DocuSign Envelope ID: B66DC7ED-53C1-4C96-8895-7CA61B7F3C72

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 12, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Amlin Crossing at 5274 Cosgray Road
23-066Z-PDP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal:	Rezoning +/- 105.02 acres from Rural to Planned Unit Development District.
Location:	East of Cosgray Road, 1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.
Request:	Review and approval of a Rezoning and a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.055(A).
Applicant:	Floyd and Joyce Miller, Cosgray Road, LLC
Planning Contact:	Sarah TresouthickHolt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-066

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved and Mr. Fishman seconded, to table Case 23-066.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Rezoning was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah Holt
89A2B05342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

DocuSign Envelope ID: B66DC7ED-53C1-4C96-8895-7CA61B7F3C72

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 12, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

4. Amlin Crossing at PIDs: 274-001307, 274-00104, and 274-001218
23-064PP **Preliminary Plat**

Proposal:	Subdividing 105.02 acres into 371 single-family lots and 51.2 acres of open space reserve and public rights-of-way.
Location:	East of Cosgray Road, 1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.
Request:	Review and recommendation to City Council for determination under Section 152.000 of the Dublin Zoning Code.
Applicant:	Floyd and Joyce Miller, Cosgray Road, LLC
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-064

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved and Mr. Fishman seconded, to table Case 23-064.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

and densities are the lynch pin. If the density issue is eliminated, then the layout issue also is eliminated. The plans for the Ponderosa community and the immediately surrounding areas would also change. The open space framework would also change. The density the Commission is looking at is 2-3 du/acre. What the applicant is proposing in the least dense area is 4.8 du/acre.; the most dense area is 35 du/acre. She is not at all supportive of that level of density. Dublin is a great community, and the City does not want to look like Columbus. Buffering apartments on the end of the City because it complements something that the City does want to be is contrary to the Community Plan and Future Land Use Plan. She appreciates the amount of work invested in the proposed plan, the effort for a well-laid out parcel and the amenities planned for the residents. However, the City has its own vision for this area of the City and none of the items in the proposed plan fit with that vision. The City wants Casto as a partner in Dublin, but it is necessary for the applicant to embrace the vision. If Casto believes the City's vision is incorrect, then staff and the Commission are open to having that discussion. However, this currently proposed application is not one that she could support.
She inquired if the applicant requested additional clarity on any of its input.
Mr. Tumblin thanked the Commission for their feedback. They have some work to do and hope to see them in the future with a revised plan.

[10-minute recess.]

Mr. Way returned to the meeting.

- **Case 23-066 - Amlin Crossing, 5274 Cosgray Road, Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Rezoning ±105.02 acres from Rural to Planned Unit Development District for the construction of 101 single-family detached and 270 single-family attached units. The site is located east of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany stated that he is present on behalf of the applicant. His presentation tonight will be unorthodox, blunt and may make him persona non gratis in Dublin, but after 20 years, he hopes he has earned enough credibility to share his opinion on what has happened and the wrongs that have been placed on Schottenstein Homes with the staff report. This has been over a 2-year process and many changes have been made in their plan. The staff report reflects many negative comments and does not make reference to the history of the case or all the hard work invested and comments received previously from the Planning and Zoning Commission. He is hopeful that after sharing his thoughts, this Commission considers their plight and provides them direction to continue moving forward this plan with clear direction to staff to work with them. He does not anticipate a vote to approve tonight; however, he would like to receive some direction and identify the positives of the plan. He acknowledges more work is necessary. He has been coming before the Commission for 20 years and has never experienced a perfect staff report. The staff report for this application states that 15 of the 16 criteria were not met by their plan. Schottenstein principals have over 60 years of experience in the business. They have had to revise their application five times due to different development guideline changes by the City and/or previous application reviews by the Commission, including: 1st Concept Plan – December 2021; 2nd Concept Plan – August 2022; Neighborhood Design Guideline Principles – March 2023; Interim Land Use Principles – June 2023. They cannot meet all

the expectations, but due to all the work that has been done, they cannot scrap their plan again and start over. Page 4 of the staff report states that staff recommended the applicant submit an additional Concept Plan. Schottenstein chose instead to file a rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan. They do not want to be in the Concept Stage any longer; it is time to start moving the application in a direction where it can develop further. What is not pointed out in the report is that staff's recommendation now is that the new Concept Plan be based on conservation design. This is in reference to Section 2B of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines that requires a site layout based on conservation design practices at the Concept Plan stage. These guidelines did not exist when they submitted their Concept Plan. The text also indicates that as part of the Concept Plan application, an open space framework plan must be provided, and after its evaluation, it would be determined whether the proposal should adhere to the conservation design development requirements. Their team was surprised to see references to conservation design requirements, as they had not heard about them until recently. If they had been provided information regarding this at the outset of their application process, they could have planned accordingly; at this point, they are unable to do so. He noted conflicts between the staff report findings and City Code, adding that the vagueness of the Interim Land Use Principles further increases the difficulty in interpretation. It is impossible for anyone to define what is "Distinctly Dublin." In summary, this application needs to be evaluated in the context of all of the reviews and changes that have happened throughout the 2-year process. At this point, they have a staff report that says their application meets none of the criteria established by Code or the City's governing documents for planning. The applicant has spent over $400,000 to date to reach this point. The previous application reviews indicated their plan had merit until the recent ever-changing planning documents and principles. If the plan previously has merit, it should still have merit. The staff report would seem to indicate their plan should be entirely scrapped. However, they ask the Commission to recognize the history of their application, the unique circumstances, and the myriad of items that have affected this plan including the change in the Tuttle Road Crossing Blvd. location. Perhaps they could have requested their application to be tabled and another Concept Plan designed, but they are appealing for the Commission to consider the money already spent and provide them helpful direction.

Mr. Boggs referred to Mr. Underhill's comments. He would like to clarify for the Commission and audience members, the Concept Stage of the PUD process is for the intent of receiving Commission feedback based on what is before them. The Code makes very clear that no discussions in the Concept Plan review are binding on either the applicant or the Commission or should be taken as an indicator of subsequent approval or disapproval. While the steps in the PUD review process appear sequentially, the first point at which a binding response from the Commission for a plan is given is at the Preliminary Development Plan and Rezoning stage. According to the timeline that was presented, the last Concept Plan review was in August 2022. They were made aware of the proposed Neighborhood Design Guidelines in December 2022, which were developed a couple of months later. During that interim period, anyone could provide commentary on the merits or lack thereof of the guidelines. The Guidelines were adopted prior to this application being filed. The purpose of the Guidelines to provide a framework with which applicants can work. Applicants are not "left guessing," but can make a case to the Commission for recommending approval of their rezoning request.

Staff Presentation

[From staff report: "The site is generally trapezoidal with three remnant parcels, each with single-family residences, in the middle fronting Cosgray Road. The site has approximately 1,660 feet of total frontage along Cosgray Road in two segments and approximately 2,800 feet of frontage along the CSX Railroad. On the north side, the site is adjacent to the Village of Amlin, and on the south side, it is adjacent to single-family residential located within the City of Columbus (Hayden Farms). The site is bisected by the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard."]

Ms. Holt stated that this is a rezoning request, prior to which the applicant is recommended to have a neighborhood meeting. Staff recommended this meeting to the applicant, but although there was significant neighborhood interest at the previous Concept Plan reviews, staff does not believe a neighborhood meeting has occurred.

Ms. Holt reviewed the site conditions. The site is flat with minimal grade change. There are significant tree stands, primarily along the eastern edge, and large tree rows run north-south on the northern portion of the property, between existing fields. There are two landmark trees in the middle of the fields, one each on the north and south sides of the property. Wetlands have been confirmed along the east side of the site, within the woods. The site has been historically farmed, and does not contain any historic structures. The Southwest Special Area Plan was completed in 2013 and is a refinement of the Community Plan in this specific area. At that time, Tuttle Crossing Boulevard was anticipated to take a different route through the property, with a wide sweep to the northwest, and Cosgray Road had an offset intersection at Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. With the completion of the Feasibility Study: Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Extension, Phase II in 2020, Tuttle Crossing Blvd. now takes a more direct route west through the property and Cosgray Road remains in its current configuration. While the anticipated organization of the site has changed based on the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard alignment, a number of goals from the Southwest Special Area Plan are applicable to this site. The Commission's last Concept Plan discussion reflected the following reparding some of those items:

- Some Commissioners were supportive of retaining the gateway feature and mixed-use area for the Village of Amlin;
- It was acceptable to reduce the railroad and Tuttle Crossing buffers;
- It was acceptable to increase the density of the originally intended low-density area on the south end of the site and decrease the 200-foot setback along the railroad (east boundary of project site).

Ms. Holt stated that an incomplete Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was provided by the applicant, so staff was unable to review traffic and transportation issues. She noted that while the City's Community Plan update is in process, City Council has adopted Interim Land Use Principles to guide development during the transition period. The staff report provided reflects which of the 12 principles the proposed application meets and those on which it needs more work. She reviewed the differences between the previous Concept Plan the Commission reviewed and the current Preliminary Development Plan proposal, including the following:

- The acreage in the center has been added back into the plan;
- Wetlands are confirmed along the railroad on the east side;
- The setbacks along Cosgray Road have been reduced;
- The number of proposed dwelling units has been decreased from 425 to 371;
- The greenspace/open space has been reduced in number, size and quality;
- The east side connectivity is now inconsistent with the City's bikeway plan;
- There are now 7 dry stormwater retention basins and 2 wet stormwater basins.

