APPROVED BY PZC 5/3/84

MICROFICHE OT-158

4. Final Development Plan

A. The Indian Run Meadow Plan was heard informally at the March meeting and formally at the April Commission meeting. The case was tabled until more detailed plans are submitted. The plans have been refiled with considerably more information detailing the development.

B. With the addition of the detailed development plans, the Final Development Plan requirements appear to have been satisfied. The two issues, the adequacy of the proposed plan and the integrity of the entire 198 acres, have been resolved enough to permit construction of the first phase. The Commission may certainly request more details at the meeting.

C. Staff had a meeting with the applicant to discuss specific details of the application. The questions that were posed to, and the answers received from, the applicant are attached to this report and should become part of the case record.

D. The owner of the entire 198 acres has agreed to submit an amended preliminary plan to the Commission within approximately 60 days. Until the plan is amended, the owner has agreed to apply the proposed development standards and similar deed restrictions to the balance of the development. This agreement at least insures continuity and development consistency on the remaining acreage of a portion of the tract that was sold before the amended plan was filed. An amended plan would give the Commission the opportunity to re-examine the commercial and small park areas.

E. Please call if there is any additional information that staff could provide or if there is anything that staff could pass on to the applicant prior to the meeting.

Indian Run Meadow - Meeting with Applicant - Staff Comments, Questions, and Responses from Applicant noted below.

Q.	1.	Preliminary Development Plan	Submitted Plan
		Gross Density = 2.65	2.503 and 2.43
		Net Density = 3.52	3.52 and 3.61
A.	1.	Checks out O.K.	

Q. 2. Side Yards on Preliminary - 6 foot minimum and 15 feet total
Request - 5 foot minimum and 12 feet total

A. 2. 5' minimum consistent with R-4 zoning district
Requiring the original side yard will probably succeed in reducing the size of the houses.

Q. 3. Are the development standards and deed restrictions submitted for this application to be applied to the balance of the single family development?

A. 3. Yes.

Q. 4. Is the definition of "No Build Zone" found in an addendum of the preliminary text to be made part of this final development plan?

A. 4. A new definition will be included.

Q. 5. Also on the preliminary text is a statement on bikeways/walkways/signage. The text obligates the development to provide and construct these amenities as indicated on a site amenities sheet dated July 21, 1978.

A. A statement is needed to reaffirm these intentions as to the final plan just submitted.

B. The Overall Site Amenities Sheet is now partially obsolete due to the boulevard realignment. A statement is needed to at least commit the rest of the development to comparable site amenities.

A. 5. The obligation still exists and the plan will be amended to include comparable site amenities.

(Question and Answer Section continued - Indian Run Meadow)

Q. 6. The Village will take control of the reserve areas when the entire 15.59 acres is dedicated, unless the developer maintains the whole thing.

A. 6. The developer will build, control and maintain the reserves with bikeways until the parks are dedicated.

Q. 7. When the Commission approves the final development plan, it is giving implicit approval to the boulevard realignment and the twin single relocation. Staff recommends these changes only on the condition that the preliminary plan for the whole Indian Run Meadow be re-filed. This plan should be refiled as soon as possible to avoid confusion or misrepresentation to the households that will now be buying homes in the subdivision.

A. 7. The preliminary plan will be amended within 60 days.

Q. 8. Is there to be any unit mix? How will the two builders be distributed on the site and will there be a mix of exterior designs?

A. 8. The developer maintains a quality control sheet that distributes the builders and mixes the exterior designs as well as adjusts the setbacks. Staff has a copy of the sheet if the Commission is interested.

Q. 9. No provision for a neutral or resident party on the Architectural Review Committee.

A. 9. The developer offered your Village Planner the position.

Q. 10. Building lines, Box Setback on Cul-de-sac - How can staff monitor this?

A. 10. Drawings will be supplied to the Building Department for easy monitoring.

Q. 11. Street trees: Landscape code requires developers to plant the trees. A 2" hardy maple planted at the lot corners will meet the requirements.

A. 11. The developer will identify street tree varieties and locations. There will be an agreement that obligates the developer to plant trees on unbuilt lots after a specified period. (1 or 2 years)

(Question and Answer Section continued - Indian Run Meadow)

Q. 12. Spell out sizes and types of the trees to be planted in the typical section of the boulevard.

A. 12. The typical landscape section will be supplied.

Q. 13. The 5.2 acre school/park site does not meet the 10 acre requirement of the Dublin School District. Either the school should have the opportunity to buy additional acreage or the site should be designated as park only.

A. 13. It was agreed the acreage would remain a park at either the present or better suited location.

Q. 14. Will the Association maintain cul-de-sac islands?

A. 14. Yes.

Q. 15. Muirfield Drive Boulevard commitment. It could be made when the preliminary is refiled. Staff's recommendation is to construct the boulevard when either the second intersection is constructed or depending on the type of unit proposed, when the multi-family project is constructed.

A. 15. Agreed. To be spelled out on the amended preliminary.