

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 17, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

3. Avery Crossing 24-014CP

Concept Plan

Proposal: Request for review and non-binding feedback for a mixed-use development comprised of residential, commercial and open space. The 127-acre site is zoned R, Rural.

Location: Southwest of the Rings Road and Avery Road intersection

Planning Contact: Christopher Will, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4498, cwill@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-014

RESULT: The Commission supported the proposal, with recommendations to further refine the transitions between the proposed residential types as well as the connections with the proposed commercial development. The Commission also recommended further development of the open space framework to better define purpose and add amenities. Commission members highlighted the necessity of transportation improvements, especially Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, and encouraged continued engagement with the surrounding neighbors.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Absent
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:

Chris Will

Christopher Will, AICP
Senior Planner



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

~~Mr. Deschler excused himself from the Consent Cases.~~

CONSENT CASES

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

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

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

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

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

~~No public comments were provided on the Consent Cases.~~

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

~~Case 25-029AFDP – Dublin Scioto High School:~~

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

~~Case 25-30AFDP – Dublin Jerome High School:~~

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

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

~~Mr. Deschler returned to his seat.~~

CASE REVIEWS

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

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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

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

Staff Presentation

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

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

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

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

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

Commission Questions for Applicant and Staff

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Garvin inquired if any units have been eliminated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Turnock responded that is correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Call requested staff to provide an overview of when PUDs work well and why they work well.

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

Commission Questions

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

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

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

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

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

Commission Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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



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:

**2. Avery Crossing at PID: 274-000023, 274-000021, and 274-000117
23-101INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Informal review and feedback of a proposed mixed residential and commercial development. The approximately 114-acre site is zoned R, Rural District

Location: Southwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Avery Road.

Request: Informal Review and feedback of a future planned development and rezoning application.

Applicant: Chris Tumblin, CASTO

Planning Contact: Chris Will, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4498, cwill@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-101

RESULT: Informal review and feedback of a proposed mixed residential and commercial development. The approximately 114-acre site is zoned R, Rural District and is located southwest of the intersection of Avery Road and Rings Road.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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:

Chris Will

8C8A0F837E3E42F...

Chris Will, AICP, Senior Planner



CONSENT CASE

- **Case 23-083 - IGS Pickleball Courts, 6100 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan**

A Proposal for construction of two pickleball courts and associated site improvements at the existing IGS Energy campus. The 15.04-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Tuttle North - IGS, and is located east of the intersection of Innovation Drive and Emerald Parkway.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) The sample and pattern of the Hanover pavers to be provided at the building permit stage.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

CASES

- **Case 23-101 - Avery Crossing, PID: 274-000023, 274-000021, 274-000117, and 274000017, Informal Review**

A request for Informal Review and feedback of a proposed mixed residential and commercial development. The approximately 114-acre site is zoned R, Rural District and is located southwest of the intersection of Avery Road and Rings Road.

Mr. Way recused himself from the case and withdrew from the room.

Applicant Presentation

Chris Tumblin, CASTO Communities, 610 Evening Street, Worthington stated that he is representing the applicant. Also with him is Tony Murray, NBBJ and James Peltier, E.P. Ferris & Associates. He is presenting the first iteration of the plan. They are seeking the Commission's feedback on the proposed uses, densities, layout and street network. He presented an aerial view of the site, which is located at the southwest corner of the Avery and Rings Roads intersection. Approximately 24 acres of the 114-acre site includes one single-family house and the 107-unit senior mobile home park known as Ponderosa Mobile Home Park. The balance of the site is undeveloped farmland. The entire project site is located within the Dublin City limits and borders the City of Columbus on its southern and southeastern boundaries; it is inside the Hilliard City School District. The site is zoned Rural, Rural District. The area to the west is undeveloped and zoned Rural, as well; the area to the north across Rings Road includes single-family lots, which are part of the Ballantrae and Cramer Crossing neighborhoods. The area to the east within the City of Dublin is partially developed with uses, including a medical office building, church and single-family residences. The area southeast of the site, which is in the City of Columbus, has been developed over the past 10 years with moderate-density housing, including multi-family, townhouses,

