



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 13, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. PUD – Oak Park Subarea D - Townhomes
17-028Z/PDP/FDP/PP/FP**

**Oak Meadow Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Proposal: A rezoning of 2.94-acres from PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for Townhomes) to PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for single-family lots) to convert four, three-story townhome buildings with 36 units to 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements. The site is on the west side of Hyland Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. This is also a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Christopher T. Cline, Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION#1: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded to approve this Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan, because it meets the future land use, thoroughfare plan, and special area plan as outlined in the Community Plan along with the preliminary development plan review criteria, with one condition.

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require Lots 118 and 119 to use the same architectural model mirrored across Oak Park Boulevard, prior to City Council review.
- 2) ***That by May 1, 2018, the applicant have the dirt pile located on Reserve F hauled away and Reserve F graded and seeded. *As approved by City Council on September 11, 2017.***

*Chris Cline agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: This Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

MOTION #2: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded to approve this Final Development Plan, because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing development standards, with four conditions.





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 13, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

- 1. PUD – Oak Park Subarea D - Townhomes** **Oak Meadow Drive**
17-028Z/PDP/FDP/PP/FP **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**
Final Development Plan
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

- 1) That the existing non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 2) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversifying the landscape materials, subject to staff approval, prior to City Council review; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to outline installation requirements for the fence details, prior to building permitting.

*Chris Cline agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: This Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

MOTION#3: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded to approve this Preliminary Plat/Final Plat, because it complies with applicable review criteria and the requirements outlined in the Subdivision Regulations, with two conditions.

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant add a note to the Final Plat outlining ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the two reserves, prior to City Council submittal.

*Chris Cline agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: This Preliminary Plat/Final Plat will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



 Logan Stang
 Planner I



~~The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated the following cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening: TownPlace Suites by Marriott; Bridge Park, Block H; McKittrick, Subarea 1A; and Downtown Parking Garage Plat. She said there would be a slight deviation from the normal procedures this evening to hear the cases in the following order: 4, 5, followed by any cases left on the Consent Agenda and lastly would be Oak Park. She stated that she and Amy Salay have a conflict of interest with the McKittrick case so they will recuse themselves for that portion of the meeting. She said Deborah Mitchell has a family emergency and can only attend the McKittrick case. She said the cases will be recorded in the order they were presented on the Agenda.~~

**1. PUD – Oak Park Subarea D - Townhomes
17-028Z/PDP/FDP/PP/FP**

**Oak Meadow Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a Rezoning of 2.94 acres to permit 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements where previously three-story townhomes were permitted. She said the site is on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there is also a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She noted anyone intending on addressing the Commission for the Final Development Plan portion of this application will need to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission with regard to this case.

Logan Stang reported this case was reviewed and tabled at the June 8th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. During that meeting, he said, the Commission expressed concern regarding the main entrance for the community with the loss of the open space reserves along with the fence appearance and landscape details for the private alleys. He reported the applicant has since revised the proposal addressing both the comments as well as meeting a number of conditions from the previous report.

Mr. Stang presented the Planned Unit Development Process Overview and noted this application consists of all formal stages of a PUD review including the rezoning that establishes the development standards through the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and said the proposal is for the conversion of six townhome buildings to 20 single-family lots within the existing Oak Park subdivision. He presented the proposed site plan and indicated the proposal is fairly consistent with what was previously reviewed comprising of 20 single-family lots using rear-loaded garages on the current private alley system. The applicant has addressed previous conditions, he reported, requiring a 9-foot, front yard setback as opposed to 6 feet that was previously proposed as well as additional landscaping for all fences abutting the alleys.

