward the open space calculation. In addition to the open space framework, the applicant is proposing open space setbacks and buffers between residential areas and proposed developments specifically along Rings Road and adjacent to the Ponderosa community. The applicant has also refined the proposed internal street network from the more rigid grid to the more curvilinear layout. They have also established a street hierarchy, which is encouraged by the Neighborhood Design Guidelines, referencing typical street sections from the Community Plan. Updates to the street network since the Informal Review include the elimination of the proposed extension of Bonanza Lane through Ponderosa, eliminating the connection to Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, and eliminating the street connection between Ponderosa and the proposed Mixed-Use area along Avery Road. They have provided an additional neighborhood-level connection to the west of the site.

Mr. Will stated that discussion questions have been provided to the Commission to facilitate non-binding feedback to the applicant.

### **Commission Questions for Applicant and Staff**

Mr. Garvin requested clarification of what appears to be a contradiction between prescribed densities. The FLU Plan has the the Mixed-Residential low-density and Suburban Residential low density. The Southwest Area Plan shows one to three dwelling units per acre (du/acre), but what is the du/acre prescribed in the updated Community Plan?

Mr. Will responded that the Residential Mixed density, as recommended by the Community Plan, provides a range of densities. The intent is that not all development in this area be the maximum. There is a range of densities, and some areas might even be below that to meet the gross overall density. The Southwest Area Plan focuses on the transition of densities to match the existing densities north of Rings Road, Ballantrae and Cramer's Crossing and some of the larger legacy lots on the north side of the road.

Mr. Garvin inquired if in that area they would prescribe 1 to 3 units/acre.

Mr. Will responded that it would generally be 3 to 12 du/acre. The Special Area Plan provides a closer view and an additional layer of guidance, while the FLU provides a higher level view.

Mr. Garvin inquired if, when they reduced some of the density on the southern edge, it changed the overall density.

Mr. Turnock stated that he would need to confirm the overall density. He believes in the southern district, it has been reduced. The overall density of the site is probably 7.5 du/acre.

Mr. Garvin inquired if any units have been eliminated.

Mr. Turnock responded that he does not know. The primary issue they tried to address was the different types of housing product. The previous proposal was predominantly single-family on small lots. They have addressed that, which may appear to increase the density. He would need to confirm the current density.

Mr. Garvin stated that the applicant also revised the plan to address the feedback that the public spaces be more central. It appears that has been done by revising the stormwater management plan. Activated spaces need to have a designated future use. He notices a pier on the end of one end of the large stormwater pond. What are some ways they plan to activate the public spaces?

Mr. Turnock responded that Engineering indicated that they were showing too little in regard to the stormwater plans. They attempted to right-size the quantity of spaces. They understand that the open space requirement for stormwater needs to have not just a detention pond with a programmed use; it needs to be incorporated into a larger, open space program to be utilized by the community. He has no details yet on sizing and depth.

Mr. Garvin stated that it is important that they are not wasted, visual-only spaces. As has been mentioned, the maximum allowable density on the south end is 12 du/acre; the proposed density on the southern edge is 13 du/acre. What is the reason the applicant decided they needed to exceed the permitted density?

Mr. Turnock responded that it is due to the building layout. They were trying to achieve the mix that is appropriate for the market and could be curated appropriately.

Mr. Garvin stated that many of the traffic implications would be reliant on the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension, which is not in the City's 5-year Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). How does that affect the timeline for this development? Would they need to know the exact alignment before building?

Mr. Turnock responded affirmatively. It is a critical component for the overall master plan of the site. They have worked with staff to come up with the proposed layout; however, the spine needs to be in place for the western portions of the site to be developed. There could be opportunities to begin development of the eastern portion of the site before that roadway extension.

Mr. Garvin stated that he saw the feedback received from the neighbors; however, he did not notice the Ballantrae HOA listed. Have they had interaction with that HOA?

Mr. Turnock stated that they did have a communication, which was forwarded today. However, no meeting with the HOA has occurred. They can do so moving forward.

Ms. Call stated that the overall density calculation for the 114-acre site appears to be 5.37 du/acre with 719 units not including the commercial area. 107 of the units are Ponderosa community units, resulting in a balance of 612 units.

Mr. Deschler inquired the gist of the feedback from the conversations with the other neighbors in the surrounding area, including the Ponderosa community.

Mr. Turnock responded his understanding is that the Ponderosa community had significant concerns about the connections to the new proposed uses and the traffic impact. His discussion with the neighbor to the north of Rings Road was traffic-focused, as well. The TIS) will be important in regard to the access points and configuration that will be required. With the Ponderosa community, he believes there is some concern about security, construction sequencing and the level of disruption to their daily lives. As they proceed, they will determine how to screen the existing community from the rest of the development.

Mr. Deschler inquired if he has questions about the traffic, he should bring them up after the TIS has been conducted or present them now.

Ms. Call stated that with a Concept Plan, traffic study details are not discussed, but if there are specific items that a Commissioner believes the TIS should pay attention to, they could request staff to add them to the study.

Mr. Will stated that with the updated Community Plan, transportation and mobility are considered as to their alignment with the Thoroughfare Plan multi-modal plan. If the development meets that plan generally at this point, it is determined that the traffic can be managed. The TIS helps determine the phasing, timing and exact steps. At this point, the proposal has to provide the connection points and necessary widths so we can ensure public service connectivity needs can be met.

Mr. Deschler inquired what is the access to Subarea 3 from Avery Road. Will drivers turn left to reach the proposed commercial area?

Mr. Turnock responded that he believes it is a full access point, but the TIS will help determine the access points and their configuration and locations.

Mr. Deschler stated that further down Avery Road, there appears to be a right turn only access/egress point near the park area.

Mr. Turnock responded that is correct.

Mr. Deschler stated that if the TIS will be analyzing those components, that is good; if not, he believes some different entrances will be needed into Subarea 3. He believes the traffic movement will be tight, especially once Tuttle Crossing is extended and Avery Road becomes four lanes. Drivers already exceed the speed limit on Avery Road, and it will be worse once that road is a 4-lane highway. He is not sure what could be done from a design perspective, but something different is needed for Subarea 3 to better route the traffic. Looking south at the proposed Tuttle Crossing extension, the development has only a right-out egress. How would pedestrians cross from Subarea 1 or 2 to get to Subarea 4 to reach the park? Will pedestrians be required to use the sidewalk along the road, or are there designated pedestrian access points, such as a tunnel under the Tuttle Crossing extension or a pedestrian bridge?

Mr. Turnock responded that detail has not yet been worked out with staff with the design of that roadway extension.

Mr. Deschler stated that as it is, Subarea 4 is cut off. Is it being considered a separate development piece? Is it the intent that residents in Subarea 1 have access to the park?

Mr. Turnock responded that ideally, it would all be connected. If you look at existing crossing points on other Dublin boulevard streets, similar conditions exist between neighborhoods. He believes the TIS and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension design process will work out the details to meet the needs.

Mr. Deschler stated that if there are children trying to cross that road to reach the park, it could be problematic; there needs to be a pedestrian-only access. Are the stormwater facilities all anticipated to be retention ponds?

Mr. Turnock responded that the site is fairly flat, sloping somewhat from west to east. We are looking for the best locations for the retention ponds and to define the size, depth and ways to activate and incorporate the pond into the open space.

Mr. Deschler stated that there could be opportunity for multiple ponds beyond the western portion. Channeling all the stormwater runoff from the residential development would involve significant drainage management. He believes there is opportunity to look at the visual aspect of that stormwater management. There can be overflow areas more central to the site. He inquired if the developer has considered ways for the central lawn area to be more visible and extravagant. It feels tight where it is.

Mr. Turnock responded that opportunity can be explored with the next iteration. The revised plan tonight was their effort to respond to the previous meeting's feedback.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the homes facing Rings Road will have garages on their back side or if the homes will front the interior road.

Mr. Turnock responded that the garages would be on the back side of the homes, and the frontage would be on Rings Road.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the City will be establishing the right-of-way for the Tuttle Crossing extension.

Mr. Will responded that the TIS will be looking at the details of alignment, curvature and access management to make sure the improvements are what are needed. If the project advances, staff will discuss those details with the applicant and establish the right-of-way jointly with the applicant. Through the plan review process, it would come before the Commission for consideration, as well.