duplexes, high-density single-family and self-storage. There are some pockets of undeveloped land fronting Avery Road that are planned for future retail development. The area immediately south within the City of Columbus includes the Avery Brooke apartment community; the area immediately south within the City of Dublin is part of the Avondale Planned Unit Development (PUD). Avondale includes a mix of different housing types and densities. Mr. Tumblin displayed the planned roadway infrastructure. The City of Dublin is planning to construct a new roundabout at Avery and Rings Road in 2024. The City of Columbus is in the process of designing and expects to begin construction on an Avery Road widening project from Hayden Run Road to the Columbus-Dublin border immediately south of the project in 2025. That project will provide two lanes of traffic in each direction and a 10-foot wide shared-use path on the east side of the road and a sidewalk on the west side. The Dublin Thoroughfare Plan shows Avery Road being widened in a similar manner immediately east of the site and identifies Avery Road as a major arterial. The most significant infrastructure improvement is the Tuttle Boulevard extension. That extension would run perpendicular to Avery Road and would bisect the project site. The timing of these public infrastructure improvements will determine when the northern two thirds of the project site can be developed. We are in the preliminary stages of evaluating sanitary capacity, water capacity, and the overall stormwater management for the site; however, it seems possible for the southern third of the project site to be developed with the existing utilities in place and prior to the Tuttle Boulevard extension. These infrastructure improvements will dramatically change the character of this corridor, which has influenced the way in which this site has been conceptually planned.

Tony Murray, NBBJ, 250 S. High Street, Columbus presented the conceptual site plan. He explained the existing conditions around the site, including its rural character, land use, entry point to the Ponderosa mobile home site and an existing service building on that site. Dublin's Future Land Use Plan and its Southwest Area Plan call for commercial mixed-use along Avery Road and to the west, mixed residential, low density and suburban low-density residential. Their plans align with those City plans and with Dublin's Neighborhood Design Guidelines. Their proposed plan provides two types of single-family lots, one that is 35' x 50' with no sideyard setbacks and an 80' x 100' manor lot. The primary access to their site will be the current Ponderosa entry point. There will also be opportunities for access and connectivity at Tuttle Boulevard and Avery Road. The site is primarily flat and slopes from west to east. The site plan provides park space and pedestrian connections. A mix of housing will be provided consistent with the surrounding and proposed housing, which includes apartments, townhomes and single-family. Mixed-use commercial development will be provided along Avery Road. Manor lots and 0-setback sideyard lots, alleys and apartments will be provided on the south side; manor lots on the north side will face Rings Road. The proposed street grid will provide a connected transportation network, tapping into existing streets and creating connection points to future streets.

Mr. Tumblin stated that their plan would preserve the existing Ponderosa mobile home park. Their plan will provide a diverse type of housing in this corridor and they look forward to working with the Commission on future iterations of this plan.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that an Informal Review of the development concept is requested, which is an opportunity for the Commission to provide non-binding feedback and guidance regarding land use, density, site layout, transportation, open space and the site's integration with the surrounding area. The PUD process in Dublin would require the applicant to come back for a Concept Plan informal