Mr. Stang said the biggest change is at the intersection of Oak Park Boulevard and Oak Meadow Drive and pointed that out on the slide. He explained the applicant has reduced the four lots on the north and south sides of Oak Park Boulevard to 55 feet in width in order to provide two smaller reserves at that intersection. He said the reserves allow for additional open space with a landscape treatment that creates an entry feature and accents the community center. The reserves still result in a loss of private open space but well exceeds the required open space for the community as a whole. He reported the applicant

has also determined that both Lot 118 & 119, located at the intersection, will use the same architectural model to further enhance the entrance to the community and this requirement will be added to the development text prior to City Council's review.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering of the proposed Reserve Landscape Plan that showed a mixture of plant materials to provide openness and symmetry outside the community center. He said the proposal includes four benches and a landscape hedge with masonry columns to define the private realm from the public realm. He indicated that Staff is requesting that the applicant use a more complimentary bench to what exists near the community center and that the landscape details be refined prior to City Council review.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering of the reserve landscaping to show the perspective from the end of the private drives as one enters the neighborhood approaching the community center in the center. This provides a conceptual idea, he said, of the proposed plantings with the mirrored architectural model.

Mr. Stang said the other main concern was the inconsistent fence design and treatment along the private alleys. He presented the applicant's revised proposal of the fence details that allow only the lattice-style fence at a height of six feet in the locations noted. For the properties with additional frontage on public streets, he explained, a four-foot solid fence is permitted that is also noted on the slide, which only pertains to a couple of lots in this development.

Mr. Stang added, this, in addition to the landscaping requirements, will provide a cohesive treatment for the rear of these lots while providing a screening and safety measure for when the commercial properties develop. He indicated that Staff is requiring that Lots 109 & 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas to the west to prevent backyard space from having visibility from Hyland-Croy Road.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering showing the appearance of the homes from the entrance at Hyland-Croy Road. He noted the rendering showed the vacant commercial property and the proposed fence details with landscaping beside the private drives.

In addition, the Plat has also been updated he said that shows the dedication of reserves to the HOA for ownership and maintenance.

Mr. Stang concluded there would be three motions required by the Commission this evening. He said approval is recommended for the Rezoning with the Preliminary Development Plan with one condition to be forwarded to City Council:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require Lots 118 and 119 to use the same architectural model mirrored across Oak Park Boulevard, prior to City Council Review.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That Lots 109 and 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas toward the western property line, subject to verification at building permitting;
- 2) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 3) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the Plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant add a note to the Final Plat outlining ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the two reserves, prior to City Council submittal.

Chris Cline, attorney with Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis Law Firm in Worthington, representing the applicant, said Linda Menerey, EMH&T, was also present to answer questions. He asked that the aerial view be shown again to show the context of the site to the surrounding areas and he noted the measured distances to provide the Commission with a better perspective on what would actually be visible. He remarked on the amount of work involved in changing the six-foot setback to the nine-foot, front yard setback. He said they previously proposed the six-foot setback because it was written in the development text but somewhere along the line, that was changed to zero. He emphasized those townhomes have a zero setback now so they are actually going from zero to nine instead of six to nine feet.

Mr. Cline clarified that fences are now required; this is not an option for the buyers.

Linda Menerey added that the four-foot fence is really the bottom half of the six-foot fence as it does not include the lattice portion on top.

Mr. Brown asked if the four-foot fence is being required, to which Mr. Cline answered affirmatively. He said the four-foot and six-foot fences will all be consistent and the color white was originally considered but finally decided on light beige.

Mr. Cline said he thought they resolved the issue of the condition in the Final Development Plan, to which Mr. Stang agreed.

With regard to outdoor living spaces, Mr. Cline noted the chamfered corner, which moves the house towards that eastern building line where there is no setback because there is a significant reserve.

Ms. Menerey explained how they revised the landscape plans and the green space.

Mr. Cline indicated they plan to have one or two spec homes built for potential buyers to see at the initial entry and they would incorporate landscaping as well.

Mr. Brown asked for Staff's perspective on Lots 109 and 128. He indicated that if the open side of those homes is not put towards the street then one is looking at a bigger, blanker wall upon entering the community. Mr. Stang said that was true and indicated Staff thought the six-foot fence would be required but part of Staff's concern was the clarity of whether the four-foot fence was optional or if it was a requirement. He said the concern was outdoor items that might be stored in the area that directly faces Hyland-Croy Road, which has high visibility for a heavily traveled thoroughfare and Staff thought that would be a detriment from the aesthetic perspective. With the additional landscaping, he concluded that Staff would be comfortable with what is proposed as the landscape will soften that viewpoint.

Steve Stidhem indicated he thought swing sets might be what staff is referring to when talking about outdoor items. He said he did not share this concern with staff but figured that was the intent of the condition.