Mr. Alexander referred to the site design and stated that it appears when the plan was revised, they gave up their goal of connecting the commercial and retail development at the front of the site with the western portion of the site.

Mr. Turnock stated that they have not given it up, but they received some feedback that the preference from the existing community was to not have a substantial connection. The pedestrian pathways in the Concept Plan are more limited than in the previous plan.

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason there are not more commercial buildings fronting Avery Road. He understands the village green and there are planning precedents for that in Old Worthington and south Upper Arlington. However, commercial structures would have visibility on Avery Road. Why is there not more massing along Avery Road?

Mr. Turnock responded that it is something they could explore with their retail group and other partners on the commercial side of the development. It was a recommendation to start with on the Concept Plan, but it could be changed.

Mr. Alexander referred to linkages and connections and inquired if there was any thought to letting some of the commercial buildings migrate across Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, as opposed to having residential use there.

Mr. Turnock responded that with the various versions of the plan, there probably was an iteration that showed commercial there, and it is something that they could continue to explore.

Mr. Alexander inquired if all of the multifamily, with the exception of the large townhouses, would provide the required parking within and under the units.

Mr. Turnock responded affirmatively. Although the plan has not yet advanced to that level of detail, in general, those product types are self-parked.

Ms. Harter inquired if the natural landscape in the center of the 4-lane boulevard (6 acres) is being identified as open space. How is that determined to be a usable public space?

Mr. Turnock inquired if Ms. Harter was referring to the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard median.

Ms. Harter responded affirmatively. Her question is if it is not usable, would the applicant consider relocating it where it would be usable?

Mr. Singer responded that they are open to looking at options for how the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension could be utilized. Initially, there was a desire to add additional width to that roadway, but because how it connects would circle within the proximity of the Ponderosa community, it had to be narrower to create a usable area to the south. As it extends to the west, we could broaden it to create the curvilinear geometry for which the Commission expressed a preference. The middle space is somewhat similar to other parkway boulevards within the City of Dublin.

Mr. Turnock stated that they are open to maneuvering the geometry of that roadway extension. If the suggestion is that open space be relocated to the single-family side instead of being in the street median and be programmed differently, they would be willing to consider that. They have presented roadway geometry for which a preference was expressed in the updated Community Plan. They are open to any feedback to help formulate a plan that can move forward.

Ms. Call requested Mr. Will to comment on the Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Will responded that the multimodal plan identifies Tuttle Crossing Boulevard as a significant corridor. It would be similar to Muirfield Drive with its wide, green median open space. He referred to the area at the Brand Road roundabout where the median contains the Jack Nicklaus statue and topiary – the public can actually access that median space. A similar median space here could count as open space if it is programmed and treated respectfully and not simply be mowed turf.

Ms. Harter inquired if the look of the area down from the roundabout would change.

Mr. Will responded that the intent is that with any future development on any other sites, the development approval would follow a similar review process with the Commission at which the alignment layout and character would be provided. The intent of the multimodal plan is that it be a signature experience with a lot of greenspace and open vistas.

Ms. Harter inquired if the City would coordinate the overall intent with the other developments along that roadway.

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired about the acre designated for a public art park.

Mr. Turnock responded that the Neighborhood Design Guidelines puts forth the idea of establishing a theme. We looked at the opportunity to use that very visible corner to establish and anchor that theme. On the site plan, it is shown as a public landscape maze, but other images are proposed that show different ideas. We are just beginning to explore the opportunity to create that theme at the gateway to the neighborhood.

Ms. Harter inquired if the corner where a recreation area is designated would be open to the public.

Mr. Turnock responded affirmatively. That area abuts the woods to the south. It is a larger open space, so it is better suited for more active recreational uses. It could also provide a connection to a trail system that might extend through those woods.

Ms. Harter inquired about the plans for the existing house on Rings Road.

Mr. Turnock responded that at this time, it is excluded. The intent is to maintain the existing character of Rings Road and not introduce a new element there.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the open space shown in the site plan meets the greenspace requirements for the site.

Mr. Will responded that the planned unit development process is a negotiated process. Determining the greenspace involves a public hearing process with the Commission, who provides input on what the greenspace should be. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines are applicable to the Subarea 1, single-family portion of that. Those guidelines prescribe the purpose and intent of these spaces, which are intended to be useful with theme and identity. The stormwater ponds have to be amenitized and treated properly. At this time, it is unclear if those areas are more about stormwater or more about public greenspace. There are elements of the plan that align with the Special Area Plan and Community Plan, such as Area E adjacent to the large woodstands. There should be a variety of spaces and purpose; there should not be just one type of open space.

Mr. Chinnock requested the applicant to clarify the anticipated building heights.

Mr. Turnock stated that for the mixed-use, we are showing one- to three-story buildings for professional service and retail uses.

Ms. Call stated that it appears in Subarea 3, the applicant has two commercial building types. She requested clarification of the square footage of nonresidential in the entirety of the plan.

Mr. Singer stated that in Subarea 3, they have a total of 46,000 SF of retail/restaurant space.

Ms. Call inquired if they see that as a significant change from the last time the project was reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Turnock stated that he would have to compare the SF of both. He believes the present iteration is driven more by layout and feedback from their partners as to what the services/retailers might be.

Ms. Call inquired, based on the Commission's feedback at the previous review, what the overall goal was with the current acreage change. Was the goal to maintain, increase or lower density since the previous review?

Mr. Turnock stated that he does not know that they were trying to maintain density. They heard the Commissioners' comments that the density needed to be lowered in certain areas, and they reacted to that comment. Based on the Commission's earlier calculations, the density has increased. They were not attempting to reach a target density. They were just trying to be sensitive about the areas where the Commission had indicated the density needed to be lowered.

Mr. Chinnock stated that at the previous meeting, we discussed the neighborhood boulevard, the main artery that runs north-south through the center of the site. We talked about that being a significant opportunity to create a nice streetscape. He requested that the applicant describe their vision for that main artery.

Mr. Turnock responded that the product type lends itself to that brownstone walkup townhome feel. We have it connecting to the neighborhood to the south to create connectivity. That organization of the plan does have a central north-south residential thoroughfare running through the spine of the community.

### **Public Comments**

Ron Lovell, 5753 Bonnally Ct., Ballantrae community, stated that the 719 units in this plan along with the 200 in the Irish Village development are a significant concern due to the increased volume

in the area. In regard to the proposed 3-story buildings, the online write-up indicates that this is supposed to be an extension of the Ballantrae community. Nowhere in the Ballantrae community are there 3-story buildings, as are proposed in this plan and in Irish Village. The volume of traffic on Eiterman Road past the Elementary School, the splashpad, etc. is overwhelming. At the school dropoff and pickup times, the traffic backs up on Eiterman Road near the school ingress/egress. Having no interactions with the Ballantrae community is concerning, in view of how close this project is to that community. This past Tuesday evening, a Ballantrae civic association meeting was scheduled at the Community Recreation Center, but it was so overwhelmingly attended, that they had to cancel the meeting due to its posing a fire hazard. The attendance volume was driven by significant concerns about this development, the Irish Village and the Cosgray data center. He heard about the speed limits on Avery Road. He often drives Eiterman Road and the speeds on that road are excessive. It is a heavily travelled residential area. He is concerned about the other construction in the West Innovation Area (WID). Along with the new sports parks, there will be a significant level of construction occurring at once. There are a lot of connecting streets there that have or will have heavy traffic volumes.

Molly Sin, 6236 Rings Road, Dublin, stated that she has spoken with her neighbors on the northern side of Rings Road and met with the Casto representative. She agrees with the concerns which Mr. Lovell just expressed. She appreciates the City's and Casto's efforts to refine the original proposal and agrees with Mr. Chinnock that the density is greater than in the initial site plan. There are burdens that the residents on Rings Road currently face. There is the financial impact of the easement improvements. Property owners along Rings Road have already agreed to sell their easements directly in front of their homes to the City to facilitate the installation of City waterlines and sidewalks. In 2019, the quoted cost was between \$10,000-\$20,000 in added improvements that they eventually they will have to pay for. With the passage of time, that cost will double. While beneficial for the community, it places an additional burden on the property owners. It will cost them \$70,000-\$100,00 to connect to the City waterline. Their home is currently dependent on well water. There is the potential loss of access to those resources due to the nearby development. Statistically, developments in the area, such as theirs, experience decreased water access or dry wells. 20 years ago, their specific property was the subject of a court case won due to their being forced to relocate their well after nearby neighborhood development caused a drop in water levels. They fear a similar situation occurring. They also will be impacted by an increase in traffic noise and air pollution. They urge Casto and the City to consider reviewing the access streets off Rings Road. In summary, the proposed development will lead to decreased property values, pose safety risks, and result in an increase in accidents, crime and general disruption to the neighborhood.