review, a preliminary development and rezoning, and a final development plan. When considering a rezoning of land, the Commission and City Council reference Future Land Use recommendations from the Community Plan. The Community Plan provides three Future Land Use recommendations for this site: Standard Office/Institutional along Avery Road, Suburban Residential Low Density along portions of Rings Road, and Mixed Residential Low Density for the balance of the site. The applicant is proposing a mix of residential, commercial, and open space uses within the approximately 114-acre site. The residential mix includes single-family homes, townhomes, and four-story apartment buildings with communal amenities. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to preserve the existing 107-lot Ponderosa Mobile Home Park. With each future land use, the Community Plan makes density recommendations. The recommendations for Standard Office Institutional are 12,500 sq. ft. of development per acre. For Mixed Residential, Low Density, the Community Plan recommends 3 dwelling units (du) per acre. With Suburban Residential, Low Density, it is 1-2 du/acre. Overall, for this site, that calculates to approximately 262,000 sq. ft. of Office Institutional and 260 residential dwellings. The applicant's mix of uses proposes 10-15,000 sq. ft. of Mixed Use Commercial; 4.8 du/acre for single-family manor homes; 6.2 du/acre for the 0' sideyard homes; 12-15 du/acre for townhomes and 35 du/acre for apartments. This is approximately 60,000-90,000 sq. ft. of mixed use commercial and 719 residential dwellings, which includes the existing Ponderosa Mobile Home dwelling units. This exceeds the recommendations of the Community Plan's Future Land Use Plan. The provisions of the Future Land Use Plan densities are used by the Thoroughfare Plan and for planning future transportation and utility needs of the community. Those numbers are also used by the surrounding school districts as they plan for future enrollment. Development is generally organized around a gridded street network with setbacks and greenspaces buffering existing and new development.

The Thoroughfare Plan identifies needed future thoroughfare connections and provides recommendations for future right-of-way based on number of lanes, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, median, and other needed streetscape components. The Thoroughfare Plan designates Avery Road as a Major Arterial, Rings Road as a 2-lane collector with rural character. It recommends the widening of Avery Road and extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard from Wilcox Road to Houchard Road across this site. In key areas of the City where substantial development or redevelopment activity is likely, special area plans provide a framework for additional design guidance for development. The Southwest Area Plan provides for the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to increase regional connectivity, increase housing variety and stock, preserve natural features and create regional greenways. The applicant is proposing an extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard from Avery Road to the west property boundary.

As the Community Plan update is developed, City Council has adopted Interim Land Use Principles to guide development during the transition. In addition, the City has adopted Neighborhood Design Guidelines to provide development guidance and ensure the intent of the Code is met in terms of open space, lots and layout, and development theme for new single-family residential planned developments.

Staff has provided the following questions for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land uses and densities?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed general layout and arrangement of uses?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed plans for the existing Ponderosa Mobile Home Park?

- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed open space framework, including types, location, and sizes of open spaces as well as the treatment of the site and surrounding area's natural features such as tree rows and woodlands?
- 5) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed street network and circulation?
- 6) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed character of the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension?

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked the applicant to share his vision for the site in regard to the mixed-use commercial use, the community center and how the proposed development would be integrated with the existing Ponderosa development and achieve a cohesive area.

Mr. Tumblin stated that the mixed-use commercial is anticipated to be support retail, medical office and restaurant type of uses. The square footage depicted is probably higher than what it will be. Realistically, it will probably be a lower density type of development in that area.

Mr. Murray stated that from a physical design standpoint, the intent is to have centrally located open space and greenspace for future and existing development. Pedestrian pathways will provide site connectivity. The existing setback present a good opportunity for site circulation.

Ms. Harter inquired about the anticipated location and look of the community center.

Mr. Tumblin responded that is undecided at this early stage. In that area, there is currently an industrial-type building historically used for storage. It could be repurposed into a community center or there could be a traditional clubhouse with a pool and/or playground in that area to be used by the community.

Ms. Harter inquired if the applicant had plans to meet with and discuss plans with the Ponderosa neighbors and businesses within the area.

Mr. Tumblin responded that they anticipate meeting with and discussing their plans with the Ponderosa residents. They have contacted the medical office user across the street and will be setting up a meeting with them and the residents to make both aware of their plans as soon as they have a better sense of how the site plan is evolving.

Mr. Supelak stated that mixed-use commercial sometimes implies commercial and residential. Is only mixed commercial planned here?

Mr. Tumblin responded affirmatively, although there will be the potential for a residential component, it is likely that it will be support retail, medical office and restaurant-type uses.

Mr. Supelak requested the intent with the proposed apartments on the south edge of the site.