The current development proposal is a single-family residential neighborhood with five development subareas:

- Subarea A: 18.03 acres, 90 attached single family units, 5.0 du/ac
- Subarea B: 20.66 acres, 58 single family detached units, 2.81 du/ac
- Subarea C: Open Space and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard right-of-way
- Subarea D: 12.68 units, 43 single family detached units (empty nester), 3.39 du/ac
- Subarea E: 28.45 acres, 180 single family attached units, 6.33 du/ac, 3-6 units/building

The proposal shows Tuttle Crossing Blvd. per the transportation plan and 2020 study. Bike lanes and shared use paths are provided. Cosgray Road is shown as widened on the south end along with a shared-use path. An additional road connection to the north is not provided, as was requested. Ms. Holt reviewed the concerns with the proposed plan specific to each subarea (as detailed in the staff report). Per the Neighborhood Design Guidelines (NDG), staff determined that this site is appropriate for Conservation Design Resolution (CDR). Key tenants CDR are described in the staff report, especially important is the edge of Dublin and the avoidance of appearance of continuous development between cities; protection of the rural character in outlying areas; preservation of natural features and open space. Of concern is the fact that the plan provides less than 50% open space, less than 75% of the lots are adjacent to open space; the setbacks along Cosgray have been significantly reduced; no information has been provided on programming of open spaces; the open spaces are generally less than the required minimums and ratios; no gateway information for the project or for the Village of Amlin has been provided; special corridor buffering is inadequate due to the dry basins; the master bikeway plan is not met. Ms. Holt reviewed the Code criteria and Interim Land Use Principles that were not met.

Ms. Holt summarized that staff has reviewed the application against the applicable Code criteria, NDG and Interim Land Use Principles and recommends disapproval for the following reasons:

1) The Southwest Area Plan's (Avery West Detail) anticipated mixed-use village center is not incorporated in the northwest corner of this proposal, nor is there an Amlin gateway feature.
2) The proposal should use the conservation design approach, and the project does not meet the requirements of the conservation design requirements nor the Neighborhood Design Guidelines (NDG) regarding open space quantity and quality.
3) The provided open space framework analysis repeats the already developed project patterns, rather than demonstrating that the preservation areas are of highest priority as anticipated.
4) Other fundamental sections of the NDG are not met, such as (but not limited to) community theme, individual lot analyses, streetscape hierarchy, garage door mitigation, and adequate private open space.
5) The TIS is incomplete and previously requested road connections have not been provided.
6) The number of dry stormwater basins is not supported due to design, maintenance and aesthetics.
7) Detailed information regarding the water and sanitary sewer mains and services and the water line extension along Cosgray Road have not been provided.
8) The setbacks along Cosgray Road have shrunk significantly since the Concept Plan, and when combined with dry stormwater basins, adequate buffering to homes is not provided here nor at Tuttle Crossing Boulevard.

9) The shared use path network is not per the Bikeway Plan along the east side; the Cosgray Road path is diminished to a path adjacent to the road without space for meandering, buffering, or landscaping.
10) The development text is inadequate regarding open space and has other omissions, inclusions, and references that appear unachievable or do not meet the vision of the NDG.
11) The applicant has not conducted public information meetings as previously requested.

- **Case 23-064 - Amlin Crossing, 5274 Cosgray Road, Preliminary Plat**

A Preliminary Plat for a residential development on a 105.02-acre site zoned Rural for 101 single-family detached and 270 single-family attached units. The site is located east of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this is a request for review and recommendation of approval for a Preliminary Plat (PP) to facilitate development of a +/-105-acre site establishing 371 single-family lots, open spaces, the creation of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard right-of-way, and other public rights-of-way. This project is concurrently submitted with a Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) request (Case 23-066 Z – PDP). Should that request not be approved, this PP would be moot. All of the concerns identified for the Rezoning and PDP apply to this submittal. She described the specific areas of concerns with the proposed plat.

Staff has reviewed the proposed PDP and recommends disapproval for the following reasons:
1) If the Rezoning and PDP is not recommended for approval, this PP is moot, although that may be overridden by a final determination from City Council.
2) Lot setback and easement conflicts exist in numerous locations, and the applicant has not provided information on how the lots could function given these conflicts.
3) The requested street connections are not provided, and the proposed shared-use path system does not comply with the Bikeway Plan.
4) Stormwater ownership and management is not defined, as required; the design does not meet the intent of the NDG.
5) Detailed information regarding the water and sanitary sewer mains and services has not been provided to the City for review, and the water line extension along Cosgray Road has not been provided.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier stated that in the proposed development text, there is reference to the exterior materials, including urethane, foam, vinyl, stucco, etc. However, in the proposed materials, there is no reference to them.

Greg Chillog, Landscape architect and land planner, Edge Group, 330 W. Spring Street – Suite 350, Columbus stated that the development text provides a palette of materials, whereas the materials in their conceptual building plan are simply those that are chosen from that palette at that point in time. It does not prohibit the use of any of the other materials in the future.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would comment on Mr. Underhill's previous comments later during the Commission Discussion section; however, Mr. Underhill spoke at length about the process, not the substance. It appears that many of staff's comments are objective. He is unsure if Mr. Underhill was saying that the applicant could address those concerns, if the target did not move further. He requested clarification of the applicant's position regarding the specific concerns raised by staff.

Mr. Chillog responded that the issue is a math problem. When they consider all the directives -- large setbacks; tree and wetland preservation; railroad setback; Tuttle Crossing Blvd. right-of-way and 200-foot setbacks; Cosgray Road 200-foot setbacks; stormwater wet basins – all of which for the 105-acre site would leave only 35 acres for development. At the low end of the recommended density of 3.0 du/acre, they would be able to have 315 dwelling units on the site, and 315 units on 35 acres would be 9.5 du/acre, which would be all townhomes. Using the higher recommended density for the site of 5.0 du/acre would result in 525 units on 35 acres. That is 16 du/acre, which would be a 2 – 3-story apartment product. Their plan proposes 20 additional developable acres, sacrificing some elements only where necessary to achieve those acres. While they could meet the requirements, it would result in a product that the Commission has made clear they do not want. The Commission has requested a unique, diverse product at a village scale. To produce that, they need to be granted relief from some requirements, including the large setbacks. Even with that relief, the result would be only 50 developable acres. They met numerous times with staff and realized they did not have their support; however, at the last Concept Plan hearing, they believed they had some support of the Commission. If the Commission indicates tonight, however, that they are not supportive, they will pursue this effort no further, as the current plan is the best they can provide. They do not want to propose a multi-family or all-townhome project, as that is not what the Commission wants. In an attempt to meet the City's development requirements, they have proposed a project that balances some of the goals of the Community Plan and incorporates many of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines, but not all. They have attempted to find a common ground.

Mr. Way referred to the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. and the provision for the overpass and the embankments to transition down to the townhomes on the southern portion of the site. Because the road has not yet been engineered, we do not know exactly where it will be. The road extension will be an important east-west connector, but there appears to be little room to absorb any error. Is the City comfortable that this plan addresses that concern?
Mr. Chillog responded that the City has provided them with a final location of the road extension. Although this is the PDP phase, they have attempted to plan ahead for embankments and crossings further south. They are 90% certain where those will be.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that the road engineering has advanced from the conceptual road alignment depicted in the Thoroughfare Plan to a more preliminary engineering alignment. However, there are many details to be worked out in collaboration with the applicant.

Mr. Way inquired if a 50-foot road setback is proposed.
Ms. Holt responded that the setback along Tuttle Crossing Blvd varies, but it does reduce to 50 feet.
Mr. Way responded that is a concern, as it leaves little room for error.

Ms. Harter inquired what was the reason they did not meet with the neighborhood.
Mr. Underhill stated that this is an iterative development process. Their intent was to meet with the neighborhood when certain variables had been solved and they had addressed approximately two-thirds of the items that would impact the neighborhood. After some of those components have

been determined would be a more appropriate time to meet with the residents. As long as the plan is uncertain, it is too early for such a meeting, and if it has no traction from staff or the Commission, a neighborhood meeting would be pointless.

Public Comments

Patty Marlin, Cottages at Ballantrae Woods, Dublin stated that one of her daughters lives on Myrick Road, and currently, there are problems with sewer and water in that area. If a new sewer system were proposed, that could be helpful. They are also concerned about safety. Much of that area lies within the Columbus police jurisdiction, and response times are slow. Would this area lie within the Dublin police jurisdiction? A dog park, bikepaths and walking paths are needed in this area. Adding a bike lane along Cosgray Road, however, would be extremely risky. The beautiful lakes and trees on this site need to remain. There are beautiful wetlands on this site, which she has walked and enjoyed many times. The traffic volume and speeds on Cosgray Road are a serious issue. She hopes there is a plan that will resolve that situation.