The Chair called for public comment.

Prasad Vempati, 7031 Greenland Place, thanked the applicant for their effort based on the number of conditions the Commission raised last time. Walking on those same streets every day, he said, the unevenness that the proposal creates, concerns his family. He explained that on one side of the street, there is a seven-foot tree lawn space from the curb to the walkway and on the other side the tree lawn space is four feet from the curb to the walkway. He said this prompts an uneven visual aspect on the same street. He added on one side of the street there is a 14-18-foot setback and on the other side there is a 9-foot setback. As he imagines himself every day, living in that place, walking through the streets, he said those conditions create a very uneven view. He concluded he is concerned about resale value. He said this is a unique situation but does not want to see a situation where the City is trying to put a square peg into a round hole.

Since there was no one else from the public that wanted to speak about this case, the Chair closed the public portion.

Cathy De Rosa requested clarification on the comments just heard from the resident about the sidewalk and tree lawns. Mr. Cline responded he had a hard time understanding what that issue is. He stated none of the public streets in the subdivision are being changed; the only things they are changing are the setbacks from those public streets. Right now, he restated, the setbacks are zero feet and they are proposing to change the setbacks to nine feet. Ms. De Rosa asked if the setbacks are consistent. Mr. Cline emphasized that everything they are doing in Subarea D is the same at nine feet. He explained the setback in the rest of Oak Park is a minimum of 13 feet or maximum of ± 21 feet. He added there is a four-foot difference between their development standard of nine feet and a minimum setback of 13 feet for the Village and Park homes in Oak Park. He said some of the homes had to be set back further based on conflicts with the current infrastructure, which could impact the perspective.

Mr. Stang explained the reason for different tree lawn spaces is they are associated with on-street parking and this is one of those existing conditions the applicant has to work with.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the deterioration of fences over time and then fixed, replaced, or repainted as part of maintenance. He asked if there is an active HOA in this area and if they would enforce any reconstruction and repainting. Mr. Cline said there will be a very strong and active HOA, it just has not been turned over yet. He indicated the HOA would be the appropriate body responsible for maintaining the fence.

Mr. Stidhem clarified he was more concerned with the enforcement of paint color and style. Mr. Cline said that would be part of the Final Development Plan. Mr. Stang added the fence appearance would be a Code Enforcement issue as well.

Victoria Newell thanked the applicant for addressing the Commission's comments from the last meeting as well as the public's. She said that what the applicant presented for open space this evening is very nice. She said she is very comfortable with the position of units for Lots 109 and 128, especially with the additional amenities such as the fence and landscaping. She recommended removing that condition from the final development plan.

Ms. De Rosa wanted the fencing requirement to be clearer. Mr. Stang indicated there is a provision in the text that addresses that issue but staff will review it with the applicant.

Ms. De Rosa said it makes sense to not use a bright white color for the fencing; a creamy white will make a real difference. She emphasized the exact color name and number should be included in the text. Mr. Cline said a better place to put that information is in the Final Development Plan and will ensure that information is included. The Chair asked Staff if that was acceptable. Mr. Stang said Staff can work with the applicant to ensure those details are provided.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require Lots 118 and 119 to use the same architectural model mirrored across Oak Park Boulevard, prior to City Council Review.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)

The Chair requested to see again the four conditions of approval for the Final Development Plan:

- 1) That Lots 109 and 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas toward the western property line, subject to verification at building permitting;
- 2) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 3) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review.

Based on the discussion, Mr. Stang suggested that condition #1 be removed and a new condition be added as follows:

- 1) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 2) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to outline installation requirements for the fence details, prior to building permitting.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with the amended four conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant add a note to the Final Plat outlining ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the two reserves, prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 8, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

2. **Oak Park, Subarea D** **Oak Meadow Drive**
17-028Z/PDP/PP/FDP/FP **Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Final Development Plan
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

Proposal: Rezoning 2.94-acres from PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for Townhomes) to PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for single-family lots) to convert four, three-story townhome buildings with 36 units to 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements. The site is located on the west side of Hyland Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a preliminary and final plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. This is also a request for review and approval of a final development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Christopher T. Cline, Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to table this application at the request of the applicant.


VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: This Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Absent
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Logan Stang
Planner I



**2. Oak Park, Subarea D
17-028Z/PDP/PP/FDP/FP**

**Oak Meadow Drive
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for Rezoning 2.94-acres from PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for Townhomes) to PUD (Oak Park, Subarea D for single-family lots) to convert six, three-story townhome buildings with 36 units to 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements. She said the site is on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She said this is also a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission in regard to this case.

Logan Stang presented the PUD process consisting of three steps. He indicated this application is unique as it encompasses the two formal steps of establishing a PUD, which are the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan that establishes the development standards and the Final Development Plan with the Final Plat that verifies conformance with the development standards. He said once this application receives final approval, the applicant will be able to record the plat and begin filing for building permits as this covers all of the public review.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted the application for Rezoning pertains to the townhome section of the Oak Park PUD or Subarea D of the development. He said the proposal is to rezone the site to allow for 20 single-family residential lots where 36 townhome units in six buildings was permitted.

Mr. Stang presented the Community Plan – Future Land Use Plan. He explained that the Community Plan has two future land use recommendations that this site overlaps. The first is for Mixed Residential – Low Density, he said, which is intended to provide a mix of housing options at a typical density of 3 units per acre. He noted the second is for the Mixed-Use Neighborhood Center providing retail uses and personal services in a commercial center integrated into a residential neighborhood. He stated the proposal meets the Mixed Residential Land Use by providing smaller single-family lots than what the existing residential development has and will help support the commercial that is intended to be developed within Subarea E, the two larger vacant properties of the Oak Park development.

Mr. Stang pointed out that the site is located within a Special Area Plan for the Northwest/Glacier Ridge area. He said as the Oak Park development was approved, just prior to the Community Plan update in 2007, many of the recommendations of the Community Plan had been met with this development such as the larger setbacks along Hyland-Croy Road and the connections to Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He presented the conceptual layout that is identical to what Oak Park is today, including the townhomes and commercial elements. Additionally, he said any right-of-way dedication and infrastructure improvements were made with the original development and due to the decrease in overall density, no additional improvements will be required as the existing street network is capable of handling the demand.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic of the Development Standards. He said these were proposed for Subarea D that are substantially similar to the standards used for the existing residential homes. Due to the smaller lot depth, he explained the front and rear yard setbacks have been modified to allow for similar style homes. He said the clustering of homes created more dense pockets throughout the development to allow for a greater amount of open space with these standards continuing the character that has been

produced. Additional standards include the continued hedge treatment along the public roads, architectural requirements, and fence regulations he said.

Mr. Stang reported that Staff is requesting that the front yard setback be increased from six feet to nine feet to allow for additional open space in the front. He said that a landscape treatment should also be provided for any fence located along the rear of the properties to soften the view from Hyland-Croy Road and Oak Park Boulevard until the commercial properties develop.

Mr. Stang said the original development applied the Conservation Design Principles, which sought to achieve 50% open space based on the entire acreage being rezoned. He reported that Oak Park was approved with approximately 51% of open space with the majority being dedicated for public use.

Mr. Stang said the proposed rezoning includes the removal of two private reserves located in front of the club house, which amounts to a loss of roughly a quarter of an acre. Although this open space is not being replaced, he explained the connectivity to existing open spaces and achievement of 50% gross open space is more than adequate for the community at large.

Mr. Stang presented a graphic of the Final Development Plan and restated it is for the re-subdivision of 36 townhome properties and two reserves to 20 single-family lots. He noted the lots will use the existing infrastructure to have frontage on one of three public streets with rear access along the private drives. He said the sites have access to existing utilities and were cleared of any vegetation during the original site work. He pointed out that the commercial properties are not included with this application and will still permit commercial uses under the original zoning approval.

Mr. Stang said the applicant has provided examples of six architectural models for Subarea D, which he presented. He indicated that most planned districts do not provide architectural examples for review; however, the proposed development text requires that the Commission approve elevations with the Final Development Plan. In the future, he explained that Planning Staff can approve additional models or elevations using the standards outlined in the development text to allow for more architectural diversity. He pointed out the two models on the right, the Ashbourne and Castletroy, were approved for the existing residential areas while the remaining four are new models. He said all of the models continue the architectural theme of the community using various materials such as brick, stucco, and shake siding and architectural elements such as towers and cupolas. A diversity matrix has also been provided he reported to ensure that no adjacent homes that are next to, or across from one another, will use the same model or elevation.