Mr. Tumblin stated that heading south on Avery Road, the east side of the road has developed with higher density residential. Therefore, on the south side of their site, there is opportunity to include a multi-family use.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the community center, pool and amenity space would be open to all residents of this community including the Ponderosa residents or if the pool and amenity space would be limited to the apartment residents.

Mr. Tumblin responded that the community center would be available to all the residents, including Ponderosa residents and the apartments across the street. The pool amenity space on the southern portion of the site would be limited to the apartment residents.

Mr. Fishman inquired the square footage of the community center. Will it include a workout/fitness room?

Mr. Tumblin responded that the details of the space have not yet been defined.

Ms. Call stated that the number of residential units proposed differs from the Community Plan's Future Land Use Plan for this area. Why does the applicant believe the proposed number is appropriate for this area and the City of Dublin?

Mr. Murray responded that their intent was to provide a variety of housing and in a quantity that fits the current market. They invite the Commission's input on the appropriateness of that number on the site.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the 200-foot setback.

Mr. Will responded that the Southwest Special Area Plan provides additional design recommendations for development in the area. Along the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, the intent is to create a rural character by using large setbacks, such as those seen on Hyland-Croy Road, programmed with open space to push development away from the roadway.

Mr. Supelak inquires if the proposed plan meets that intent.

Mr. Will responded that the proposed setbacks vary in the conceptual plan; they are between 50 and 140 feet, which is less than the 200 feet provided in the special area plan.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the timing of the Avery Road and Rings Road improvements in sync with this development.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the traffic component would be discussed in greater detail as the application advances. The applicant will be required to conduct a Traffic Impact Study, consistent with a proposed rezoning. A City of Columbus project will widen Avery Road south of this site. The City of Dublin has improvement projects planned at the intersection of Avery, Rings and Cara roads. Construction is anticipated in 2024.

Ms. Call requested staff to describe what is included in a road widening capital improvement project, such as sanitary sewer lines.

Ms. Rose stated that the City of Columbus and City of Dublin have worked together on sewer shed areas that have been pre-defined. As the project continues, it will be reevaluated. This area will be included in the Tuttle Crossing Phase 1 extension.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the meandering nature of the Tuttle Crossing extension.

Mr. Will responded that the Special Area Plan provides guidance in design. It is not meant to be interpreted literally always, but provide the spirit and intent, which is for a rural, open space character. The City has conducted preliminary discussions regarding the extension along with utilities; the details are not yet planned.

Ms. Harter inquired if the proposed apartments would be four stories.

Mr. Murray responded affirmatively.

Public Comment

[shared during meeting]

Lorrie Blosser, 5477 Cartwright Lane E., stated that this is a 55+ community. There are no sidewalks, so residents who are 85-90 years old will be walking in the streets in their community. The developer is proposing to increase the traffic volume in this community. The property owner

is already proposing to increase their lot rents for the residents who are on Social Security. Half of their monthly income is going towards their lot rent. The developer is proposing to add families with children in this area. The Ponderosa residents live in a 55+ community on purpose; they do not want that to change. Are the developers aware of the impact on the Ponderosa community? Their intent is to squeeze out their community, and where can they go since they cannot afford \$300,000-\$400,000 homes? The Ponderosa residents are scared that they will lose their homes. The developer is proposing to bring other people in the community to the community center. What about the Ponderosa community's privacy? Although there are other neighborhoods nearby, those children are not coming to the Ponderosa community. The increased traffic will prevent their ability to walk their dogs near their homes. She has been a property manager and is aware that when apartment communities come in, the crime increases and the typical targets are the elderly. There is a 98-year old resident in the Ponderosa community, who would not be able to quickly get out of the path of a car speeding into their community. She asked the Commission to consider the impact of this proposed development on the Ponderosa community.

Barb Robertson, 7000 Inchcape Lane, stated that she is president of the Cottages at Ballantrae Woods Homeowners Association. Their community is located where the roundabout at Rings Road separates into Churchman Road, which is close to this site. Their community is concerned about the utilities. She has lived at the Cottages for three years, and every year the water pressure diminishes. That will likely become a bigger problem if for residential units are added here. They also are concerned about the traffic level. The morning and evening traffic on Rings Road is a current disaster. They are also concerned about safety. They do not want more people in this neighborhood.