Bill Sluka, 5590 Stockton Way, Cramers Crossing, Dublin, echoed concerns about the proposed density from both this development and that happening to the south in the Columbus-Hilliard area. If any of this development occurs before Avery Road is improved, there will be even greater traffic problems there than they have today. The residents in this area feel ignored because they are not in the Dublin School District. He hopes the City considers the traffic impact on those residents in the Hilliard School District. In regard to HOA fees, he believes that when installing amenities in a development, consideration should be given to the cost of maintenance. There should be a balance between the aesthetics and the maintenance cost impact to the homeowners.

Matthew Langhals, 5733 Trafalgar Lane, Ballantrae community, Dublin, stated that the proposal would be placing too many people within the limited acreage. He is an area attorney. He believes opening offices in a mixed-use area, such as is proposed, is where businesses go to die. Nobody

goes to businesses in these type of mixed-use areas. No one will walk up Rings or Avery roads to those businesses. There are many access points off Rings Road. The City is indicating that they want to maintain a rural feel to the 2-lane road, but they will be unable to do so with that number of access points into the neighborhood. Rings Road and Avery Road already are becoming Indy 500 roads.

Christian Cooney, 5835 Barronscourt Way, Ballantrae community, Dublin, stated that they were shocked recently to learn that the undeveloped land to the north, west and south has all been rezoned and re-envisioned. They have been told that because this area is addressed in the Envision Dublin Plan, they can do nothing. This will be a telling test. How much fidelity will the City hold to the prescribed density in the Envision Dublin Plan? He explained the difference of 3 du/acre and 6 du/acre could be seen by comparing Ballantrae Woods and the Lakes of Dublin. The developer has indicated that they are moving the greater density from the north to the south side of the site. The proposed density on the east and west of the site is inconsistent with the Community Plan. The Envision Dublin Plan has a large green park area on the south to give access to the woods and provide a focal point similar to Glacier Ridge. Per this plan, most of that property will be comprised of five apartment buildings. If the City has identified that area as park, why isn't it being required to be a park? On Cosgray Road, the road setbacks go to the back of the farmhouses. In that area, the developer is planning to construct single-family homes, so it will lose the intended character. Why aren't PZC and City staff requiring developers to abide by the Envision Dublin Plan? If the City is not going to require that, then it means there is flexibility for the industrial area to the west of Cosgray and the commercial and industrial proposed to be built to the north of Shier Rings. This is a test of PZC and City staff. Will they ensure fidelity to the Envision Dublin Plan, or will that occur only when it's convenient for the City?

Liz Lovell, 5753 Bonally Ct., Dublin, stated that the City has planned well, and as a result, the City is beautiful. However, it seems that the 43016 area is a little neglected in some ways. You are proposing to build 3-story apartment buildings here, but those don't exit anywhere else in Dublin. In addition, there are assumptions that the younger generation wants mixed-use. Not all of us want to live in mixed-use areas. We prefer single-family residential areas; that's the reason we live there. If I wanted mixed-use, I would live in Bridge Street. We like living in the "burbs." We can drive and go to other places.

Patty Marlin, Cottages of Ballantrae Woods, Dublin, stated that she does not believe their HOA met with the developers, which would have been helpful. Many of her neighbors did not even know about this meeting. She does not even attempt to exit left from her neighborhood onto Avery Road, due to the traffic volume. If 719 units are placed in this area, which would be at least 1,438 additional drivers, the traffic going the other way on Rings Road will back up all the way to Amlin and the railroad tracks, trying to access Cosgray Road and Rings Road. Cosgray, Avery and Rings roads all need to be four lanes, especially if all this development is planned. The City needs to add the infrastructure first, then build. However, she agrees with Ms. Lovell; she did not select this community to live in thinking it would have apartments. Will this end up being Section 8 housing? She also agrees that we do not need retail here. We have retail down the street, less than ½ mile. Customers for the businesses will not choose to shop where left or right turns are difficult or there is no parking. There will not be sufficient schools for the additional children. What is proposed will make the area very difficult for residents. She loves Dublin, but hates to see so much growth. What they are proposing on Cosgray Road is extremely disappointing.

David Row, 5749 Trafalgar Lane, Ballantrae community, Dublin, referred to the proposed building architecture shown. He does not know yet if he is for or against the development but recognizes that this farmland will be developed into something in the future. What is proposed may not be the best choice, but it is better than a Walmart or a skyscraper. He would recommend that the City have conversations with the residents of Ballantrae. There are many people there, 100s of homes. While we don't come out for everything, when we are concerned, we come out in force. That is evidenced by our attempted HOA meeting earlier this week, at which too many people showed up, causing it to be postponed until a large enough meeting site can be found. He would ask that the developer and staff not rely on meeting with a few people from the Ballantrae HOA, but have a more open forum. They have had recent communication problems with their HOA. He pointed out a couple of apartment building examples shown that seem out of character to the neighborhood and single-family homes. He agrees with the others here that he does not want to see a large amount of dense residential, and certainly not nondescript, block apartment buildings. What will be the price point of the single-family homes and the different residential structures? He would appreciate if any development in the surrounding area make room for multi-use paths. It will be important to traverse Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and make the area as walkable and bikable as possible.

Ms. Call thanked the residents for their comments. She asked Ms. Rauch to explain the Envision Dublin Community Plan and the frequency at which the Community Plan is refreshed, and what areas have or have not yet been rezoned.

Ms. Rauch responded that Envision Dublin was the recent update to the City's Community Plan, which occurs every 7-10 years. The most recent update was adopted in July 2024 after an 18-month study process, largely led by a steering committee that included Council, PZC, Architectural Review Board (ARB) members and many stakeholders of the community, including businesses and Dublin and Hilliard School Boards. The children in the homes in this proposed development would attend Hilliard Schools. That planning process looked at land uses City-wide, not just where there are Special Area Plans. It looked at identifying the most appropriate land uses, transitions between existing and new development. City planners use the Community Plan in our work every day, particularly when development is proposed. The City has received many development proposals within this particular southwest area. Those proposals have been Concept or Informal Review applications. We have not had many rezoning requests. The residential applications have been seeking Commission feedback. City Council did recently review a rezoning request for the West Innovation District, which was in furtherance of the updated Community Plan and Economic Development Strategy.

Ms. Call asked staff to provide an overview of the interaction between the City and the School Districts and how the School Districts use the tools provided by the City in their daily planning.

Ms. Rauch stated that as part of the Community Plan update, proposed densities are considered. Additional development impacts school enrollment numbers. Dublin and Hillard City Schools do their own planning and enrollment projections. Having those school districts represented on the Envision Dublin Community Plan steering committee was beneficial. The School Districts use the Community Plan to inform their enrollment projections.

Ms. Call inquired what, if any, purview the City has in Section 8, rental or ownership of parcels.

Mr. Boggs responded that the City's regulatory authority deals with land use, whether it be residential or commercial, and the level of density, such as the number of living units per acre. The

City also sets development standards, setbacks, open space requirements, architectural requirements, etc. The planning and zoning purview of any city in the state of Ohio does not include legal purview to dictate the economic arrangement of rental versus home ownership. The City can dictate only that the land is designated for residential use, and it can approve rezonings and development texts. The City can have designated straight zoning districts, such as R1. An R1 district establishes the types of residential structures that can be built and the required setbacks and the exterior appearance requirements for anything built in that zoning district. In a Planned Unit District (PUD) development, the requirements are established specifically for the proposed development. A PUD development text can address specific architectural styles and building materials for that development district only. That dictates the caliber of building in that particular zoning district.

Ms. Call requested that Ms. Rauch provide an explanation of at what point the HOA versus City land ownership is determined and who is responsible for maintenance of any amenities in that area.