Mr. Boggs stated that there have been a couple of public comments about police coverage. All of the lots along Myrick Road are within the City of Columbus. The northern edge of those lots borders the property under discussion tonight, which is the corporate boundary line for the City of Dublin. Any development that occurs on this property will be served by the City of Dublin City services, including police. All of the area south of this site, including Myrick Road and Hayden Run Road, is served by the City of Columbus; therefore, Dublin Police would not respond unless it was for a mutual aid situation. City of Dublin Police or Fire can lend assistance to a mutual aid need within the City of Columbus.

Mr. Chillog referred to the earlier public comment about wetlands. Their intent is to incorporate dry retention ponds, but they would also attempt to extend the character already established with the existing wetlands on the site out to Cosgray Road. Some design considerations would be necessary, but the details can be addressed. With dry retention ponds, they would be able to have 3.5 du/acre; with all wet retention ponds, it would be only 3 du/acre.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes there are too many issues with the proposed plan. He appreciates the applicant's frustration with the longevity of the process, but at the same time, it appears that some small items, such as bikepaths and 90-degree parking have been ignored. It appears that the development on the site has been maximized with no effort to appreciate what the City wants to accomplish with this site. Without a TIS, the Commission has no information concerning the traffic impact on the area, so it would be impossible to make a recommendation.

Ms. Harter stated that she appreciates the amount of time the applicant has spent with both staff and the Commission on this plan. However, she does not understand the reason some of the more significant issues continue not to be addressed. For that reason, she is not comfortable with supporting this plan tonight.

Mr. Way stated that when he compared the last iteration of the Concept Plan and the proposed Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), he saw a change in direction. The Commission's comments with the previous Concept Plan review were that the plan appeared to be heading in the right direction, but when he viewed the PDP, he was concerned that it was no longer heading in the

right direction. Previously, the applicant was interested in a unique, urbanist style product with units fronting streets and parking access to the rear. The NDG provides a vision of what he was looking for and he had hoped to see those incorporated in this plan. The proposed plan has units facing outward and parking on the inside; a public street would now have public garages on it. It defeats the purpose of having a clean streetscape without garages and parking hidden behind the units. The conservation design guidelines have been taken out of the equation, and the result is the type of plan proposed tonight. He supports an approach that is consistent with the NDG and conservation design. One of the intended elements, mixed-use development for Amlin Village, has been lost in the process. He noted that there is an aesthetic element to using wet basins versus dry basins, and if there is a solution wherein dry basins would create something new and different that would tie together the development, it would be worth considering. He does not see that addressed in the narrative, however. What is lacking is a stormwater management strategy.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is sympathetic and empathetic with the applicant. However, with his legal experience, Mr. Underhill should recognize that this is a quasi-judicial body, and the Commission is acting in a legislative capacity, not an administrative capacity with this case. There is an inherent subjectivity to this process, which can be frustrating. However, that has been the pattern for over 100 years. While there is subjectivity in the criteria for approval, the expectation is that the body not be arbitrary or capricious. He does not believe the Commission has evidenced that. He does not believe conflating subjectivity with objectivity is fair to the Commission or staff. With respect to the facts of this case, he believes that there are a number of binary or objective elements in the staff report with which the applicant has chosen not to concur. While we may be making judgments with respect to land use, and we can agree or disagree as to whether the judgment is appropriate, it does not mean the Commission is being arbitrary in doing so. Whether the applicant has a neighborhood meeting before or after this hearing does not matter to him. There are a number of other issues of substance, however, on which he concurs with staff, and he is hopeful there will be some meeting of the minds.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes staff has done an excellent job. He believes the issue is that there is too much development on too small of a site. Ultimately, the City's standards must be met.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is the potential for this to be a lovely anchor site for Amlin. Planned unit developments (PUDs) have a set of unique custom rules, on which there is flexibility to negotiate for the purpose of achieving a desired result. Significant work has been done on this project, but the design is not yet ready or agreeable. Currently, there are several disagreeable elements in the design. At this time he is not supportive of casting a binding vote, but he is very supportive of the plan. It is a large project, and big projects take time. To offer something more specific about architecture, he is concerned about the monopoly buildings that result in awkward corners and transitions. In the south area, there are a number of places where the greenspace to unit relationship needs to be reconsidered. The applicant is trying to provide something different, and at times, the design is very interesting. There are some successful moments where the front door abuts generous greenspace, but there are many other places where the design is not mature and remains awkward. That comment about the plan has been consistent throughout the reviews with this Commission. The plan, however, has potential.

Ms. Call stated that she knows of no other parcel in the City of Dublin that is a major gateway site, has two major corridors, a railroad crossing, an overpass, significant tree stands and a large amount

of wetland. The resulting development process considering all those elements has been long. The current situation is not due to lack of work, collaboration, communication or listening. There is a vision for that area, and how those regulations are implemented result in only 35 buildable acres. That is unfortunate, but that is the field. There are other fields that do not have all these requirements -- some within the City of Dublin. With this proposal, too many exceptions are being requested. The negative staff report is not due to the applicant but because of the land with which they are dealing. While she is not supportive of either of the applications under discussion, she is supportive of all the work that has been invested. She inquired if the applicant wanted to move forward on a vote tonight.

Mr. Underhill requested that the Commission table Case 23-066, the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan and Case 23-064, the Preliminary Plat for the site.
He noted that he agrees with Mr. Boggs on all the points he made and respects every Commission member and staff member. He was hopeful the Commission would recognize their unique circumstances and the changing rules and would like the staff to feel empowered to assist them in finding a balanced give and take with the plan.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded a motion to table Cases 23-066 and Case 23-064.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- **Proposed 2024-2025 PZC meeting calendar**

Ms. Rauch stated a proposed meeting calendar for 2024 and the first two months of 2025 has been provided for the Commission's consideration. Members are asked to advise staff of any date conflicts before their next meeting. The proposed meeting calendar with any revisions necessary will be scheduled for adoption at the November 9, 2023 meeting.
Ms. Call noted that the Commission has previously discussed the need to take another look at the calendar at the 6-month point and determine if there was any need to make meeting date changes for the remainder of the year.

Mr. Supelak drew attention to the seven meetings proposed for the two months of August and September. Some Commissioners have school age children. He recommended that those meetings be spaced differently.
Ms. Rauch stated that it might be possible to schedule the site tours in the spring. The joint work session in August cannot be changed, as Council has approved its 2024 meeting schedule. She will review the proposed calendar and look for any opportunities to alleviate the schedule.

- **Commission Attendance and Training**

Ms. Rauch referred to the training and attendance memo from City Council, which was included in the packet. All Board and Commission members are required not to have absences totaling more than 20% of the number of meetings, which for the Commission would be four absences.
Mr. Chinnock noted that his meeting attendance has not been good over the last several months. There is a significant amount of travel associated with his work, but he has been able to make

DocuSign Envelope ID: 018CFB0A-331C-41B7-A930-3344C7B8FBCE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION
Planning & Zoning Commission
Thursday, August 18, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

1. Amlin Crossing at PIDs: 274-001307, 274-001004, & 274-001218
22-043CP **Concept Plan**

Proposal:	Development of ±101.1 acres consisting of 190 single-family homes and 235 townhome units, zoned Rural District.
Location:	East side of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.
Request:	Review with non-binding feedback of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.
Applicant:	Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-043

RESULT: The Concept Plan presented was based on feedback received in December 2021, which included concerns about compliance with the Community and Area Plans; inadequate setbacks at the railroad and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard; a streetscape focus on garage doors; and the provision of adequate future Tuttle Crossing Boulevard right-of-way. The applicant adjusted road layout, product type, and open space design to address some of these comments including, density reduction to 4.2 du/ac, provision of the full Tuttle Crossing Boulevard right-of-way, creation of three separate development areas and home products, and houses that primarily face common greens with private alley access. The Commission was inclined to be flexible on the Community and Area Plans based on the final alignment of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. The Commission was concerned with the lack of commercial/mixed-use in the northwest corner of the project as anticipated by the Community Plan. There was a lack of support for private alleys and a concern for long-term aesthetic of alleys. The Commission expressed concern with the architecture and massing of the townhouse product. They also stated the structures along the southern edge needed better open space buffers and height transition to the adjacent development. Some Commissioners identified that the open space appeared disjointed and private in character. The Commissions shared the architectural concepts overall need more detail, variation, and side yard articulation.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 18, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the August 18, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from 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, Lance Schneier, Warren Fishman, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way (virtual)

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble, Sara Holt, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawskiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 07-07-22 meeting.
Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission 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. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases.

NEW CASES

1. **Amlin Crossing at PIDs: 274-001307, 274-001004, & 274-001218, 22-043CP, Concept Plan**

A proposal for development of ±101.1 acres consisting of 190 single-family homes and 235 townhome units. The site is zoned Rural District and is located along the east side of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the applicant is seeking initial nonbinding feedback of a Concept Plan for a Rezoning and Planned Unit Development Plan.