Barbara Wright, 6244 Cartwright Lane N., inquired what a manor lot is. A manor home, as described on the web, is a huge home. Her home backs up to the proposed lot. There is no greenspace separating her home from those lots. Will there be anything to separate those homes with their children and dogs out of her yard? She searched for her home for some time to escape previous neighborhood issues and traffic. She loves the Ponderosa community because it consists only of 55+ residents and is quiet. She can walk the streets in this community without concern. What separation is intended between her home and the proposed lots?

Martin Lynch, 5509 Tayside Circle, Ballantrae Woods, stated that they moved to their community 15 years ago to ensure that they were not in an area with apartments. They are very concerned about the clientele that apartments will bring into the area and the type of children being added to the school system that their children attend. Washington Elementary through Davidson High School is a good school system. Adding children with a different set of values will impact the children within their community and the surrounding neighborhoods. The quality of their school system will deteriorate. In addition, the main entry to Ballantrae is Royal Dublin Road. What will be located there? There is no discussion about widening Rings Road, which is currently difficult to enter. Even though a traffic circle is proposed at Avery Road, this will be a very congested area. The developer has referred to the existence of other apartments within the greater area, but those are in the Columbus jurisdiction, not the City of Dublin, and those children attend a different school district than Ballantrae and surrounding neighborhoods attend. This will bring a significant change into their environment. He is concerned about his home value plummeting due to the introduction of apartments and introduction of a different type of residents nearby.

Patty Marlin, Cottages at Ballantrae Woods, inquired within which Police jurisdiction the proposed development would lie. If the apartments would be within the City of Columbus Police jurisdiction, that would be a concern, due to the slower response time. Since the zoning for this area is Rural, wouldn't cottage-type homes be more appropriate than apartments? There are existing cottage homes on the other side of Avery Road. In Ballantrae Woods, the water pressure is insufficient for sprinkler systems. There is also a traffic speeding issue on Churchman Road and a traffic volume issue on Rings and Avery roads. Traffic backs up daily during peak hours. Adding 713 additional homes in this area will create a disaster.

Gloria Power, 5489 Cartwright Lane, E., stated that her family has lived in the Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates for 50 years. Near the intersection of Avery and Hayden Run Road, there already are a large number of apartments and more are under construction. Additionally, the proposed community center in the development is currently their mailroom – what will happen to that? She is also concerned about the water. Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates has their own water system. Will they be forced to connect to the City of Dublin water system? If so, at what cost? If this development is approved, it is important that Avery Road be widened beforehand. Currently, it is often impossible to turn from Rings Road to Avery Road without sitting through numerous traffic light cycles, and this has been the traffic situation since all the recent development in this area.

Gregory Mason, 5490 Cartwright Lane, E., stated that he has worked in the construction business since he was 19. He knows that these type of investments are not made without a vision. What the developer is sharing about their intent with the Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates is very vague, but he knows they have a vision concerning this area. He would like for them to share their long-range plans. Will the mobile home estates be allowed to remain as they are in the midst of all this new development? That is the most significant question to answer, before anything else is considered. The intent to displace people from their homes is a significant issue.

Donna Carter, 5475 Cartwright Lane E., stated that she would like to reiterate the longevity of the existence of this mobile home park. Most of its residents have no other homes for a home. She would ask the City of Dublin to obtain a longevity commitment from Casto Development, so the residents can be assured of their future, whether they are 55 or 95 years old.