Ms. Rauch responded that this type of arrangement is related to the reserve areas. It is typically decided as part of the rezoning application and sometimes further refined with the Final Development Plan. Historically, stormwater ponds are maintained by the City. The open space area that doesn't include stormwater management is part of the rezoning determination. The City's goal is to provide meaningful open space and address how that can happen. That discussion has occurred with all of the City's residential developments. The development text establishes the arrangement and makes the financial commitment clear to the forced and funded HOA.

Ms. Call asked the City's purview on types of housing products and pricing of those products.

Mr. Boggs responded that through its Envision Dublin and the City's community planning process, the City establishes certain goals for a variety of housing types. The City does not have any regulatory authority over the pricing of any house, apartment or office space. That is a function of the local market.

Ms. Call requested staff to provide an overview of when PUDs work well and why they work well. Ms. Rauch stated that standard districts establish standards to achieve a level of character. A PUD allows for a much more intense conversation and negotiation of what the expectations will be for a particular development, whether residential or commercial. We want to make sure the desired character and aesthetics within all City neighborhoods is achieved, and the PUD helps the City do that. It achieves an even greater standard than the City Code would require of a standard district.

### **Commission Questions**

Ms. Harter inquired if the homeowners in a community can ask the developer of a proposed development whether the development will contain single-family or rental units.

Mr. Boggs responded that there is nothing that stops a homeowner from asking that question of the developer.

Ms. Rauch stated that there were some questions about the recommended density of the Special Area Plan. She suggested that Mr. Will explain the density and how it is intended to transition.

Mr. Will stated that within the FLU, the mixed-residential density is for between 3 and 12 du/acre. Special area plans provide further guidance, such as transitioning from existing single-family or lower density areas to more intense areas or commercial areas. It is an illustrative plan, not a

literal plan. It provides an example of how one might apply the Community Plan FLU and transportation elements. It shows more intense development toward the south and east along Avery Road and the future Tuttle Crossing extension. It decreases in density as it extends toward Rings Road, Ballantrae and Cramer's Crossing and the residence on the north side of Rings Road. The goal of the Community Plan is to preserve and enhance the single-family neighborhoods.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Garvin stated that he would respond to the Discussion Questions in order. In regard to the Open Space Framework, he mentioned earlier concerns about its usefulness, particularly in the stormwater gardens. He would prefer to see the open space areas more activated. This should be an area that can attract people to its amenities. The proposed maze is an interesting and unique idea, activating the ponds with a small pier might be nice. There needs to be much consideration about what would be an actual useful space. There is a lot of density that does not seem to have direct access to most of the open space. In regard to the character of the Mixed-use Subarea, there is a big difference to him between the two-story shops and the fully used, three-story locations. What type of businesses would those buildings attract? He is supportive of commercial use along that edge, but perhaps more limited than depicted. In regard to the Residential Subareas – those are his primary concern. As he mentioned before, Subarea 4 is above the maximum density. A density of 12 du/acre is too much, in his view. He referred to one resident's comments about the transition on the west side of the property from south to north – the transition is too abrupt between the cluster homes and the single-family homes. He would like to see the density lowered from south to north. In regard to the Proposed Street Network, Tuttle Crossing Boulevard is very important. If the development begins to add people in this area before that roadway extension, it will push people into other directions that will further strain an already strained network of streets. The next step must provide Traffic Impact Study recommendations that will mitigate the traffic that is already an issue. In regard to being supportive of the transitions and buffering, generally, that is where stormwater facilities can be used to activate the edges that will not close off those areas. He believes, for the most part, that is what he sees. In regard to the theme and architectural inspiration, in general, he is supportive if the architecture transitions with the surrounding single-family home neighborhoods. He does not doubt that there is demand within the area for smaller square footage housing, but it is important to consider how that density would blend with the existing neighborhoods. Right now, it is too abrupt and too heavy overall.

Mr. Deschler stated that this is not an easy site to develop, given its characteristics. While the residents would love to see it not developed, there will be something developed here. It is the Commission's role to try to make that the best possible. He has the following concerns.

- Open Framework: He is not supportive of it. There needs to be additional utilization of the stormwater management and park access. As currently proposed, it is too separated.
- Character of the Mixed-Use Subarea: The area along Avery Road appears disjointed. The public comments about the type of retail or office spaces are accurate. He agrees with Mr. Alexander that there should be some additional frontage along Avery Road. He does not know what retail could be there. Office space in this area would sit vacant.
- Residential Subareas: Based on the way the proposed Tuttle Crossing extension is depicted, it feels like that bottom portion of the site should contain apartments. However, it is too dense as currently proposed, so he would prefer to see the density reduced. The whole concept seems disjointed with that separation, but it is probably the best place for

apartments. In Subarea 1, he is not supportive of the single-family homes fronting Rings Road; it feels forced. Perhaps there could be more frontage to block the more dense areas. At the traffic circle, the maze is proposed. He believes something different should be done that would generate interest into the community. He is not supportive of the type of homes that are proposed, particularly duplexes and cluster homes. He likes the townhome concept and perhaps single-family condominiums, playing off the single-family condominiums that already exist in the Ballantrae community. They would look nicer. Although they would reduce the density, those types of single-family units would be more appropriate in this area. In regard to the transitions, buffering and street network, he will have to see the additional details that will be coming back. If the intent is to change some of what is proposed, he would defer providing feedback on something. He is interested in seeing more concepts relative to the buffering and transitions. He does not see how it would be possible that Rings Road remain two lanes. Perhaps when the TIS is completed, additional detail will be available on that element. He will not comment on the theme, as he believes that would change if some of the other recommended changes occur. He likes some of the proposed architecture, although no specifics or materials are yet known.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is very supportive of the open space framework. He appreciates that each of the subareas has its own open space that provides that community a center and a focus. That gives each of the subareas identity. He thinks it would be strengthened by how that area is linked and connected to Avery Road, perhaps with a greenway along the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. Tying all the greenspaces together would alleviate concerns about accessing the fields. He lives close to Dublin Road and sees many people using the shared-use path there. He believes people use a path that connects the areas deeper in the site to the areas along Avery Road. He believes that, currently, that is one of the shortcomings of the plan – how the pieces connect. He has already shared his thoughts on the Avery Road frontage. He understands the reason for placing the maze and the water feature at the roundabouts, because, otherwise, there is no access to those. He does believe there should be more mass along Avery Road. He has no objection to the proposed density in the south. What the plan does really well is that it transitions from the massing in the adjoining Columbus area to the single-family residences in the north. He has no objection to that density because they then are under-developing the rest of the residential areas in the site. If the density was increased to the limit in the other areas, there would be far more units than are proposed on the site. He shares his fellow Commissioners' concerns about the traffic, so the TIS will be very telling. He believes the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard connection is critical to making this development work. The difference in the street network proposed in the earlier iteration and this iteration is that there are many connections across the site and not through the Ponderosa community. When the Tuttle Crossing connection is completed, that could really ease some of the pressure on the north part of the site. In regard to the theme and architecture, he shares the same view about the one apartment building example as the resident who spoke of it earlier. When we are attempting to have traditional architecture, that example does not work.

Ms. Harter stated that the Special Area Plan addresses the importance of the natural features, so she would like to see more of that in the proposal. There is buffer on one side, but the other side may need more buffering. The retention and detention ponds must be high quality and have a purpose. That should be defined in the next iteration of the plan. She has no objection to the four acres of open space for the public park, although the associated safety and walkability is important. She believes the proposed multi-use works, but more single-family homes would be beneficial. There would be some conveniences to having shops here, it would help connect neighbors. In

regard to the residential, it would be important to place detached, single-family homes adjacent to Rings Road. Because fire and emergency services are important to the residents, she suggested that the Fire Department be included in any neighborhood discussions. She has no objection to the proposed duplexes. Family members are living closer together today to provide family support. Perhaps mounding could be used along with the landscaping to provide more separation and buffering. She is concerned about the density and the transition between the different uses.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he was not supportive of the developer's first iteration of the development. With this plan, he is becoming more supportive, although more work on the site plan is needed. The significance of a site like this means it could be something special and unique. The best way to reduce traffic is to reduce the need for it, by creating walkable communities with coffee shops, microbreweries, etc. As the site currently is laid out, the residents will need to drive to Avery Road to access restaurants and other amenities. There is an opportunity here to create a unique community that has true mixed-use with walkable paths, and that opportunity needs to be considered further. In regard to connectivity, they need to provide good pedestrian access and activate the streetscape. The plan has many good "bones," but he reiterated his recommendation that more consideration be given to truly making it a pedestrian, mixed-use community.