Mr. Stang presented the Landscape Details that the applicant has included in a landscape plan containing a continued streetscape with additional lot requirements being determined and reviewed with the building permit. He said the text also allows for a six-foot privacy fence installed along the rear of the homes with one of three designs that were approved for the existing single-family sections; a side yard abutting a public street is allowed a four foot fence of a consistent design.

Staff is conditioning that a provision be added to the development text, he said, requiring a fence treatment along the private drives to help soften the appearance, which would be reviewed with the fence installation, depending on whether a property owner chooses to install the fence.

Mr. Stang said the final component of this application is a Preliminary and Final Plat required for the re-subdivision to the single-family lots. He presented a graphic and noted the plat identifies or establishes necessary easements for the development of the lots and does not include any right-of-way or open space dedication.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require a minimum front yard setback of nine feet from the public right-of-way, prior to City Council review; and
- 2) That the applicant revise the development text to require continuous landscaping along all fences constructed next to an alley or private drive, prior to City Council review and subject to staff approval.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the existing curb ramps be replaced with curb ramps meeting standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the proposed sidewalk connections at the intersections be built with the site;
- 3) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 4) That the proposed landscaping be removed from within the intersection sight distance triangles in accordance with Policy 08-013 at the time of building permitting, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
- 5) That the applicant revise the landscape plan to provide a diverse selection of street trees at the time of building permitting, subject to staff approval.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the Preliminary Plat be revised to contain the information required by Section 152.018 of the Subdivision Regulations, prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Steve Stidhem asked for clarification on fencing along the rear of the properties. Mr. Stang explained it is a privacy fence to help screen from the commercial area if the homeowner would like to install the six-foot tall fence. He said it is not required and they can run it from their house to their side property line.

Cathy De Rosa said when this was reviewed before, the Commission was given three options (A, B, or C). She asked if this is option 'B' to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively and clarified it is the one option that did not include the commercial properties at all.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the lot coverage comparisons. Mr. Stang said the existing homes were designed in a cluster to allow for more open space so they have a maximum lot coverage of 60%. He said the reason this is increased to 70% is because there is a loss of about 20 feet from the depth of each of the properties due the existing conditions. He indicated that other areas in the City have been approved for up to 70% for lot coverage for smaller lots.

Chris Brown asked if there would still be parking on the street in front of the homes. Mr. Stang confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Miller inquired about the setback from 6 feet to 9 feet. He asked how a nine-foot setback compares to other patio homes in the City. Mr. Stang indicated it is larger because typically, there is a very small front setback so six feet is average for some of those that come to mind. He said there are some developments that have larger or deeper lots so they can implore a larger front yard setback. He referred to a section of Tartan West as being an area comparable to this proposal in terms of lot size.

Mr. Miller asked what the rationale was for going from six to nine feet. Mr. Stang answered it was the result of working with the applicant and meeting their configurations.

Victoria Newell asked about the clipped corners for Lots 119 and 118 as there is no setback at Oak Park Boulevard. She noted there are several lots that are that way and asked if staff was supportive of that. Mr. Stang said staff was supportive given the nature of the lots themselves.

Ms. Newell asked if the heights of four and six feet for fencing was part of the original text. Mr. Stang answered the original submission did not state that was permitted. He reported that staff had encouraged the applicant to have fences at four feet in height to be consistent with the rest of the City.

Ms. Newell noted that when the Zoning Code limits fence heights to four feet and asked how staff can support six-foot fences. Mr. Stang indicated it was due to the commercial components and they are viewing it as if the commercial area gets developed.

Claudia Husak said the Commission has approved that fence height for other small lot developments such as at the Villas of Ballantrae and Greystone Mews).

Chris Cline, Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis, Worthington, OH, said he is representing the applicant, Oak Park Dublin LLC. He pointed out a lot of his team was present to answer any questions. He indicated that he learned the day before that the intent is for the commercial component to be developed. He stated the applicant has agreed to all of the conditions presented this evening. He reported the applicant has met with the residents twice since the informal review with the PZC.