Fred Still, 6250 Cartwright Lane N., stated he would quote from the October 5, 2023 edition of the *Columbus Dispatch* Business section: "A Casto representative said the company did not have more details on its proposal now, but he did say the project will maintain the existing Ponderosa Mobile Home Park, a 107-space community that offers a unique affordable housing option for the area." Everything he has heard so far, however, is an attempt to eliminate this affordable housing for senior citizens. They want to extend through streets through the mobile home park, which would destroy the community for the seniors. They want to replace the senior citizens' mailroom with a community center. The Ponderosa community residents would rather keep the mailroom, placing the community center elsewhere within the development. They are also concerned about the water system and central septic system that currently exists for their community. The concept refers to stormwater retention ponds, which means there will be stormsewers. That added cost will result in higher lot rents for their community. There currently is only one main entrance off Rings Road and no through streets through the Ponderosa mobile home park to the areas that Casto proposes to develop. Casto wants to change that to through streets, which will ruin the Ponderosa Mobile Home Park. The proposed density is too much for this area in view of the already high level of

traffic congestion. He is hopeful that the Commission will support their request to keep the Ponderosa Mobile Home Park as it is.

Molly Sin, 6236 Rings Road, stated that her home is directly in front of a proposed sidewalk or road. She echoes the concerns of the Ponderosa community. She has a 3 year old and a 10-year old who attends a nearby school. She has a PhD in Education and is concerned about the impact on the school system. Washington Elementary School is already crowded and the class sizes are too large to enable ease of learning. Choosing to introduce more students with no plan will impact the school system significantly. The traffic level on the roads is already difficult. She chose this area because she has retired parents, who live in the Ponderosa community, a quiet area with older residents where they are able to have a garden. She is not supportive of the addition of undefined commercial and retail space in this particular area. Nor does she want opportunistic crime introduced to her family due to the addition of mixed-use commercial. Community crime apps indicate an increase in crime in some areas, but currently, this area has very little crime. She would like to see more detail with this plan, as there is little clarity, and she would encourage a reduction in the proposed number of dwelling units.

Laura Bonai, 6306 Cartwright Lane, stated that she lives in the first home at the front of the Ponderosa community, so her lot will back up to the manor homes. No buffer is shown between her home and the manor lots. It is a large space; will there be a road there? She is concerned about the stormwater. Currently, the stormwater retention ponds fill up and ducks appear there. The field along Rings Road floods and the stormwater flows over the road. The traffic level on these roads is already too high and needs addressed. Currently, the building with the mailroom is in their neighborhood. She does not want it replaced with a community center, which would result in all of the neighborhood entering the Ponderosa community. They do not want their main street to be made a thoroughfare. They are concerned about the increase in crime with all of the apartment buildings being added to this area. Although the property will be developed, she is hopeful that it is with fewer dwelling units.

John Pittman, 6449 Rings Road, stated that the traffic in this area is definitely a problem. The homes are very close to the intersection, and busses dropping off students is a concern, due to the volume of traffic. At night, the road resembles a racetrack. In addition, there is a stormwater flooding issue here. He has a landscape business that he runs from his home, so he is concerned about his property security. He is on a septic system. Is there a plan for the properties to be connected to City water and sewer?

Public Comment

[emails received before meeting]

Edward Ostrowski, Village of Balgriffin condominiums, stated that he is president of the Village of Balgriffin Condominium Association, which is located at the northeast corner of Rings and Avery roads. Their Board has not taken any position regarding the proposed development, but their homes will be impacted by the development of these parcels. The extension of Tuttle Crossing from Wilcox Road to Avery Road should be completed before this project is commenced. The Avery Crossing project notes stated that access to the new development would be from Tuttle Crossing Blvd and Rings Road. However, access in Dublin from the east, i.e. from I-270, as of now, will necessarily require the use of Woerner-Temple and Rings Road. Neighborhoods adjoining these two streets will be called on to exclusively carry any increased east-west traffic in Dublin to and

from I-270 to the proposed development and points south and west. Rings Road is a two-lane residential road in no way equipped to handle additional traffic from this development. I note that the general land use project drawing has arrows showing project traffic to be directed east on Cara Road east of Avery and east on Tuttle Crossing. This drawing is deceptive since Tuttle Crossing does not currently exist between Avery and Wilcox roads, and Cara Road east is a 400-foot dead-end into Dublin's Kaltenbach Park. The project drawings submitted do not show Rings Road just north of Cara, which winds from Avery to Emerald Parkway and I-270. This section of Rings Road has about 20 single-family homes with curbcut driveways, two large City parks and multiple crosswalks to accommodate neighborhood residents. Without the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. in place as the shortest route from I-270, traffic from the project will necessarily use Rings Road."