Ms. Call stated that beginning with the question about the street network, she believes the street network is great. The applicant listened to the comments and concerns that were expressed at the last Commission meeting. We want to make sure the street network is not only navigable, but also safe. She thanked them for making those modifications and incorporating the Tuttle Crossing extension alignment. In regard to the open space, she agrees with Mr. Alexander that each area needs to have its own programmed open space elements. She is concerned that there is not sufficient space in Subarea 1 to create valuable open space and create its identity; there are a large number of homes in that Subarea. She is not satisfied with the current plans for that area. In regard to the transitions – at this stage, the transitions are too forced, but if the open space is changed and there is more space to work with, the transitions would look different. She would disagree with Mr. Deschler regarding Rings Road. She believes the City fronts single-family homes along roadways very successfully. You can see that on Hyland-Croy Road, for example. The homes in the newer developments front that wider corridor with setbacks from the roadway. The main difference with that plan is that there is not an immediate transition behind the single-family homes. Behind them, it does not transition to a more intense, dense use. If we had more of the single-family homes before the transition to the more intense/dense use, it would change the feel. By her calculations, the number of proposed residential units has increased significantly in this second plan – from 719 residential units to 807. We had concerns with the previously proposed density, and that concern has increased. The plan has increased from 5.37 du/acre to 6.35 du/acre. Density is not necessarily a negative; proper use of density, achieving it gradually as it extends further from current homes. Placing a 3-story apartment building near a single-family home is not good planning. Density can occur successfully in a PUD, as is evidenced in the Corazon development. The taller buildings are surrounded by expansive, beautiful parkland. The overall density is probably 2 du/acre, because they have clustered the intensity on one side. That is an example of a PUD's give and take, making sure the property owner can develop their property, but in a way that benefits the community as a whole. In regard to the commercial use, previously, there was 262,000 SF of commercial, office and retail space, and now the proposal is for 46,000 SF. Looking at the proposed residential units, we traded some of one use for more of the other. There is history that the Commission can be mindful of. In the Hyland-Croy area, the earlier intent was to place multiuse there; later, it was decided the commercial could not be developed there, only residential.

The Commission needs to make sure there is proper structure in the site plan to allow that future development. The City can be patient as it waits on the right development. There are areas of the City that have been green for many years that are now developing, i.e., the hospital next to Sawmill Road. In regard to the theme, in her opinion, the last thing we need in this area is more Bridge Park type of block housing. This is a suburban area; it is primarily residential, trying to transition gradually between single-family homes inside Dublin to the multi-family homes outside our City limits. We need to be sensitive to that, but we are not the City of Columbus and do not want to be. We want to look like Dublin; it doesn't matter if we are in 43016 or 43017.

She inquired if the applicant needed any additional clarification in the Commission's feedback. Mr. Turnock stated that they needed no additional clarification.

- **Case #24-128PP - Liu Trail – Preliminary Plat**

Request for review and recommendation of approval of a Preliminary Plat for 7 single-family lots and a reserve. The 12.78-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District, and is located at 7192 Dublin Road.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Ben Schilling, 122 South Otterbein Avenue, Westerville, stated that the developer is Mr. Jason Liu, who has been a Dublin resident since 2003, and is the owner and founder of J Liu Restaurant with both Dublin and Worthington locations. Mr. Liu has been involved with a number of City events. He has been a sponsor of the Dublin Irish Festival since 2004 and has hosted the lunch following the St. Patrick's Day parade since 2005. He is with American Structurepoint, as is Matt Lily and Landscape Architect Kyle Adams, who are present this evening.

Mr. Schilling stated that 7192 Dublin Road is located just north of I-270 and Emerald Parkway, and south of Brand Road on the east side. Currently, there is a single-family home on the site and many mature trees adjacent to the Scioto River. This site is over 12 acres. To the west of the site is Coventry Woods. In the proposed development, the smallest lot is .92 acres and the average lot is 1.51; the largest lot, the existing residence, is 3.0 acres. He described the site plan. Liu Trail is a public cul de sac road. There are 7 proposed lots. 79% of the site is greenspace. Their plan proposes no impact to the floodplain along the Scioto River, even with the stormwater outlet. There is a City-required left turn only lane onto Dublin Road. They are also proposing a 10-foot right-of-way dedication along the east side of Dublin Road. Along with the 40-foot setback along Dublin Road, that totals 50 feet from the east right-of-way line of Dublin Road. They are also proposing a 20-foot landscape easement along Dublin Road. There is 58-foot right-of-way for Liu Trail, 24 feet of which is paved, 6-foot sidewalks and 8-foot tree lawn. The stormwater outlet is along the south side of Lot 5. The existing residence would not be occupied during construction. Their proposal is aligned with the Envision Dublin Community Plan. The Dublin Road corridor has a FLU in this area of residential, low density. They are proposing .56 du/acre, consistent with that land use. Dublin Road is also designated as a river character area and commuter boulevard. Multiuse paths along both sides of Dublin Road are indicated. There is currently a multiuse path on the west side of Dublin Road. They are proposing a fee in lieu for the future multiuse path on the east side. The reason primarily is because the extension of that path along the east side of Dublin Road probably is several years in the future. It makes the most sense aesthetically to defer that installation in this location to later when the whole network would be built. A path installed now

would deteriorate over time and look much older than future portions of the path. They conducted a tree survey. Any tree over 6 inches in diameter was evaluated for need for preservation. Of the 216 trees surveyed, 31 were identified to be in poor condition; 17 of those are identified as preserved. 185 trees were in fair or good condition, and 125 will be preserved. They are looking at the tree canopy area and the critical root zone. The intent is to preserve any mature trees that should be kept. There are heavily wooded areas along the Scioto River and denser vegetation on the north, south and northeast corner of the site. They will try to protect those trees. Street trees are proposed along Liu Trail and in the landscape buffer along the east side of Dublin Road. They are proposing a private reserve area (Reserve A), maintained by the HOA, along the Scioto River, essentially a riverside park for the residents. They are envisioning a gravel path with stone steps, due to the steep topography, and a landscaped area with a retaining wall and benches.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mullinax stated that a preliminary plat is required for the subdivision of land including right-of-way dedication and the recording of easements. Approval is a two-step process where the Commission makes a recommendation to City Council and City Council provides approval of the plat. Subsequently, the final plat would follow the same process, before any building permits are submitted. Ms. Mullinax reviewed the existing site conditions. A private residence currently exists on the site along Dublin Road. The site is zoned R1, Restricted Suburban Residential, which is a standard zoning district. The R1 development standards and the Subdivision Regulations apply to this application. The proposed minimum lot sizes are met, although minor administrative errors need corrected. To access the subdivision, a new left turn lane on Dublin Road and a new public street are required. An 11-foot shared use path is required along the east side of Dublin Road. The applicant is requesting a fee in lieu of constructing the path. Engineering will determine if this option is acceptable, otherwise, the applicant is required to construct the path. Depending on which option occurs, an associated easement will be required for the width of that path. Additional minor adjustments regarding the proposed street name, location of driveways and measurements still need to be addressed. Water and sanitary sewer utilities are available on site. Water quality control is provided through a proposed underground detention system that is beneath the cul de sac. Stormwater quantity control is not required. The applicant is proposing to design lots around the sanitary sewer. Staff has concerns regarding Lot #2's limited developable area, once those easements are shown on the plat. The applicant will need to show driveway locations to demonstrate that their slopes do not exceed the maximum allowable slope, and house locations on Lots #2 and #6 will need to be relocated to be out of the sanitary sewer easement. These issues are reflected in the Conditions of Approval. Required open space is being provided between Lots #4 and #5 and street trees along Liu Trail and Dublin Road. The applicant has provided a tree survey and tree preservation plan. The tree replacements are required to be provided within the landscape easement along Dublin Road. Staff recommends evergreen trees be used to create a more immediate and effective landscape buffer. The applicant is requesting a tree waiver, which will be reviewed and approved by City Council. All the preliminary plat criteria are met or met with conditions, therefore, staff recommends the Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat to City Council with 13 conditions.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Garvin inquired what necessitates the left turn lane – the number of units or the side street? Ms. Mullinax responded that it is required because it allows traffic to slow, navigate and turn left safely; it is a safety precaution.

Mr. Garvin inquired if there were a second home on the road that would also require a left turn lane.