The site is in the southwest area of the City, bounded by Cosgray Road and the CSX Railroad. It is located 1,300 feet southeast of the intersection of Cosgray and Rings Roads, just south of the Village of Amlin. The site, which is primarily farmland and woods, is zoned R-Rural District and is adjacent to Washington Township, City of Columbus and City of Dublin. A previous iteration of this project was reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on December 8, 2021. At that time, 505 lots were proposed on 101 acres, with a similar mix of single family detached and attached products. The Commission voiced concerns with the following:

- Conflicts with Community and Area Plans;
- Inadequate setbacks at railroad and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard;
- The streetscape had a high focus on garage doors and driveways; and
- Provision of the future right-of-way for Tuttle Crossing Boulevard on the project site.

The applicant has revised the plan and is presenting it today with the following changes:

- Removal of three acres in the center of the site;
- Density revised to 4.2 du./acre, where previously it was 5.0 du./acre;
- Tuttle Crossing Boulevard right-of-way is provided fully on this site;
- Three development areas are provided, where previously there were two;
- New product types face common greens with private alley access.

The Community Plan contemplates mixed residential, medium density, which equates to 5.0 dwelling units (du.) per acre in a walkable neighborhood at a village scale. The Special Area Plan contemplates a Village of Amlin gateway with a mixed-use village center with medium density; a mixed residential rural density in the south, which equates to 1.5 du./acre; open space on the east side of the property; a 200-foot railroad setback; and a 200-foot Tuttle Crossing Boulevard setback. The applicant states that the Special Area Plan, which was approved in 2013, is out-of-date. While staff agrees generally, there are some concepts that are applicable to this proposed development. The 2013 Thoroughfare Plan anticipated the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard through this property in a northwest angle. The Phase 2 Feasibility Study for Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, completed in 2020, showed a 116-foot right-of-way, allowing for shared-use paths and medians, recommended a railroad overpass, and an east-west alignment of the road extension through this property. The applicant has expressed concerns about the strict application of the Southwest Area Plan with the new Tuttle Crossing Boulevard alignment, as that plan was organized around the previous road alignment. That alignment created a large development area in the southwest corner; the new alignment compresses that area. The applicant indicates that combining the anticipated setbacks along both Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and the railroad would comprise 22% of the site, and the anticipated grading for the proposed railroad overpass would take up further space.

Staff has provided the following questions for the Commission's review of this Concept Plan:

1) *Is the Commission willing to support the deviations from the Community Plan and the Special Area Plan?*

Because circulation is a driving factor in the layout of this development, the applicant provided a proposed circulation plan (shown). Staff has some concerns, as there is a need for a continuous north-south public road through the site; some intersection configurations need adjustment; and

public access is needed from the south into the remnant parcel. Public access to the largest Amlin parcel is provided with this proposal.

2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed density and conceptual site layout?

Of this 101-acre site, the gross density is 4.2 dwelling units (du.) per acre. There are three separate development areas. Area A1 - 31 acres with 140 detached single-family units; Area B1 - 10 acres with 50 detached condominiums; Area B2 - 20 acres with 235 townhomes (a mix of 2.5 and 3.5 stories). For reference purposes, the adjacent density of Hayden Farms to the south is 4.9 du./acres; the Village of Amlin to the north is .53 du./acres; the large lots in Washington Township to the west are .25 du./acre.

3*) Does the Commission support the development setbacks along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard (50-foot minimum) and the railroad (100-foot minimum) as shown, which differ from the Special Area Plan recommendation of 200 feet for both*?

Staff's concerns with the proposed development pods of A1 - homes fronting common greens with access from private lanes; B1 - detached condominium homes fronting open space; and B2 - attached townhomes were noted.

4*) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open space locations including preservation of natural features?*

City Code requires 15 acres of open space is required; 46 acres is proposed, but the future right of way for Tuttle Crossing Blvd. was included and should not have been. The 10-acre regional park will function as a neighborhood park. Staff has concerns about tree and wetland conflicts. There are shared use paths along the railroad and Cosgray Road, and the majority of the homes face common areas, some with stormwater ponds.

5) Does the Commission support the conceptual product types presented with the application?

[Sample elevations and locations were shown.]

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the anticipated Tuttle Crossing extension. Does the developer dedicate the right-of-way for that?
Ms. Wawskiewicz confirmed that is the typical practice, and the widths would be based on The Thoroughfare Plan and the preliminary engineering study. The final responsibility and funding configuration for the infrastructure have not yet been determined.
Mr. Schneier noted that the staff report indicates that the proposed private alleys/roadways by the garages are not an item that the City looks upon favorably.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that City Council has discussed previously the issues experienced with neighborhoods, which had private drives for which their homeowner association (HOA) was responsible for the maintenance. Due to the extent and cost of that maintenance, HOAs have requested the City to take on the responsibility for those roadways. The City prefers that if the City will be responsible, the private drives be dedicated as public streets from the outset. If the developer would prefer private drives, that is possible, but it is important that everyone understand that would be a large undertaking for a private development. The HOA would be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep, including snowplowing and resurfacing. In the past, staff has requested that those fees be broken down to provide better understanding of the degree of maintenance needed for the private drives.

Ms. Call requested staff to clarify, when the City does accept the maintenance of private drives, what standards the private drives would need to meet. Would this proposed development meet those standards?
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that there are City standards for construction of private drives to ensure the private roads can meet fire and emergency access needs.

Mr. Hendershot stated that the construction standards for public roadways are a 12-foot lane width; curbs and gutters; an 8-foot tree lawn width with sidewalks on both sides; and potentially, a shared-use path on one or both sides, depending on the City's bikeway plan. Private drives do not have the same requirements. Private drives may not have curb and gutters, but may, instead, have an inverted crown in the middle of the roadway. That would not meet public street standards.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the Tuttle Crossing connector. Has the overpass versus underpass for the railroad been determined?
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that the preliminary engineering study recommends that the roadway extend over the rail.

Mr. Way inquired what would be the elevation of that roadway extension over the railroad.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that this is an important rail corridor in the region. The desire would be to have a clearance of two rail cars under the roadway. The height would be similar to that of the Hayden Run Blvd. crossing, located west of Avery Road and south of the Avondale Woods development. The height is approximately 20-25 feet (20 feet for the clearance, a total of 25 feet for the deck and pavement).
Mr. Way inquired if there would also be a large embankment on each side.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded affirmatively.
Mr. Way stated that the view from the homes on the south side of the future overpass would be of a large embankment.

Mr. Way inquired if the intersections with Cosgray Road had been determined at this point.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that they have not, as this is only the Concept Plan stage. In the Preliminary Development Plan phase, a Traffic Impact Study is provided, and Engineering staff will be taking a close look at that. The formal spacing of intersections and improvements and any traffic mitigation needs will be identified.
Mr. Way inquired if two intersections are anticipated.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that staff's recommendation is to limit the number to two, which the current application reflects.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the current setback requirements along Hyland-Croy Road for residential developments.
Ms. Call responded that Hyland-Croy has a setback that undulates between 100 and either 150 or 200 feet.
Ms. Rauch responded that the Community Plan recommends 200 feet, but it moves in/out along that corridor.
Mr. Way inquired if that is the desired character the City is attempting to establish along that corridor.
Ms. Rauch responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the tree and wetland conflicts referred to in the presentation.

Ms. Holt responded that as part of the phase 2 engineering study completed for Tuttle Crossing Blvd., approximately 19.1 acres of wetlands were identified on the site. Staff has made the applicant aware of the need to preserve and incorporate those areas into open spaces with 20-foot setbacks, as required by City Code.

Mr. Way inquired the reason that the railroad setback has been reduced from 200 feet to 100 feet in some areas for certain projects.
Ms. Rauch responded that the setback width varies to accommodate the proposed development, but it has not been less than 100 feet.

Mr. Fishman stated that the construction standards for private alleyways are less than for public streets, so he appreciates the concerns that have been pointed out. What party will be responsible for building the railroad overpass?
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded the responsibility has not yet been determined. Those discussions will occur as the project proceeds to the Preliminary Development Plan stage. That is when an infrastructure agreement would be drafted, if participation were needed from both the City and the developer. None of those details have been finalized.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if architectural details had been proposed at this stage.
Ms. Holt responded that those details are not provided in the Concept Plan stage.

In response to the previous roadway setback inquiry, Ms. Rauch stated that she has pulled up the pertinent information. Hyland Glen has a variable 100-foot minimum setback. That site is narrow, which is probably the reason for the variable setback at the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road. Further to the north, the subdivisions on the east side of Hyland-Glen Blvd. have a 200-feet setback along that corridor.

Aaron Underhill, attorney for the applicant, Underhill & Hodge, New Albany, Ohio, stated that also present tonight are Greg Chillog, Edge Group; Jim Hilz, Pulte Homes; and Mitch Acock, design architect. Mr. Underhill provided a brief summary of the changes made in the project per the Commission's previous direction to avoid "more of the same" and "cookie cutter developments." They are now proposing three different types of homes with attached, rear-loaded garages in a village-like layout, all with views of a significant amount of open space. The proposed site plan provides opportunities for future connections and integrations with the Village of Amlin area to the north. He reviewed the development constraints posed by surrounding developments.

Greg Chillog, landscape architect and planner, EDGE, Inc., 330 W Spring Street, Columbus, OH 43215 reviewed their goals, components of the site plan and surrounding conditions/constraints resulting in the proposed layout.