Fred Still, 6250 Cartwright Lane, stated that Casto states that they plan to leave the Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates as is in their request for a rezoning of vacant property on the four sides of the Ponderosa Mobile Homes Estates. However, the map that Casto provides reveals that their intentions are far different from leaving the Ponderosa estates as is. Their map shows through streets within the Ponderosa community, which would allow drivers to speed through the quiet, senior citizen community. He believes there will be an uptick in crime by allowing the through streets. Another negative of this development could be an impact on the well fields that supply water to the Ponderosa community, impacting their central septic system. Many areas where Casto wanted to build on vacant land are now similar to retention ponds during incidents of heavy rainfall. He is sure there is a remedy for the stormwater, but he fears an increase in water and sewer because of the rezoning, if approved. He believes the end game for Casto is to price the senior citizens out of their now affordable housing. This intent is evident due to their recent \$50 increase to the residents' monthly lot rent. Please stand up for your senior citizens and deny this rezoning.

Jim Bloom, 6167 Turvey Loop W., Dublin stated that as someone locally impacted by this, he is reaching out to share his thoughts regarding Casto's Avery Crossing application. He will also be submitting a similar letter to the Public Comment section for this review. His concerns are the density and the infrastructure of the proposed application. The Avery Crossing density of 484 apartments and 154 homes/townhomes will strain an already stretched infrastructure for both roads and schools in this area. This development would be in addition to the proposed Amlin Crossing application, which will include another 425 units. These two projects combine to add almost 1,500 new housing units in this already dense area of land. As the Commission is aware, the City of Columbus has previously allowed numerous apartment complexes to be built between Hayden Run and the Rings Road intersection. While Dublin had no control over this, it has impacted the transportation and service infrastructure of Dublin and Washington Township. From a transportation standpoint, it has directly impacted the vehicle count increase on Avery Road, and it has resulted in an increase of accidents at intersections in this corridor along with a pedestrian death. In their application, Casto acknowledges that the only transportation project scheduled is a roundabout at Rings and Avery roads. He does not believe the current road infrastructure can safely support any additional growth. It has significantly increased the volume of students in Washington Elementary and other feeder schools. The fact is that the City of Dublin does have control over this proposed growth within its boundaries. For the sake of the existing schools and the transportation infrastructure, these issues need to be addressed concurrently or prior to the increase in the area population.

Ms. Call provided the following response to questions posed in public comments:

1. Should this application go forward, a traffic impact study would be required for this proposed development;
2. Manor lots are an accepted property type in certain areas, as defined by City Code.
3. Greenspace is addressed with the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and fences are addressed in the Final Development Plan (FDP). City Code guides that development.
4. Conceptual roadways are provided in the Concept Plan and addressed in more detail with the PDP.
5. Public services and stormwater management are addressed with the Preliminary Development Plan, discussions occurring in advance of the plan.
6. Police, fire, water and sewer services are all evaluated and ensured in the planning process.
7. The City would not be responsible for existence of the mobile home park in perpetuity, schools and the community center and associated costs to the residents.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested the commissioners to provide feedback to the discussion questions provided by staff.