Heidi Rose, Engineer, indicated that whenever a private development application is submitted with a proposed access point, for safety purposes, Transportation & Mobility requires a left turn lane, regardless of the circumstances.

Mr. Garvin inquired if the fee in lieu request considers the future or current cost of the multiuse trail.

Ms. Rose responded that those details have not been determined at this point. Typically, it would consider a future date and the prevailing wage rate. Essentially, whatever it would cost the City to construct the path would be the fee, which would be established via an agreement with the applicant.

Mr. Garvin inquired if the stone gatehouse would remain.

Mr. Schilling responded that it would be removed. Initially, they attempted to keep it because it is a nice feature, but were not permitted to do so.

Mr. Garvin inquired the square footage of the current residence.

Mr. Schilling responded that it is 13,500 SF.

Mr. Garvin inquired the anticipated square footage of the Lot #2 home.

Mr. Schilling responded that it is not yet defined, but a 3,000 SF home would fit on the building pad.

Mr. Garvin inquired if the existing home would remain significantly larger than the proposed homes.

Mr. Schilling responded affirmatively.

Mr. Garvin inquired which direction the homes on Lots #1 and #7 would front along Dublin Road.

Mr. Schilling responded that there was discussion about their fronting Liu Trail, but it remains a discussion point.

Mr. Garvin stated that per the staff report, 28% of the existing trees on the site would be removed. Would all of those be replaced? Does the evergreen buffer count toward that replacement?

Ms. Mullinax stated that the 14 trees within the landscape buffer would count as tree replacements, and a condition of approval requires additional replacement trees. The applicant is pursuing a tree waiver. If they were to replace all the inches that are proposed for removal, it would cause tree overcrowding on site. However, they cannot replace them on the single-family lots, as the future homeowners potentially could remove the trees, inconsistent with the tree replacement requirements. The tree waiver would proceed to City Council for consideration.

Mr. Deschler inquired clarification of the PZC's scope of evaluation with this case. Is the Commission approving only the lot lines, or the house and driveway locations? He does not see the latter provided in the materials. He was trying to look for the associated Code sections.

Mr. Boggs responded that this application is simply for the Preliminary Plat review. This is a straight zoned property, and the Code does not establish specific criteria for the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Call added that the Commission is providing a recommendation to City Council, which is the deciding body for platting of property.

Mr. Boggs stated that the Commission is looking at the layout of the streets and lots, not the more finely grained zoning details that are governed by the Code.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification that the Commission is looking only at the street and the lot lines. He does not want to provide a recommendation to City Council, if he believes he does not have all the information necessary to make that determination.

Mr. Boggs responded that the question for the Commission is if the plan's arrangement of streets and lots is consistent with the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Deschler asked if the plan indicates lot lines or proposed locations of the buildings.

Mr. Boggs responded it indicates only the lot lines.

Ms. Call stated that we understand that something will go on the lots. If that something can't be constructed according to Code, then that factor needs to be considered for the platting of property.

Mr. Boggs concurred. If the proposal was for a 40-foot lot and the zoning requirement was for a 60-foot frontage, that would be an element to consider with the Preliminary Plat review. This is unlike a Preliminary Development Plan review of a planned district, where the Commission would look at setbacks and neighborhood design guidelines to ensure the building pad configuration is adequate to accommodate outdoor hardscape, etc. That level of fine-grained review does not occur with a straight zoning district, such as this.

Mr. Deschler stated that if he has questions about the proposed location, he cannot see a proposed driveway that might indicate that.

Ms. Call stated that it is warranted to ask questions about driveways, because it does affect the build envelope.

Mr. Deschler stated that they are not shown on the proposed plan.

Mr. Boggs stated that this is the Preliminary Plat. The Final Plat will have more fine-grained details that would be dictated by the Preliminary Plat.

Ms. Call stated that at the Preliminary Plat review, the Commission could state that with the Final Plat review, it will be essential to have the driveway orientation and any other details that the Commission will need for that review.

Mr. Alexander stated that if there is information in this packet that leads a Commissioner not to support the way in which the site is divided, it can be pointed out. He assumes at this stage we can evaluate everything provided in the meeting materials and indicate that based on that information, we can or cannot support this.

Ms. Call stated that the response could be made a condition(s) for Final Plat approval.

Mr. Boggs noted that Code Section 152.021 requires that for disapproval of a Preliminary Plat, the Commission must specifically cite the Code section or rule that leads to that result.

Mr. Alexander stated that these questions impact whether he can support the way in which the property is subdivided. He inquired if the barn on the property that is intended to be razed has any historical significance.

Ms. Mullinax stated that she does not believe so. The intent is that the detached structures and tennis courts will be demolished. The single-family house will remain.

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason for the large amount of gravel currently on the site.

Jason Liu, 10279 Worthington Boulevard, Powell, stated that the reason he stockpiled gravel reserves on the site is for another land development project he has south of Bloomfield. Available gravel for that project is limited. He was hoping the project would start this time of the year. A truck entering a wet area would tear up the ground, so he took advantage of the winter season and frozen ground to stockpile the gravel and have it ready for construction.

Ms. Rauch stated that City Code Enforcement has received some complaints about the gravel stockpiles, and they are working through that Code violation process at this point. The gravel is not permitted on the site, as there is not an active building permit, which would permit the storage of building materials on the site.

Mr. Alexander inquired how the applicant established the proposed number of homes on the site. Mr. Liu stated that if he could have done a Bridge Park development, a 5-story condensed development; that would have been better for him. However, they are attempting to meet the criteria of the zoning on this land. Originally, they were interested in having a private, gated community, similar to Deer Run two miles north. City staff indicated that would not be permitted. They are attempting to maintain the private setting and keep most of the trees on the site.

Mr. Alexander inquired how the proposed plan responds to the existing house and size of the current parcel.

Mr. Liu stated that for this particular location, a 2,000 SF home would not make sense. He is interested in having a high-end, minimum of 5,000-6,000 SF house.

Mr. Alexander stated that there is significant manipulation of the contours of this property. Why is there the need to create walk-out basements in these housing units? They are raising the grade 10 feet in most of the houses. He has looked at the grading plan, the existing grades, and the existing build pad grades. On Lot #2, there is 10 feet difference between the grade currently at the front of the house. At the back of the house, the grades drop dramatically. In Lot #3, there is a 9-foot difference and the difference from the road below and to the right is 14 feet. That is just the building pad; the first floor will be elevated another 1.5 feet. On Lot #5, they are proposing to raise the grade 13 feet from what it is currently, and that is to the platform, not the first floor. When you look at the way the grades change on the site, and the difference from the build pad to the rear elevation, it is clear the desire is to create walkouts or have full exposure. However, what they are doing to the site is highly questionable. Why do they need to do that to the natural contours of the earth just to create walk-out basements?

Mr. Turnock stated that it is due in part to the public road extension; the transition downward is too quick.

Mr. Alexander stated that there is a 9-foot drop on that driveway to the house. That is what is created by the new grading plan. From the top of the new driveway to the existing roundabout is 9 feet. If you were not creating walk-out basements, you would not need to bring in all of this fill onto the property.

Mr. Turnock stated that the creation of the walk-outs is in response to the fact that there is such severe topography; not the other way around.

Mr. Alexander responded that is not the case. Comparing the current topographic survey and the distance between the contours on the front of the lot compared to the rear of the lot, the spacing between the contours is radically different. That suggests that the slope is more gradual in the front than it is in the back.

Mr. Turnock stated that it is due to the public road extension. With the existing grade, they can't extend from the existing road at same that slope. That public road extension is dictating the need for so much fill on the site. Because there is so much fill, the houses have to be much higher. They have proposed walk-out basements to break up that elevation.

Mr. Alexander stated that he understands his reasoning. However, what is the reason they are proposing seven houses on the site? If they had fewer houses, they would need less fill and they

could work more with the existing topography of the site. Mr. Alexander stated that the footprint of the proposed build pad is approximately 3,000 SF; the footprint of the existing house is 13,000 SF. It doesn't appear that the character of that house has much impact on the proposed development.

Mr. Turnock responded that his estimate of 3,000 SF was to give an idea of the size house that could comfortably fit on the build pads. They could be much bigger, and that is the desire.

Mr. Alexander inquired how they determined the siting of house #6.