Mitch Acock, Acock Associates Architects, 383 N Front St # 2, Columbus, OH 43215, reviewed the proposed architecture and the intent of a formed community built upon common green areas.

Jim Hilz, Pulte Homes of Ohio, LLC, 475 Metro Place South, Dublin, OH 43017, presented an overview of the proposed townhome product.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Supelak requested details specifically about the units proposed along the southern edge of the site, which are adjacent to City of Columbus land. Most of the proposed housing product is rear-loaded.
Mr. Hilz responded that the empty nester housing product is in the southwest corner. There will be a 25 to 35-foot greenspace/landscape buffer separation between this site and the City of Columbus area.

Mr. Fishman inquired about the building materials.
Mr. Acock responded that because this is the Concept Plan stage, those details have not been finalized. The material may be hardiplank; it will not be vinyl.

Mr. Schneier stated that the applicant worked extensively with staff on the proposal, but there were a few items on which they did not agree. Was that due to the marketability factor of the product?
Mr. Underhill responded that is part of the issue. They have proposed the larger home sites of higher value along the northern edge of the site, adjacent to what is now a rural character, but in the future, is anticipated to be a mixed-use environment. These homebuilders are not interested in building next to a more dense product.

Mr. Schneier stated that the detached-garage product is a new housing product in central Ohio. Have they conducted formal market research, or have they proposed this product in response to the Commission's earlier encouragement for a more unique product? He believes there would be some negatives with a detached garage.
Mr. Underhill responded that there will be some potential homebuilders not interested in a detached garage product, but other benefits and opportunities would be provided by the product. The fronts of these homes will have no garages, so it is hoped that the residents will be encouraged to gather in front of homes with great architecture and a beautiful vista of greenspace. Grandview Yard has offered similar products, which have been quite successful.
Mr. Chillog stated that they have conducted market research, and do not believe the proposed product will be a hindrance to the development.

Mr. Fishman inquired how the HOA would be structured.
Mr. Underhill responded that they foresee a master association to maintain the common elements. There would also be three sub associations for each of the communities. In the community in which he lives, he pays a small master association fee and a larger sub association fee.
Mr. Fishman responded that the anticipated homebuyers for this community would be looking for affordable homes. The City wants to avoid having a bankrupt homeowner association in ten years, which is the reason he stresses the need for high quality products, such as brick and hardiplank. It is important to prevent significant maintenance issues for these homeowners occurring within ten years.

Mr. Way inquired if the public streets in the development would have on-street parking.
Mr. Chillog responded that parking on one side of the street is anticipated.
Mr. Way inquired if the on-street parking would be the primary visitor parking.
Mr. Chillog responded that the on-street parking would be primarily for overflow parking, although in the townhome section of the development, it could serve that purpose.

Mr. Way inquired if Amazon deliveries would be made at the back of the homes, where the garages are located.
Mr. Chillog responded that that they have been discussing that solution. At this point, delivery access is anticipated via the private lanes.
Mr. Way responded that is one of the challenges of a front door versus back door arrival concept, which has been discussed for years. It is an issue that would need to be resolved with this project. He requested clarification of the setback between the townhomes and the property line on the southern edge.
Mr. Chillog responded that they have drawn a 25-foot setback line to match the setback on the south side. The position of the units actually will be closer to a 35-foot setback, as they would not be built up to that setback line in the rear yards.

Mr. Chinnock requested more details regarding the intent for the greenspace on the south side of the site. That area may not be accessible to everyone; the courtyards would be limited to the residents in that area. Are any park amenities anticipated?
Mr. Chillog responded that they would be looking into those details with the Preliminary Development phase, based on the marketing indications. The open space network is anticipated to be a publicly accessible system of greenspaces with different characters and functions. Some of those greenspaces will be more linear, and some may appear more private than others.

Ms. Harter inquired if the driveways would be blacktop or concrete; the latter product is longer lasting.
Mr. Chillog responded that detail has not yet been determined.
Ms. Harter inquired if the HOA assessments would be monthly or annual per household. Are there two assessments?
Mr. Underhill responded that they would be annual or quarterly assessments, depending on the amount of the assessment; it would not be monthly.
Ms. Harter stated that if the City were to provide snow removal, there would be no charge to the HOA for that.
Mr. Underhill responded affirmatively.
Ms. Call clarified that the City does not conduct snow removal on private roads.
Mr. Underhill stated that the applicant is open to discussion on whether these lanes should be private or public; there are negative and positive factors associated with both. The proposed roads do not fit City specifications, so changes would be necessary if the intent is that they be public streets.

Ms. Harter inquired if the home construction products contemplated would mitigate the sound of trains and traffic.
Mr. Chillog stated that he could not say the train would not be heard from within the house, but they have attempted to orient the sides of the homes to the railroad, and in Area B2, to position the homes back to match the nearby Columbus housing development.

Ms. Harter stated that there would be a shared rear yard wall between the detached homes. Could that pose an issue between the adjacent homeowners?
Mr. Underhill responded that the HOA documents will provide detailed restrictions, and hopefully, the HOA board would be actively engaged.

Mr. Supelak stated that one home's green area seems to extend onto the side of the adjacent unit. That could present a maintenance issue for those homes.
Mr. Acock stated that five feet on either side of the wall belongs to the other home.
Ms. Harter responded that homeowner would feel free to use the space on their side of the wall.
Mr. Supelak stated that it is confusing as to whose space that is.
Mr. Underhill responded that the space would be detailed and clarified with the next phase of review. The best example they can provide of the intent is that of the Epcon Community Homes, whose newer home plans provide a sideyard living area. Those spaces are well defined.
Mr. Supelak stated that it will be important to define the space legally versus intuitively.

Ms. Call inquired if they had considered a "not for sale" product in any of the subareas.
Mr. Chillog responded that Schottenstein Homes does not build a "for rent" product.

Mr. Supelak stated that as depicted in the Community Plan, Tuttle Crossing Blvd. would extend past Cosgray Road. At this point, however, the plan shows Tuttle Crossing Blvd. teeing into Cosgray Road. He requested clarification of the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. position in this site.
Ms. Holt provided clarification of the Tuttle Crossing right-of-way.
Mr. Supelak inquired if the road would extend westward to Houchard Road and connect to SR161.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that is an issue that will be looked at in greater depth with the upcoming Community Plan and Thoroughfare Plan update. It is anticipated that Tuttle Crossing Blvd. would continue west to Houchard Road, eventually to SR161, and potentially extend further north beyond City of Dublin limits. The tee intersection is the limit of the Preliminary Engineering Study, which looked only at the section between Cosgray and Avery roads. The study looked at the Cosgray Road alignment and, at this point, continues to contemplate Cosgray Road in its existing alignment. Realignment would involve many parcels and would need to be timed with the redevelopment of those parcels. Although Cosgray Road is shown in its existing configuration with Tuttle Blvd. teeing to it on the east, those plans could be advanced differently in the new Community Plan and Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Underhill stated that this is a complex site, and the City's development review process involves several stages to reach a desired plan. With the Concept Plan stage, they are seeking the Commission's blessing to move on to that next stage, where more details would be provided.

Public Comment

Kathy Butler, 5965 Roundstone Place, Ballantrae subdivision, Dublin, OH inquired if the proposed sideyards of the detached homes would be 6-7 feet.
Clarification was provided that the sideyards would be a total of 14 feet.

Mr. Boggs stated that per the Commission's Rules of Order, comments and questions should be directed to the Chair, and the Chair may/may not redirect them to the applicant.

Ms. Butler inquired if this concept has been seen in a suburban environment.
Ms. Call stated that the City has seen other alley-loaded developments. She inquired if staff had any additional information to provide.
Ms. Holt indicated that there were other multi-family townhome developments in Dublin and one in Tartan West; however, this housing product is not common to Dublin.
Ms. Butler inquired if the wetlands would be part of the greenspace.

Ms. Call responded that they are identified in the Concept Plan, but how they will be allocated and potentially activated would be addressed in the next iteration of the plan. This is not the last time the Commission will review this greenspace.
Ms. Butler inquired if the construction of the shared walls had been determined.
Ms. Call requested staff to clarify the requirements for shared walls or to provide the information via mail.
Ms. Holt responded that detail would be looked at in a later phase of the development process.
Ms. Butler inquired if a traffic study would be conducted.
Ms. Call requested that Engineering staff respond.
Ms. Wawskiewicz stated that this is the Concept Plan stage. If advanced, the Preliminary Development Plan and Rezoning stage is where the applicant is required to provide a Traffic Impact Plan for City review and determination of mitigation strategies, if warranted. Should an infrastructure agreement be needed, City Council review and approval would be provided.
Ms. Butler inquired if the railroad overpass would be similar to the existing Hayden Run overpass.
Ms. Wawskiewicz responded that the length and height of the structure would be similar to the Hayden Run railroad overpass. The aesthetics and materials have not yet been determined.