Mr. Cline said they have not asked the Commission to cut them a break on materials or architecture with this plan so they are going forward with the same quality development as is already in place. He indicated these homes will need to appeal to a demanding and educated clientele. He anticipates the prices will be \$375,000 - \$450,000. He said the lot depth of 104 feet makes it difficult to deliver a successful single-family residential design with an attached garage in the rear and there is a connector between the house and the garage. He suggested that the variety of floor plans that could appeal to multiple demographics be used. He said the architectural models they have proposed tonight are ready for approval versus the placeholder conceptual homes they presented before. He said they do not have a lot of experience with rear access products in Central Ohio and selling the alleys for high quality homes could be a challenge including the lack of safety factors in the back.

Mr. Cline presented a graphic showing the conceptual plan superimposed onto the existing conditions plan and pointed out that all the other homes in Oak Park have a secure back yard and none of these homes will have that protection. He said the privacy fences along the commercial lot are essential as anything could go into the commercial property.

Mr. Cline said even though the fences are not required and could be a choice for the occupant, the applicant is making it mandatory that all the fences are installed as each house is built for consistency. He said the only caveat he would have to commit to that is a condition or safety net whereas if the commercial boundary were to develop residentially before they completed development of this site, they might want to revisit that as to whether or not they still need the six-foot privacy fence if there was a similar land use on the other side of this property. He said any condition the Commission would like to impose on that point, he would appreciate being left a back door where staff could approve the removal of that fence, if the applicant determines it is not necessary.

He said they are going from 36 units down to 20 so they are challenged economically but believe they brought a good plan to the City. He indicated they are trying to fix a problem that others created.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, presented a diagram that was in the packet. She said she wanted to touch on just a few points and restated that on-street parking currently exists. She said it is possible to adjust some of the lots to accommodate nine-foot setbacks. She pointed out where the chamfer is and the sidewalk is actually inside of the lot on an easement when it is adjacent to this public street so they have smaller tree lawns and shrubs. She restated they went to the 70% lot coverage because these are smaller lots and they do not know yet the designs of the patios or how much room they will take up from the yard so they allowed themselves flexibility. From a stormwater perspective, she said they ran the calculations as if they were doing the full 70% lot coverage. She provided a graphic with the private alley on the rear and pointed out the area where the six-foot fences would be installed. She said the homeowner would have the option to put a four-foot fence up for all four sides but then a two-foot lattice would be added as a nice detail and to have heights consistent.

Mr. Miller inquired about lawn maintenance. Mr. Cline said the deed restrictions state that the maintenance will be provided by the HOA but if the HOA decided to do that the homeowners would have to pay more money; he indicated that is a detail they need to sort out.

Brett Cantrell, project manager for Oak Park, said each individual homeowner takes care of their own lot; the builder takes care of some of the common areas and some of it is split with the HOA. Mr. Cline said that as they move forward they will need to fix that discrepancy by working with the residents.

Mr. Stidhem asked about the inconsistency on the fence. Mr. Cline said the builder is going to require that the six-foot fence be a mandatory option.

Ms. De Rosa asked what the distance is from the garage door down the driveway or the back to the alley. Mr. Stang answered the distance would partially depend on the model chosen. He said there is a 10-foot easement between the property line and the garage but the models stagger a little bit. Mr. Stang confirmed there would be landscaping behind the fence portion within the 10-foot easement.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about landscaping buffers for the commercial side of that property. Mr. Stang answered there would be additional screening requirements for vehicular use areas for the parking lots themselves. He anticipates the resident seeing a landscape island that would run along the other edge of the private drives but there will be access points to the private drives but there will be additional landscaping required like a single row to help shield the parking lot from the rear of these homes. Ms. De Rosa asked what the height would be. Ms. Menerey said there would be a three-foot continuous hedge fence with trees one per 40 feet. She added there would be a layering effect to the plant material.

Ms. Newell suggested she would like to see the two fence heights treated aesthetically better.

The Chair invited public comment.