Mr. Supelak thanked the residents who offered their public comments. In regard to the discussion questions, he has no objection to the residential development in this area, which is consistent with the Community Plan. However, there is a significant variation from the density recommended in the Community Plan. In regard to the general layout and arrangement of those uses, in large part, they are aligned with the Community Plan. While there is an attempt for a sensitive transition to the adjacent neighborhood, adding through streets in that neighborhood would be a focus for debate. The suggested office use has been replaced with commercial use, which also could be a matter for debate in this location. Additionally, the residential density throughout the proposed development is an issue, particularly with the apartments on the south side. While some buffers have been provided around the Ponderosa community, the circulation and connections will have significant ramifications on the Ponderosa community. There is significant work to be done with this plan to produce a win-win solution. In regard to the proposed open space, there are concerns about the ramification of usurping space away from the Ponderosa community to be used in a different manner. Fundamentally, the developer is attempting to lace them through the site effectively; that is not entirely disagreeable, but there is still work to do. The proposed street network and circulation in particular give him major concerns. They have leveraged Tuttle Crossing Blvd. as the barrier to the area to the south, i.e. the apartments. The current and preferred rural character has been replaced with buffers on each side of the proposed development and creating space on the south side for the apartments. He believes that is unfortunate. He believes the Tuttle Crossing component should abide more closely to the Community Plan, which ultimately, would alleviate some of the discomfort everyone is having in regard to the proposed density and circulation. In regard to the proposed street grid, there is an existing community to acknowledge and honor more significantly; there is currently discomfort with the proposed plan to run streets through it. There are three additional connection points on the backside, and Bonanza Lane becomes the centerpiece of the entire community, which will by default invite a significant level of traffic to it. Once the density has been revised, the street grid should take on a very different nature. There is, however, much work to do. He is uncomfortable with the current proposal.

Mr. Fishman agreed that the density should abide more closely to the Community Plan. Residential use, however, is appropriate. The mixed-use commercial may eventually be something the residents would appreciate.

[Residents present expressed disagreement.]

He stated that the proposed apartments on the south side are a concern. The greenspace layout is agreeable; it provides buffer for the Ponderosa community. He believes making the Ponderosa community entry the main entrance for the proposed development should be eliminated.

Mr. Schneier expressed thanks to the residents who participated. He agrees that the proposed residential use would be appropriate here, as would be a commercial use to support that residential development. The proposed density, however, is a significant deviation from the Community Plan. While he is in favor of increased density generally - and this would be a good place for increased density due to the complementary nature of what would be developed - this is too much. In regard to the plans for the existing Ponderosa community, the Commission is sensitive to the residents' concerns regarding increased lot rents; however, that is not a matter on which the Commission can comment. He is generally supportive of the proposed open space. In regard to the street network and circulation, providing the main north-south access through the Ponderosa community would impact the character of that community. There needs to be another entry solution. A wider buffer needs to be provided along the Tuttle Crossing Blvd. Having less density here would solve or minimize many of the other concerns. Some great planning has been invested in this plan, and with significant fine-tuning, he could be supportive of the project.

Mr. Chinnock thanked the public for their comments. The Commission receives the application information from staff and reviews the proposed plan in depth in preparation for discussion at the meetings. When he reviewed the plan earlier, he thought the community spaces and the manner in which the Ponderosa mobile home community had been integrated into the plans was good. The information shared by the residents has changed his perspective. He believes the Ponderosa community needs to be more insulated from the proposed development. He believes the message to the applicant is clear that they need to meet with the Ponderosa community, discuss their plans, and figure out what the residents want. That would help significantly. He is generally supportive of the proposed mixed-use. The density level is a concern and needs to be reconsidered. The proposed Tuttle Crossing Blvd. connection should be more organic, fewer through streets, mitigate traffic more effectively and be more pedestrian-friendly. He is generally supportive with some necessary refinement.

Ms. Harter stated that the proposed land use is appropriate, but the proposed density is too high. She is concerned about the look of and impact of the proposed 4-story apartment buildings on the nearby Ballantrae community. The Ballantrae community incorporated art into their community design well. She would encourage them to do the same with art, trees, etc. The buffer is important and the streets should be evaluated. She would encourage them to meet and discuss their plans with the Ponderosa community and discuss safety concerns with the Dublin Police. She is looking forward to seeing greater detail with the next iteration, particularly with the proposed community center.

Ms. Call stated that while many of us would like to pause development in our community, that is the world in which we live. The Commission is given certain tools for evaluating proposed development including the Community Plan, the Thoroughfare Plan and the Future Land Use Plan, all of which have a vision for this particular area to be a rural community. The proposed land use

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~~