Jodie Dzuranin, 5709 Aderholt Road, Hayden Farms, Columbus stated that she attended the December Informal Review of the earlier version of the plan, and this iteration is a significant improvement. She appreciates the accommodation that has been made for the existing homes, particularly those on Myrick Road. She noted that this site currently contains a large number of rusted vehicles, for which some type of environmental remediation will be needed.
Ms. Call requested that Code Enforcement staff follow up on that issue concerning this parcel.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he would attempt to respond to the discussion questions provided by staff. The Commission typically is not supportive of any deviations from the Community Plan and Special Area Plans, but because this site has some challenges due to the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd., he is not overly concerned about those missing pieces in the plan. In regard to the density issue, it is difficult to commend the applicant for the unique and novel way it is addressed in one section and penalize them in another. Given the unique nature of this property with both the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. extension and the railroad, he is less concerned with that element. He will defer comment on the setbacks, on which staff and the applicant views differ. With respect to the open space, there appears to be sufficient open space, if the right-of-way is considered open space. The problem is that the open space is in pockets; he would prefer to see more continuity in the open space. In regard to the proposed housing product – he believes it will be a good addition to the community, but the large amount of mass in Area B2 should be broken up in some manner. He commends the applicant for bringing back substantive changes to the plan.

Mr. Way commended the applicant for addressing many of the issues pointed out in the previous meeting. The shift in Tuttle Crossing Blvd. changes the site, so he is much more open to discussing how rigidly the Commission should follow the Community Plan. He has no objection to the proposed density but has concerns with the conceptual layout. He is supportive of a village approach. He likes the applicant's proposal for different size open spaces in the development. However, there is only one public street, which extends through the north section of the site. Although there are a number of units that front open space, they have no direct street access. In a development such as this, it is important to remember the principles of New Urbanism, wherein a street circulates throughout the site, provides on-street parking and the method for delivery and visitor arrivals. There is also an alley

system where unit parking is hidden and private space for each of the units is located. The scale of massing in the northern section is an issue. The open spaces are bigger than needed; the lots are larger; and the private lanes are very wide, essentially street width. There are 24 feet of pavement, a parking pad, a garage and a back yard. Those elements could be compressed and considered differently. The concept is unique and it could be made attractive; but currently, the layout is disconnected, requiring a long walk to reach some units. It requires private lanes to be used as streets, with traffic circulating throughout the private areas. He has no issue with the empty nester product in the southern portion of the site; however, the associated open space looks private and should be more open to public access. The townhouse product is a concern, and should not be compared to The Towns on the Parkway project in Bridge Park. That degree of density is not appropriate here. While there could be some 3-story components, the ends should transition to a lower height. The seam between this development and the area to the south is very compressed. He would encourage the provision of a large open space buffer to enable a better transition between the two developments. In regard to the setbacks -- he believes it is important to be consistent with the City's tradition for setbacks on major streets to the extent possible. The open spaces on the north side are large in comparison to those on the south side, which are smaller and more intimate. A midpoint between the two should be explored, as well as the connectivity and public view of the open spaces. In general, the housing products are fine. He does not oppose townhouses, but a 3-story townhouse in this location is a challenge. Perhaps there are ways to mitigate that with height transitions. These issues should be explored before the next review stage.

Mr. Chinnock stated that this is a unique product but it has some challenges, one of which is the amount of pavement. Having usable greenspace is very important in Dublin, and it should be accessible for the entire City, not limited to pockets of greenspace. Because maintaining the traditional setbacks and the character of Dublin is very important, he hesitates to concede on that issue, although he understands the challenges of the site. In regard to the architecture, it will be important to see more variation and use of brick, stone or stucco. Better articulation of the sideyards will be important to the character of the community.

Ms. Harter stated that she is not opposed to permitting some flexibility to the Community Plan for this site. In regard to density, the townhomes are large and would benefit from some height transition. They might, however, provide some noise buffer for the adjacent single-family homes. She likes the proposed open spaces, which include some wooded areas. The empty-nester cottages could be made more inviting, perhaps by adding porches. She does not have an issue with the two-car, rear-loaded garages.

Mr. Supelak stated he is open to some deviations from the Community Plan and Special Area Plan, but the type of deviation might be the issue. The Tuttle Crossing Blvd. adjustment is an issue that must be recognized and dealt with appropriately; the proposed layout is attempting to contend with that. He is disappointed with the deviation from the Special Area Plan vision for commercial development in the northern area, perhaps some on this site. He applauds their efforts with the improved layout, but would recommend greater setbacks along the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. extension and the railroad. He is supportive of the conceptual open space locations and wetlands preservation. The greenspace in Section A1 is very successful; unfortunately, many of the other open space pockets and locations are not very successful and do not create the desired space. He has no issue with the mix of product types and the detached garages. The empty nester product is nice, but he is concerned that the townhomes are overbuilt vertically. There is opportunity to relax the spacing, eliminate a few units and adjust the massing to achieve more of a community feel. Presently, the rendering

resembles a "monopoly hotel." The formula of greenspace to units should be reconsidered. He is concerned about the private lanes, parking and access to front doors. The site layout is currently awkward; the ingredients need to be massaged differently, including the street layout and greenspace adjustments. There needs to be deliberate consideration of the potential impact of the railroad embankment on this site and the adjacent homes. The units along the southern edge, specifically in Section B2, fit too tightly, so that layout needs to be revised. He appreciates the fact that three-story townhomes are not proposed there. The parking and the awkward front door access are concerns. The connections between the architectural styles of the units must be improved. The B1 units are a simple, vernacular style, but there is a difference between a simple yet elegant and refined style, versus plain; at this point, the style comes across as plain. Aside from the trees, the proposed green materials are low-lying elements. The porches are a critical point of this architecture, so must be done well. At this point, many are simply uncovered slabs extending from the front of the homes, but there is opportunity to improve that element. He does not care for the flat frontage adjacent to a gable. All of those elements are incomplete at this point. There should be a mix of materials, such as brick and stone. In the B2 section, stepping down the end units would be beneficial to that subarea. Similar to the Pulte homes in Bridge Park, there would be merit to stepping the units laterally. All the "monopoly hotels" need to be broken down more effectively.

Ms. Call stated that given the realignment of Tuttle Crossing, it is possible to allow some flexibility with the Community Plan provisions for this area. In regard to the density and layout -- she has conducted research regarding rear lane-loaded home products. In a walkable environment where the front doors front onto greenspace, open space and sidewalks, the front door functions as such. However, in rear lane, auto-oriented neighborhoods, the back door functions as a front door, and the front door becomes the back door. In most neighborhoods, the standards for what occurs in the back yard are more relaxed than the front yard. In applications where that dynamic is flipped, it is essential to be very aware of how that will affect the overall feel of the neighborhood several years in the future. The depth of the dedicated driveway parking spaces will be critical; longer vehicles extending into the roadway will be problematic. If the two-car garages provide storage space, those residents will park in their driveway, and visitor parking will be shifted to the front lane. She is not opposed to density, if done well.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant desired any additional clarifications or direction from the Commission.
Mr. Underhill responded that they appreciated the helpful comments from the Commission and had received sufficient input to proceed.

Ms. Call noted that because this is a Concept Plan, no action would be taken by the Commission at this time; however, Commissioners look forward to seeing the next iteration of the plan, which will provide the preliminary designs. The Corazon community, which has an empty nester product, is beautiful. That plan is well executed and is adjacent to higher density. Its open space flows well, and it is a very walkable, yet auto-oriented community. That example would provide a good option for consideration. To her, cookie cutter development means an entire community of "copy and paste" homes. Even if a few architectural elements are varied, use of the same floor plan is evident. Looking at Muirfield and some of the older, large developments, the early founders of Dublin's growth did a good job incorporating different architecture within a community while still achieving a cohesive design. The railroad setback needs to be considered from multiple perspectives. Dublin has a done good job thinking outside of the box, but it is important not to provide an undesirable product for any of our population in this area next to a railroad. The level of housing product

should be typical for Dublin and not a "settle for" product. A significant amount of work is anticipated with the open space and wetlands. She is not comfortable with the implementation of the lanes as shown in this plan. She would need to see more dimensionality and application of that element in the Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Fishman commended the applicant for their attempts to be responsive to the Commission's earlier input, but there remains a long way to go. His concern is not the density, but the fact that there will be too many people and vehicles. Dublin has done a good job in developing for a quality of life. Streets packed with cars do not achieve a quality of life. Alleyways tend to deteriorate. He drove through the residential areas south of this site and viewed some of the townhomes. The appearance of those units has deteriorated, even though they are only 10-15 years old. He is concerned about the homeowner association's maintenance responsibilities in this proposal. It is critical to provide quality materials, such as brick, that do not require a high level of maintenance. The brick apartments on Zollinger Road, for example, are 85 years old and not particularly well-maintained, but they do not look bad. He does not believe the proposed townhomes fit in this site. The development is located in the Dublin School District, and there will be families with children here. The goal is for this development to look as good in ten years as the day it is built. That will be a challenge with this plan.

Mr. Supelak stated that private lanes in communities have posed a significant problem for those HOAs, and streets that are built to a different standard cannot be transferred to the City. There are "red flags" here. The potential HOA burden and fees must be in the forefront of the applicant's considerations.