Melvis Houseman, 7134 Snow Drop Court, said she is one of the residents in the community. Prasad Vempati, 7031 Greenland Place, said he is also a resident of the community. Ms. Houseman said they were here speaking on behalf of many of the homeowners in the community. She said they prepared a PowerPoint presentation to express their concerns. She said the three primary concerns are how crowded the areas are with big homes on smaller lots along with the shorter setbacks, designated open space that has been removed, and the fence because it will be in view as one enters the community and since the commercial property development timeline has not been established, they would like the fence not to be installed until the commercial property is developed.

Mr. Vempati said because the look and feel of the community is starting to change.

Ms. Houseman said because the sides of these homes will be placed so close to the sidewalk, there will not be any privacy for those homeowners and with the smaller setbacks there, there will also be less

green space. She suggested one of the homes be eliminated. Mr. Vempati said there is no space for a tree on some of these lots in the back of the house.

Ms. Houseman said fences require maintenance and do not look good over time and that is why a lot of communities do not permit fences. Mr. Vempati said additionally there is hardly any space for a lawn mower to maneuver between the homes due to the small side setback.

The Chair invited additional public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. De Rosa said she wanted to address the architecture.

The Chair requested the review criteria be posted again and pointed out that the Final Development Plan is in conformance with the Preliminary Development Plan as well as the final details for the site itself.

Mr. Brown asked if there was green space in the original development where currently Lots 118 and 119 are being shown. Mr. Stang answered yes, which was located in reserve B & C for the townhomes.

Mr. Brown said this case is so difficult because looking at the original developers' intent, two separate ownership groups, and current residents that have invested in the community. He indicated the intent of the developer is to try and make it right somehow in a way that is economically feasible. He said he also has to consider the people that will live there in perpetuity. He said he does not have a problem with the density. He indicated he has to consider the long term picture and is assuming the commercial area will be developed nicely. He said he has a problem with the reserves being taken up with these two lots. He questioned whether it is logistically possible to hold off building the fences until the commercial component is developed.

Mr. Stidhem said he is fine with the proposed density. He suggested that fencing consistency should be written into the deed restrictions. He said he agreed with Mr. Brown about the two lots taking up green space. He said he likes the architecture and the houses closer to the street, and the garages in the rear are going to be interesting.

Ms. De Rosa said the Commission loved the way the townhouses were going to look in the original plan and had expressed that one of the most important things was that the feel and character continue. Referring to the four elevations out of six, she said they are flat and feel tighter in that very condensed space. Mr. Cline said he is not the architect but when the new designs were put together, they pulled the garages off the front placing them in the back and they took elements from approved models. He mentioned that staff has not been critical of the architecture so they took that to mean they hit the target in terms of having the right kind of look.

Ms. De Rosa said she is not critical of the elements, she asked that the look and feel of the current community be considered for consistency. Mr. Cline stated he did not think the houses in this development will be distinguishable from anything in Oak Park.

Ms. Menerey added there are three models with porches, which provides relief along the frontage. She restated that there will be the requirement of architectural diversity. In terms of the front setbacks, she said they are set; the existing parking is in, the sidewalk has to be where it is, the right-of-way is there and established, and the three foot difference was determined to be the maximum give. She said, side-to-side, these units are probably less crowded due to the footprint they have.

Ms. De Rosa agreed with her fellow Commissioners about having the green space at the entrance because that will create a feel of openness, even if it is relatively small.

Ms. De Rosa said the struggle with the fences in the back is going to be inconsistency.

Bob Miller said he is very empathetic with the residents. He said this is a tough situation given the owner of the commercial property is not being as cooperative as we would like. He said he believes the applicant has done an outstanding job with this difficult situation. After reviewing all the criteria the Commission uses to apply to a case, he said that applicant has checked just about all of the boxes: the density has been brought down; the green space has been met as Mr. Stang has pointed out several times; and the setback has been increased in deference to improving the look of the community. He said the only thing he struggles with is the view from Hyland-Croy Road until there is commercial development. He suggested the fences be installed later, which could appease the residents but he does not know how to accomplish that. For the most part, he said the applicant has his full support. He concluded he would eliminate the four-foot fence on Oak Park Boulevard to which Mr. Brown and Mr. Stidhem previously agreed. He suggested that if the fence was made of stone, it might look better.