Mr. Turnock stated that to the right is a sanitary easement; they placed the site up against that. In addition, staff requested that they increase the buffer between Dublin Road and the proposed pad as much as possible. Finally, there are some mature trees in that corner that they are attempting to preserve.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the proposed plan is subject to the Neighborhood Design Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch responded that it has to meet the Residential Appearance Standards; it does not need to meet the Neighborhood Design Guidelines.

Mr. Alexander inquired if those standards address how homes address the streets, i.e. the setbacks from the street aligning the home frontages.

Ms. Rauch responded that she believes in the Subdivision Regulations there are requirements about staggering the setbacks. She would check into that.

Mr. Deschler stated that he has reviewed the Code section Mr. Boggs identified earlier. He indicated that if the Commission were to disapprove the Preliminary Plat, they would need to identify the criteria that the proposed plat does not meet.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively. For example, one of the criteria is that if it is a subdivision with more than eight lots, no more than six lots in a row may have the same lot width. If the lots did not meet that requirement, Section 152.019 (B)(8), that could be cited as the reason for disapproval.

Ms. Harter inquired how large the private park near the river would be. Could it accommodate a group?

Mr. Turnock responded that it would be 15-20 feet in diameter, sufficient for a family gathering.

Ms. Harter inquired if the park is closer to the house or the treeline.

Mr. Turnock responded that it is right up against the trees.

Ms. Harter inquired if the intent is that someone will be residing in the existing house. Are any other uses of the home foreseen?

Mr. Turnock stated that it would remain a private home. It is on its own parcel.

Ms. Harter referred to the tree replacement waiver. She inquired if the tree replacement requirements could be met by the individual homebuilders with the associated landscaping.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the tree replacement requirements cannot be met by trees planted on single-family lots, because of the potential for a homeowner to remove the trees. A homeowner cannot be prevented from removing a tree on their lot.

Ms. Harter inquired if there is potential for replacing the trees in some way, so that a tree replacement waiver is not needed.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the applicant would need to replace the trees by placing them in the landscape buffer along Dublin Road; however, it would not be possible for them to replace 1,210

inches of tree caliper within that landscape buffer. A waiver is needed to reduce the amount of the requirement.

Ms. Harter inquired how often the City receives similar tree replacement waivers.

Ms. Rauch responded that it is rare, and there is criteria that Council considers, such as whether the applicant is demonstrating that they are trying to build on their site and preserve as many trees as possible. In the last year or two, the City has had one other request. The tree waiver replacement is strictly Council's purview, so the Commission does not evaluate the associated criteria.

Mr. Chinnock stated that this home site is an iconic site and an integral part of that area of Dublin Road. The site has significant impact on the character of Dublin Road. How does this plan enhance that area and help the character of Dublin Road by developing the site in this manner?

Mr. Turnock stated that he believes the proposed development is consistent with the rest of the lots within the area. It stands out, as it is now. The addition of the turn lane will add a safety feature to that area of Dublin Road.

Mr. Liu stated that there is a beautiful modern home located south of this site and a very traditional, larger house on the site, so they will be sensitive to the character of the neighboring homes when they build the house. The intent is to use stone, brick and wood building materials. He is confident Dublin will be proud of the result.

Ms. Call inquired if the meeting materials delineate the dimensions of the existing home.

Mr. Turnock responded that the dimensions are not shown on the plans.

Mr. Deschler stated that he believes the left turn lane here is not a good idea, as he does not see the safety aspects of it. There are numerous large subdivisions along Dublin Road where there are no turn lanes, such as Donegal Cliffs and Woods of Dublin, so why is it required here?

Ms. Rose responded that she would attempt to represent Transportation and Mobility, as no one from that department was able to attend this evening. She believes that after a fatal accident occurred at Glick Road, the City has pursued left turn lanes for safety purposes.

Mr. Deschler stated that widening that area and slowing traffic there might make the area less safe. He stated that he believes this proposal is premature.

Mr. Deschler stated that he does not believe the Commission has sufficient information to be able to make a recommendation for City Council. The addition of numerous conditions is placing City Council in a position in which they should not be placed. The Commission should ensure the issues are settled at this stage before passing it on to Council. If he needs to state, line by line, everything he believes is not satisfactorily met by the plat, he would attempt to do that. However, based on Mr. Alexander's questions and some of the homes being positioned without driveways and dimensions identified, he believes the Commission would not be exercising due diligence in recommending a preliminary plat with missing information.

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff dictated to the applicant where the entry point and curbcut to the development should be.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff advised the applicant to move it from the current location.

Ms. Mullinax responded that staff had advised the applicant that the existing private drive could not remain a private drive; it would need to be replaced with a public street. She does not believe staff provided a specific location for that curbcut. She invited Engineering to respond.

Mr. Rose confirmed Ms. Mullinax's response.

## **Public Comments**

Rochelle Wagner, 7199 Dublin Road, Dublin stated that her property is diagonal to the target site. Mr. Liu has shared his plan with the neighbors. She would much rather have big houses than 10 smaller homes. She does not believe the neighbors have any objection to the proposed plan. It is a beautiful property. She is hopeful that as many of the trees be preserved as possible, perhaps some could be placed near the river. She believes the proposed building materials indicate beautiful homes will be built.

Douglas Sladoge, 7118 Dublin Road, Dublin stated that his property is adjacent to the south. Mr. Liu has kept the neighbors informed of his plan. There are a couple of things on which he disagrees with him, however. As Mr. Alexander pointed out, the elevation of the houses, particularly that on Lot #5, the one that would be next to his property, suggests it will be a 3-story house. With regard to the trees, there is a telephone easement on the east side of Dublin Road and an electrical easement on the west side of Dublin Road. Those prohibit extension of a walking path beyond this site. He believes a left-turn lane into Mr. Liu's property is needed, even if there are only seven homes on the site. During AM and PM peak hours, the traffic becomes quite difficult. He also is concerned about the 24-inch stormsewer that runs between the south side of Mr. Liu's property and the north edge of his property. That will create a significant problem running downhill. Mr. Liu has committed to working with him on that element. That area sits approximately 60 feet above the river. Finally, there are two cul de sacs in front of the house, the one in front of the existing house and the additional cul de sac that would be constructed. That will result in two parking lots in front of four houses. He believes Liu Trail should be shortened and moved up; that would result in a better watershed at that point. In summary, he believes there are some of the items that should be considered for the Final Plat.

Naethan Eagles, 49 Browning Ct., Dublin stated that his property is located north and adjacent to Lot #2. The meeting documents discuss moving the existing northern stormwater drainage up 30 feet toward the northern property line, which is his property. That entire area floods during heavy rains, particularly the area of Lot #2.

There were no additional public comments.

Ms. Call requested staff to respond to the north stormsewer drainage issue referenced in the last public comment.

Josh Reinicke, Engineer, stated that the applicant has indicated a desire to move the existing stormwater sewer on the north side of the property further north, because it would enable them to have larger building pads on Lots #1, #2 and #3. That is typically permitted with appropriate considerations given to impacts to adjacent properties, as well as impacts to the property being developed.

Ms. Call inquired what evaluation process is followed to ensure that moving the stormwater sewer would not negatively impact adjacent property owners. At what stage in the process does that occur?

Mr. Reinicke stated that would be addressed as the plat moves forward. Staff will continue to look at the grading plan. The applicant will provide engineering calculations that show what the current volume and impact of stormwater is with the proposed stormwater drainage and impact.

Mr. Garvin inquired where the liability lies if there is a mistake in those calculations, and one of the adjacent properties began to regularly flood as a result of this change. What would the recourse be?

Mr. Boggs responded that the liability would not lie with the City.

### **Commission Discussion**

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is asked to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat with 13 conditions as proposed by staff. Commission members have expressed some concerns. She asked the applicant if they would like the Commission's deliberations to move forward, or if they would like to table the application for refinement and future consideration.

The applicant indicated they wished to move forward.