Ms. Call stated that not only must private streets be built to public street standards, but the number of homes within the community must be too few to meet the maintenance needs/costs of their private lanes for the City to assume maintenance responsibility of those streets. She summarized the Commission's input. The Commission is open to some deviation from the Special Area Plan, and although work needs to be done with the density and layout, the issues are not insurmountable. There is no general consensus regarding the setbacks, so the Commission will be sensitive to any proposed undulations or deviations. The open space will need to work not only for this community but the community as a whole. There were mixed reactions from the Commission in regard to the product types, but there are opportunities for enhancement.

Mr. Underhill thanked the Commission for their thoughtful input and points of consensus. Good direction was given, which they will be taking into consideration.

~~Ms. Call stated that the next two cases would be heard together.~~

~~2. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road, 22-099Z/PDP, Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan~~

~~A request for approval of a Rezoning of ±6.7 acres from Mixed-Use Regional 4 - Llewellyn Farms Office District to a Planned Unit Development District, on a site located northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.~~

~~3. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road, 22-100FDP, Final Development Plan~~

DocuSign Envelope ID: 28557315-2D51-4307-B40A-205F62202232

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Tuesday, December 8, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

3. 5274 Cosgray Road
21-142CP **Concept Plan**

Proposal:	Informal review and feedback for a Concept Plan to develop ±101.1 acres consisting of single-family, detached and single-family attached units. The development is divided into two subareas, one consisting of 160 units with a density of 5 dwelling units per acre and the second consisting of 345 units with a density of 9.2 dwelling units per acre. The site is zoned Rural District.
Location:	East of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.
Applicant:	Paul Coppel, Schottenstein Homes
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-142

RESULT: The Commission was not supportive of the proposal, finding it did not meet the recommendations of the Community Plan. They expressed concerns about the proposed layout, density, decreased setbacks, and design of the proposal. They expressed a desire for a detailed, unique residential product with a village-oriented layout. The site should capitalize on the opportunity for unique architectural design and meaningful integration of open space. The plan should be walkable, a mix of housing styles, connected to adjacent developments, unique, and timeless.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Absent
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

~~Mr. Way stated that since the last meeting, he has spent time assessing this site and the corridor. While we have a vision for that corridor, it is a long-term vision. It will take a while to get there. To have parcels like this at key locations sitting vacant does not make sense. The applicant has worked very hard to achieve the intent of the Code to bring activity to the streetscape. They are doing that, but he would like to see even more activity along that edge, if it could be integrated. The applicant has addressed many of the issues to make this a viable, inviting site. The proposed plan could be an asset on that corner. Development changes over time, so 20 years from now, there may be something else here. He is supportive of the Concept Plan.~~

~~Ms. Call stated that she appreciates that this is a difficult parcel. The deed's square footage and height restrictions along with the Bridge Street Code, discourage development. Ms. Fox has suggested that a hybridized approach might be a possibility. The difficult points for her are the proposed drive-through, which allows for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. There is too much activity occurring within a very small footprint. Currently, staff is recommending disapproval She is supportive of a hybridized approach, if could be made to make the City more supportive of the development. While she could be supportive of the Concept Plan, she would not be supportive of a Preliminary Development Plan, as currently proposed.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Concept Plan.~~
~~Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, no.~~
~~[Motion carried 6-1.]~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the combination of the Preliminary Development Plan with the Final Development Plan.~~
~~Mr. Grimes, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Ms. Call, no; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Schneier, no.~~
~~[Motion failed 0-7.]~~

3. 5274 Cosgray Road, 21-142CP, Concept Plan

A request for an informal review and feedback for a Concept Plan to develop ±101.1 acres consisting of single-family, detached and single-family attached units. The development is divided into two subareas, one consisting of 160 units and the second consisting of 345 units with a gross density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre. The site is zoned Rural District and is located east of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this is a request for Informal Review of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a site located 1,300 feet southeast of the intersection of Cosgray and Rings Roads. It is bounded by Cosgray Road on the west, the CSX Railroad on the east, and is located south of the Village of Amlin. The site is comprised of farmland and woods. The site is zoned R-Rural District and is adjacent to Washington Township and the City of Columbus. The Future Land Use Map in the Community Plan shows this site as "Mixed Residential Medium Density". Contemplated within that category are "areas where greater walkability and pedestrian orientation at a village scale are desired, at a maximum density of 5.0 du/ac. Areas are intended for integration around Village Center developments." The specific Southwest Special Area Plan of the Community Plan anticipates a Village of Amlin gateway with a mixed-use village center and mixed residential,

medium density on an alley-type of system; open space on the east side; and 200-foot setbacks along the railroad and along Tuttle Crossing Blvd. The 2013 Thoroughfare Plan contemplates extension of the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. northwest through this property. The 2020 Feasibility Study contemplates a 116-foot right-of-way to accommodate bike lanes, a detached shared-use path, and a median. The recommended alignment in this study shows an overpass at the railroad, along with the entire right-of-way being located on this project site. Cosgray Road south of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard is contemplated to be a Major Arterial, with a 120-foot right-of-way. Cosgray Road north of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the CSX Railroad crossing is shown as a Collector, with a 70-foot right-of-way. The proposal for the 101 acres with a density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre. The development would be comprised within two development pods: The northern pod consists of 31 acres with 160 units that are detached single-family. The southern pod is approximately 37 acres with 345 units, a mix of attached and detached units. Surrounding development consist of Hayden Farms to the south with 4.9 du/acres; the Village of Amlin to the north with .53 du/acres; and 0.25 du/per acre lots in Washington Township to the west. [Development details of the two pods reviewed. Proposed elevations were shown.]

Staff has provided the following questions for discussion purposes:

1) Is the proposal consistent with the Community Plan and the Special Area Plan?
2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed density and conceptual site layout?
3) Does the Commission support the development setbacks as shown?
4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open space locations including preservation of natural features?
5) Does the Commission support the conceptual product types presented with the application?

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodges, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, OH, attorney for the applicant stated that with him are Greg Chillog, Edge Group and Paul Coppel, principal, Schottenstein Homes. He stated that the proposed densities exceed the Community Plan provisions. The railroad, a wooded area, the anticipated Tuttle Blvd. extension, and the impact of existing City of Columbus development to the south are impacting this site. The anticipated extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd. has not yet been scheduled in the City's CIP budget. It will probably be ten years before that roadway project occurs, but the site must be developed in accordance with the City's long-range plans. The property owner who would be impacted by that future project, who is also selling them this land, is open to that conversation. He has indicated support for their obtaining the Commission's feedback on the proposed development. Combining the required right-of-way and setbacks encompasses large amounts of the property, making it unusable for private purposes. As currently proposed, 8.5 acres or 10% of the site will be used to accommodate right-of-way and setbacks for the future street connection. The roadway extension and the railroad tracks dictate the type of development that can occur on the site. On the western edge of the portion of the property south of the future Tuttle Crossing extension, a cottage product is anticipated, similar to that in Ballantrae Woods. To the east, a townhome product is anticipated; to the north, there would be a housing product that could integrate with the Village of Amlin. They are anticipating a product that would have a public street behind the units, with the units fronting open space, not public streets. There would be rear-loaded, detached garages.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired the reason the alignment of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension includes a jog to the south.

Greg Chillog, Planner/Landscape Architect, Edge Group, 330 W Spring St #350, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that based upon the 2013 Thoroughfare Plan, they contemplated the roadway would extend around the woods and through this property. That is their preferred alignment; however, the current engineering study proposes a straight roadway extension. They have attempted to minimize the amount of right-of-way and buffer on the site to achieve a buildable zone on the south end of the property. Because the complete boulevard will not occur in the initial phases of the project, the idea was to split the boulevard along the property line, recognizing the engineering study indication that the road would cross the railroad further east.
Mr. Way inquired if the roadway would cross the railroad tracks at an elevation if it would involve the embankment on both sides?
Mr. Chillog responded affirmatively. At the highest point, the embankment is at 100-150 feet, tapering downward. They have attempted to keep this as far from the woods as possible.
Mr. Way stated that his assumption was that they were moving the roadway to the south to avoid the woods.
Mr. Chillog indicated that was correct.

Ms. Fox stated that the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Study provided five alternatives; the City recommended Alternative 2. Is this proposal consistent with that alternative?
Ms. Holt responded that this proposal is Alternative 2, with the exception of the right-of-way landing width on this property.

Public Comments

Bruce McLoughlin, 5131 Brand Road, Dublin, 43017, stated he and his wife raised their family in Dublin and are invested in the community. He and a partner own 70 acres directly across the street, which has frontage on Cosgray and Rings roads. They have questions about the anticipated utility extensions and the roadways. They have been waiting quite some time for the extension of water and sewer in this area so that they could develop their property. They are hopeful that the Commission will ensure either that these developers size their utilities sufficiently so they can be extended across the road, or involve them to ensure that occurs. Property owners on the west side would like to continue the development of this area. Additionally, the intersection of Rings and Cosgray roads is significant, handling a large volume of traffic. Although it is not part of this development, he would recommend that the City take a focused look at how that intersection will be addressed long term. He attended a presentation 3-5 years previous that indicated Tuttle Crossing Boulevard would be moved west from Wilcox Road to Avery Road; that has not occurred. Now, it is proposed that Tuttle Crossing Blvd will be extended across the railroad tracks to Cosgray Road. Is Dublin going to allow a new Tuttle Crossing Blvd section at the west end without completing the area at Wilcox Road, or will all this area be addressed so that the roadway will work?