Ms. Newell said the density is about half of what could be permitted on the property and that alone makes this a very viable application. She said she struggled with the criteria for adequate open space. She said she found that everything appeared to be an improvement with this application as to what could be on this property until she got to the elimination of that green space. In terms of the fencing, there are other options that could be explored because we cannot control when the commercial gets developed and we cannot even be certain it will ultimately be commercial development but we have to look at the way it is zoned today.

Mr. Brown said he is questioning how to solve this problem temporarily and make those two commercial lots look bigger and the solution is street trees on Oak Tree Drive North and Oak Park Boulevard along those undeveloped lots. He said it would make the whole entrance more pleasing and tempers the backyards of all of these villas. He stated the depth to the street does not bother him and he referred to neighborhoods in New Albany, Ohio. He indicated those neighborhoods are stunning and beautiful and provide a sense of community.

For clarification, Mr. Stang asked if Mr. Brown is proposing that 2-inch caliper street trees be planted on the opposite side of the alley on the commercial lots. Mr. Brown answered on the commercial property on Oak Tree Drive North and Oak Park Boulevard to soften the whole area which gives an actual boulevard; it would help screen the back of all these developments as those grow just because it changes the focus. He added the trees can be removed once the commercial property starts its development. He concluded it would help the entry to the whole community.

Mr. Cline said the main entrance is a public street so there may be right-of-way we can work with there; the street to the east is owned in fee by the commercial property owner. Mr. Brown said he understood that but thought maybe there was a way to work with them. Mr. Cline said doing something with the City is feasible; he does not think it is feasible to work with the commercial developer.

Mr. Stang said Oak Tree Drive is not part of this application and we cannot require that the property owner do anything with that property as it is all private and they have full ownership and we cannot hold this applicant to do something on property they do not own.

Mr. Brown said he is tired of that commercial land being in purgatory and he is looking for a solution.

Claudia Husak said with all the outstanding issues, this application is not ready to move forward.

Mr. Cline requested that the application be tabled.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Newell seconded, to table this application at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)

3. PUD – Llewellyn Farms – Parking 17-043AFDP

4930 Bradenton Avenue Amended Final Development Plan

~~The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a request for an Amended Final Development Plan to reduce the total number of parking spaces required for a medical office. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of Frantz Road and Bradenton Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Text Modification and an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.~~

~~The Chair swore anyone intending to address the Commission with regard to this case.~~

~~Nichole Martin presented an aerial view of the site. She indicated this PUD is one of the older developments in the City and does not have a development text to accompany it; therefore, the standards for the site refer to the most similar zoning district and in this case it is the Suburban Office and Institutional District. She said the site was developed under those standards being parked for general office. She said the 20,000-foot building that exists on the site requires 80 spaces. She said the applicant is requesting parking for a medical office that would require 90 spaces on this lot. Additionally, she said the proposal is to maintain 79 spaces and staff has determined there is adequate space to provide the 80th parking space.~~

~~Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for a Minor Text Modification that allows the building to reside on the site in the current condition parked at an office rate of one space per 250 square feet of floor area equating to 80 spaces. She said the following is a condition of approval:~~

- ~~1) That the applicant provides one additional parking space to comply with the general office parking requirement.~~

~~Bob Miller said at 20,000 square feet, 10,000 is proposed to go from general office to medical. He asked if staff took into consideration the possibility of the other 10,000 square feet being impacted by all the medical parking. Ms. Martin answered staff was comfortable with that change as this has been seen elsewhere in the City and the medical parking does not utilize the full extent of the parking that is required.~~

~~The Chair invited the applicant to speak.~~

~~Aaron Greene, Hplex Solutions, owner's representative, said he wanted to point out that they have long-term leases with the second floor architectural firm. He said a third of the first floor is housed with mechanical spaces and a large data server and the other half that will be occupied by medical use is for surgery space where the cases run 6 – 8 hours so it is not high turnover like a traditional surgery center.~~

~~The Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this case. [Hearing none.] She called for discussion amongst the Commissioners.~~

~~Chris Brown asked if the applicant was in agreement with the one condition to which he answered affirmatively.~~