Mr. Garvin stated that Mr. Deschler's points about missing details on the lots is accurate. It is difficult for him to look at Lot #2 and envision exactly how that lot fits. While it may meet the criteria for lot lines, there are concerns about moving the stormwater drainage and the amount of land fill needed to raise the height of the building sites. The neighbor to the south has mentioned that he will effectively have a 3-story home next to him. There are rules regarding the size of the homes. It is difficult to approve the parcels if we don't know exactly how they will be used. He acknowledged that may be intended to be a future, Final Plat discussion. He would be inclined to recommend approval with the conditions as stated, but he would intend to take a much deeper look at the details in the next phase. He would expect the Commission to be very thorough at that point, which is where we look at the impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Deschler stated that if it is the City's determination that the left turn lane is warranted, then he has no objection. He understands there are obligations either determined by ordinance or the current City policy. He has no objection to the development of the property. However, currently, he does not have enough information to be able to make a recommendation to City Council. Without delineating the specific Code requirements not met, he would point out that the applicant has not provided the location and approximate dimension of all existing buildings. In addition, there are lots where there is lack of clarity. For those reasons, he would not vote to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Alexander stated that we have identified language in the Code that would support those Commissioners who are unable to support approval of the Preliminary Plat. He is not supportive of the plat, as proposed. He does not agree with the application of planning standards for this site with an existing home on the site that is nowhere close to those homes across the street, which do meet the planning standards that we want to apply. If this house did not exist on the site, the conversation would be very different, although he would still have issues with the topography. When we compare the building footprint and frontage of the existing home and the footprints and frontage of the potential homes, the scenario is that of creating a manor house and serf homes. The estates in Muirfield have addressed the issue correctly, where large houses, such as this, are set apart by themselves. In Muirfield, the larger estates are on one side of the fairway; the smaller homes are on the other side. The estates have a separate entry; the parcels are bigger and all the homes there are similar. He believes the applicant is creating a very awkward condition here by having one huge house and much smaller homes. It would be better for the site to add one or two other larger homes more consistent with the existing home. The applicant has also created a

problem with the proposed grading. They have indicated a need to build up the site to where the new road will be. The applicant chose to move the road and place the entry point at the proposed location. However, if they had left the entry point at its current location, they would not have the same issue. The proposed grading is insensitive, and the property owners to the north may really pay a price for what is proposed. There is Code language that clarifies his reasons for not being supportive of a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Harter stated that this proposal does not provide what the Commission needs to be supportive of recommending its approval. There are 13 conditions and a tree waiver needed with this proposal. Very few developments are approved if not meeting the tree replacement requirements. She would not be supportive of a recommendation for Council approval.

Mr. Chinnock stated that we need to take a look at what is happening further south on Riverside Drive, where they are taking large home sites like this and re-developing the sites. It has had a very negative impact on that environment. He does not believe this type of development is necessary here. If you are familiar with this area, you understand what is going on. These sites have so much character. This is a very nice piece of property. There are adjacent parcels for which we do not want to set a precedent to continue in the entire area. That area could not handle it. We can discuss road improvements, but what is proposed is too much for that area. When we look at what is right for the space, this isn't right, in his opinion. He would not be supportive of a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Call stated that she would echo most of her fellow commissioners' points. Ms. Harter has pointed out the tree waiver request. While that is not in the Commission's purview, we do look at sites in totality, and that sets the tone. When an application must have 13 conditions to make the proposal fit, it feels like forcing square pegs in round holes. According to the realtor's listing, the existing house on the site is 13,556 SF. The applicant has indicated that 3,000 SF homes could fit on the proposed building envelopes. City Code 152.018C(2) requires that the dimensions of the existing buildings must be identified for a Preliminary Plat. The Commission is not opposed to subdividing. We could look at this Preliminary Plat proposal again, but we will be sensitive to details. We will want to see the vision for how this property is treated to a more precise degree than what we can see right now. It is very hard to recommend approval of the plat for a property that has major existing trees, significant sewer easements in different alignments, some that must be moved; significant impact to street lanes; waiver requests for multiuse paths. She walks Dublin Road and it is not very pleasant when you have to cross the street a couple of times to access the walking path. While we would wish the City were financially able to install the complete trail system, we achieve that goal by doing sections of it over time. She also is not supportive of recommending approval of the Preliminary Plat at this time.

Mr. Chinnock stated that for the record, he is not supportive of the subdivision of this property.

She asked the applicant if he would like the Commission to vote or would like to table the application.

Mr. Boggs pointed out that if there is a vote, the Commission will need to provide Code citations. Ms. Call stated that the Commission would cite accordingly.

Mr. Deschler suggested that clarification be provided to the applicant about the differences, if any, in tabling and disapproval, including if there is a waiting period to re-apply and if a new application would engender new fees.

Ms. Rauch stated that if the Preliminary Plat application is not approved, the applicant would need to re-submit a new Preliminary Plat application. It would be starting over, so there would be new fees, but there is no wait period to re-submit. If the applicant should choose to table the application, however, there would be no fee to bring back a revised Preliminary Plat. It would continue to be an active application with no timeframe for submission of revisions.

Mr. Boggs read aloud the following Code requirement: "The disapproval of a Preliminary Plat by the Planning and Zoning Commission: If the PZC disapproves such preliminary plat, it shall enter in its minutes the reason for such disapproval, including citation of a reference to the rule or regulation violated by such plat. The subdivider may thereafter make such changes as necessary to conform the plat to the rules and regulations and re-submit the same as revised to the Commission for approval or disapproval, which revised plat shall processed within the times and in the manner provided in this section." That does not reflect a maximum time for the applicant but a minimum time for the Commission to prepare to have it on its agenda.

Ms. Call repeated the difference between tabling the current application versus receiving a vote for disapproval and needing to re-submit a new application.

Mr. Liu stated he acquired this property 2.5 years ago. Since then, he has worked with City engineering to meet the requirements, such as the need to change the name, which in turn was reversed, and a traffic study. He has worked with Engineering on every detail of the plat. If the Commission is opposed, he asks that they explain their reasons for denial. Originally, he attempted to develop the site with the original entrance, as there would be less disturbance to the site, including stormwater runoff and less impact on the trees on the site. However, City staff directed otherwise. He wants to be treated similarly to Deer Run, but he feels that he is being discriminated against. He has spent so much time and resources on this project. He asks that the Commission consider his record. All the property he touches ends up looking better. Some examples are J.Liu Dublin, Fox in the Snow and J.Liu Worthington. He extends effort to ensure the buildings are beautiful. If he builds something, he wants to leave a positive mark on the community. His interest in naming Liu Trail was to leave his mark on the Dublin community. Since he came to Dublin, he has always been supportive and a good Dublin citizen. He expects to be treated fairly, as well. He asks the Commission to reconsider and approve the project so it can move forward.

Mr. Turnock inquired if it is only through a vote that they can learn the citation for disapproval. If we table the application, could we also hear that reason?

Ms. Call stated that the Commission would cite Code for the reason for disapproval. She would highly encourage the applicant to provide more detail for the next phase. It is one thing to say the site can be platted; it is another thing to actually be able to build on the site. Even though this is the Preliminary Plat phase, the Commission is concerned about the build phase.

Mr. Turnock stated that they have done more than create a Preliminary Plat with this project. They have completed 80% construction documents, working extensively with the Engineering Department. They have held grading and stormwater discussions with Engineering staff. The level of coordination has been extensive, one that he would expect more in the final engineering stage. In regard to the resident's question about the stormwater swale on the north side of the property, as a professional engineer, he can say that they would be improving that situation. The existing

swale is shallow; they would improve the situation by deepening it and accommodating the level of drainage needed. This is just one example of the amount of engineering that has been invested to date.

Mr. Liu indicated that he would like to table the application with provision of the citations related to disapproval, so they can be addressed.

Mr. Boggs responded that would have been his recommendation, as well.

Ms. Call provided the following Code citations:

Section 152.018C(2) – requires providing of approximate dimensions of all existing buildings on the site.

Section 152.019C(3) – asks for the sidelines of all lots to be right angles to straight streets or radial to curb street lines. With the proposed plat, those are difficult to envision.

Section 152.09C(6) – requires varied setbacks. With the vagueness of building locations, we cannot see enough detail to see if this plat will work for a future building.

Potentially, Section 152.019C(5) – define corner lots, due to access for maintenance. If driveways are narrow, they cannot accommodate certain types of vehicles.

Mr. Alexander added:

Section 152.018C(7) – regards the contours and the slopes. Make sure the revised plan conforms to that Code section.

Section 152.019C(5) – lot width. Be sure that Lot #2 meets that requirement.

Mr. Deschler moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to table the application per the applicant's request with the provision of the Code sections as cited.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes.

[Motion carried 6-0.]

## COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Clerk of Council