Ms. Call requested Mr. Hendershot to explain the overall thoroughfare plans for this area.
Mr. Hendershot stated that the provision of sanitary sewer and water in this part of the community is difficult, and Engineering has been studying this for some time. Specific to the site in question, the sanitary sewer and water access would be extended from the south. However, extending it as far north as the west side of Cosgray Road would need to be studied.

Ms. Call inquired about the thoroughfare plans in this area.
Mr. Hendershot responded that the Plan shows the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to Houchard Road. No additional studies have occurred regarding the alignment.
Ms. Call inquired if the Wilcox Road portion was covered in the same study.
Mr. Hendershot responded affirmatively. That is the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Phase 1 project. It has been planned but not funded.

Jody Dzuranin, Columbus Hayden Farms, 5709 Aderholt Road, Dublin 43016, stated that she has resided in this Columbus neighborhood directly south of the site in question for 12 years. She would like to comment on the southern portion of the proposed development, She encourages the developer to choose a home style and density that is compatible with their community, which is comprised of free-standing homes in three sizes – cottage, carriage and village homes. The proposed development will back up to the least dense properties, the Village Homes. She would like to propose that the southern portion of this property be annexed to the City of Columbus, which would achieve a more efficient delivery of public services and safety. Completion of the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and railroad overpass will create a service island, resulting in inefficiency and confusion. Annexation would designate the new Tuttle Crossing Blvd as the municipal line. She inquired about the timeline of the development.

Ms. Call requested Ms. Holt to address the anticipated timeline.

Ms. Holt stated that this is the first stage of a three-step development process. Essentially, the timeline for that is chosen by the applicant. The development review process could take a number of months.
Mr. Underhill stated that there will be multiple steps and hearings. He would not be surprised if that process has not yet been completed by Christmas of next year. This project will not break ground before 2023.

Mr. Way inquired if the applicant had contemplated any north-south connection through this site.
Mr. Chillog responded that it has been considered. As the development plan evolves, that will be taken into consideration further.
Mr. Underhill that it would need to recognize the disturbance that would occur to the treed area.

Public Comment

Eric Wayland, 5325 Cosgray Road, Dublin, OH:
"Focusing on the proposed development for now, I object to this proposal, as well as any other future proposals regarding land surrounding my property, because I am worried that the already horrible traffic will get much worse. I also really do not want a development built across from his property, as there are already more than half a dozen housing options of all types and sizes within a half mile in any direction of this proposed development. I would prefer for it to stay farmland for as long as possible, if up to me. At the very least, something should be done to ease the traffic before building any additional housing in this area.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that the Community Plan indicates a village concept here. She has come to realize that the City is reacting instead of being proactive about intentional types of development in the remaining parcels the City has. The Community Plan also indicates the intent to maintain a rural

landscape aesthetic. The development to the south within Columbus's jurisdiction is very dense. With Ballantrae Woods, the City has moved more towards a very dense and less unique and timeless development. The proposed development is not consistent with the Community Plan and the village concept. The intention of the Plan is to break up the density. With the proposed plan, there is one look. A PUD must be better than a typical subdivision would allow. The intent of a PUD is that the development be more unique and more attentive to the aesthetics of open spaces and curvilinear street. She is concerned with the cookie cutter look the City is getting. Similar to Emerald Parkway, Tuttle Crossing Boulevard will become very important. Without having adequate setbacks, she cannot be supportive. She believes the housing product needs to be more unique, village-centered, and sensitive to the rural environment and the Amlin community. At this time, she is not comfortable with the Concept Plan.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would reiterate Ms. Fox's comments. This area borders on a very rural area. What would fit is a development surrounded by farmland. Notwithstanding that, what is proposed is a cookie cutter development. There is a great opportunity here to do something quite different. There is very little in the Concept Plan that he likes.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the density should be flipped -- the village concept should be located along the north. As development in the City moves to the west, there is the opportunity to do something different. It should not resemble development within the central area of Dublin. There is an opportunity to test different types of village products. While the proposed character may be "village," the layout and density are not.

Mr. Grimes stated that he agrees. There is a great opportunity here to make this a very important property because of the proposed Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension. This will be a desirable area, with quick access to the freeway. There are opportunities to create a node here between the highway and the Village of Amlin. It will be important to look at the future re-sale of the identified housing products.

Mr. Supelak stated that he concurs. The site is difficult, but it is also difficult to react to the Concept Plan, as it is very limited in what is articulated at this point. This site may be the first piece of a greater Master Plan. Looking at the proposed discussion questions, clearly, the proposed development is not consistent with the Community Plan and the Special Area Plan. He would agree that the density needs to be considered relative to the Special Area Plan. He does not support reducing the desired setbacks. A large portion of the proposed housing product already exists en masse, which makes them less agreeable. Commissioners would recommend a different path be taken.

Ms. Call stated that she also has concerns about the proposed density. However, she would not necessarily be opposed to a little more density here, as long as it achieves a village feel. There are some communities along Hyland-Croy Road, such as Corazon, that blend a village product nicely with open space and acre parcels. There are village products that could work well. The applicant has 100 acres here -- a blank canvas to paint. The Commission is interested in partnering with the applicant on a new development of which the City can be proud of, that would be the lynchpin for a new corridor in Dublin. This will be a southern gateway into Dublin. There has not yet been a lot of development in this area, but there is opportunity.

Mr. Underhill stated they are disappointed not to have more support; however, it does appear there is some support for density, if done correctly, and a different product type. He is unsure of the type of product that would be acceptable. Would the Commission be supportive of apartments?
Ms. Call responded that she would not support 100 acres of apartments. However, an apartment building within surrounding lower density and mixed-use might be an option.
Ms. Fox responded that there is a benefit to mixed housing styles. What concerns her, however, is that this area of Dublin is all beginning to look the same. There is no energy within these developments. They are simply housing units stacked upon houses and more houses. A village concept provides an opportunity to incorporate a lifestyle on 100 acres. If they can devise a plan that mixes housing styles but also creates a place that is enjoyable to walk through or around to reach Amlin – that could be a village concept. However, we are weary of seeing the same product everywhere without any sense of uniqueness or timelessness.

Mr. Underhill responded that might be possible on the northern section; on the southern section, however, that would be a struggle.
Ms. Fox stated that it is not so much that an apartment building is unattractive; it is the context in which it sits – what is offered around it. There must be a partnership between the building, landscaping and streetscape.

Mr. Underhill responded that they would look into the possibilities.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the bifurcation of City services here between Dublin and Columbus.
Mr. Boggs responded that all of the land in this application is within the City of Dublin jurisdiction. Dublin obtains its water and sewer infrastructure through an agreement with the City of Columbus. Those issues lie within the purview of that agreement, which is ultimately a City Council question. Fire services are provided by Washington Township. Police services would continue to be provided by the City of Dublin. There are mutual agreements that provide ability for municipalities to provide support to one another along the abutting edges of the communities; for instance, whichever agency is closest to a fire addresses the need.

Mr. Underhill stated that due to the sheer size of the road extension, some relief on the required setbacks would be appreciated.

Ms. Call requested Commission support for moving Cases 5 and 6 ahead of Case 4, to accommodate the residents present.
Commission members indicated support.

~~5. Oak Park, Subarea F at 7050 & 7055 Oak Park Boulevard, 20-192FPD, Final Development Plan~~

~~A request for development of 12 single-family lots on a 3.47-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Oak Park Subarea F. The site is located west of Hyland-Croy Road, ±700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road.~~

~~6. Oak Park, Subarea F at 7050 & 7055 Oak Park Boulevard, 20-193FP, Final Plat~~

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc. Form No. 30043

Ordinance No. 56-05 *Passed* _____, 20____

AN ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT AN ANNEXATION OF 65.5 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, IN WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, TO THE CITY OF DUBLIN (5274 COSGRAY ROAD – FLOYD AND JOYCE MILLER – CASE NO. 05-095 ANNEX).

WHEREAS, on July 5, 2005, the Franklin County Commissioners approved the regular annexation petition for 65.5 acres, more or less, from Washington Township, Franklin County to the City of Dublin, as filed on May 25, 2005 by Harrison W. Smith, Jr., Agent for Petitioners Floyd and Joyce Miller, 5274 Cosgray Road, Dublin, Ohio 43016; and

WHEREAS, the area proposed for annexation lies within Dublin's exclusive water and sewer service extension area, as provided under the agreements with the City of Columbus; and

WHEREAS, the proposed annexation is in conformance with the annexation strategy contained in the Dublin Community Plan, adopted by Council on November 17, 1997;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Council of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, 4 of the elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. The petition for the annexation of 65.5 acres, more or less (see attached legal description, Exhibit "A") to the City of Dublin, Ohio is hereby accepted.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest date permitted by law.

Passed this 17th day of October, 2005.

Signed:

Maribeth Brennan Zurcher
Mayor - Presiding Officer

Attest:

Anna C Clarke
Clerk of Council

Passed: October 17, 2005

Effective: November 16, 2005

I hereby certify that copies of this Ordinance/Resolution were posted in the City of Dublin in accordance with Section 731.25 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Judith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council, Dublin, Ohio