




City of Dublin

**Office of the City Manager**

5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090  
Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

# Memo

**To:** Members of Dublin City Council  
**From:** Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager   
**Date:** April 6, 2017  
**Initiated By:** Vincent A. Papsidero, FAICP, Planning Director  
Logan M. Stang, Planner I  
**Re:** Lakeside at Avondale Woods Final Plat (16-034FDP/FP)

## Summary

This is a request for approval of a Final Plat to subdivide 19.349 acres into five reserves on the west side of Avery Road at the terminus of Avondale Woods Boulevard.

## Background

The Planning and Zoning Commission approved a final development plan and recommended approval to City Council for a final plat for Lakeside at Avondale Woods on August 11, 2016. City Council approved Ordinance No. 99-14 on October 13, 2014 for the rezoning of approximately 120 acres from R, Rural District to PUD, Planned Unit Development (Avondale Woods) for the future development of 360 single and multi-family housing units and 37 acres of open space.

## Description

The Lakeside at Avondale Woods contains a total of five proposed reserves: Reserve A – 7.055 acres, Reserve B – 1.001 acres, Reserve C – 2.149 acres, Reserve D – 7.205 acres, and Reserve E – 1.939 acres. Two of the reserves, Reserve A and Reserve B, will be owned and maintained by the Subarea A homeowners association known as The Lakeside at Avondale Woods. Reserve A will contain a private drive servicing the condominium units with Reserve B being used for open space. Reserve C and Reserve E will be owned and maintained by a master homeowners association for the purposes of an entry feature and future community center. Reserve D will be owned by the master homeowners association and maintained by the City for the purposes of stormwater management for the entire development, including National Church Residences at Avondale Woods to the south.

## Recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission

### *Minor Text Modification*

The Commission reviewed and approved six minor text modifications to the development text at the August 11, 2016 meeting. The modifications were to address changes from the preliminary development plan regarding reserve ownership and revise development regulations for Subarea A of the development. No further action is required by City Council.

*Final Development Plan*

The Commission reviewed and approved a final development plan at the August 11, 2016 meeting with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to determine an appropriate light fixture that matches the style of the condominium buildings;
- 2) That the applicant replace the post mounted sign at the southern entrance of The Lakeside at Avondale Woods with the pier mounted sign; and,
- 3) That the high density urethane signs be replaced with etched natural stone, subject to staff approval.

No further action is required by City Council.

*Final Plat*


The Commission reviewed and recommended approval to City Council of the final plat at the August 11, 2016 meeting with three conditions:

- 1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to submitting for City Council;
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and,
- 3) That the appropriate method for documenting the private drive for The Lakeside at Avondale Woods be determined prior to City Council submittal, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

The applicant has met and addressed all three conditions prior to the submittal for City Council review.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the Final Plat for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods at the April 10, 2017 City Council meeting.




0      300      600

Feet







16-034FDP/FP  
Final Development Plan/Final Plat  
Lakeside at Avondale Woods  
Avery Road

0 300 600  
Feet







CITY OF DUBLIN

Land Use and  
Long Range Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

# PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION APPLICATION

(Code Section 153.232)

## I. PLEASE CHECK THE TYPE OF APPLICATION:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Informal Review  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final Plat<br>(Section 152.085)                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concept Plan<br>(Section 153.056(A)(1))                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Conditional Use<br>(Section 153.236)                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Development Plan / Rezoning<br>(Section 153.053) | <input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Development District (CDD)<br>(Section 153.115)      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final Development Plan<br>(Section 153.053(E))    | <input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Development District (CDD) Sign<br>(Section 153.115) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amended Final Development Plan<br>(Section 153.053(E))       | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Subdivision   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Standard District Rezoning<br>(Section 153.018)              | <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-Way Encroachment                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Plat<br>(Section 152.015)                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Specify): _____                                 |

Please utilize the applicable *Supplemental Application Requirements* sheet for additional submittal requirements that will need to accompany this application form.

## II. PROPERTY INFORMATION: This section must be completed.

Property Address(es): Avery Road	
Tax ID/Parcel Number(s): 274-000137	Parcel Size(s) (Acres): 120.253 acres
Existing Land Use/Development: Agriculture, Woods, and Undeveloped	

### IF APPLICABLE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

Proposed Land Use/Development: Residential Development, Parks and Open Space
Total acres affected by application: +/- 34 acres (Subarea A, portion Subarea C, portion Subarea E for SW Management Area & Entry Feature)

## III. CURRENT PROPERTY OWNER(S): Please attach additional sheets if needed.

Name (Individual or Organization): Homewood Corporation LLC, c/o Jim Lipnos, President	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 2700 Dublin Granville Road Columbus, Ohio 43231	
Daytime Telephone: (614) 898-7200	Fax: (614) 898-7210
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jlipnos@homewoodcorp.com	

**IV. APPLICANT(S):** This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Jim Lipnos		Applicant is also property owner: yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.): Homewood Corporation, LLC		
Mailing Address: 2700 Dublin Granville Road, Columbus, Ohio 43231 (Street, City, State, Zip Code)		
Daytime Telephone: (614) 898-7200	Fax: (614) 898-7210	
Email or Alternate Contact Information: jlipnos@homewoodcorp.com		

**V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER:** This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Chris Cline	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.): Blaugrund, Herbert and Martin	
Mailing Address: 300 W Wilson Bridge Road, Suite 100, Worthington, Ohio 43085 (Street, City, State, Zip Code)	
Daytime Telephone: (614) 923-3132	Fax: (614) 764-0774
Email or Alternate Contact Information: ctc@bhmlaw.com	

**VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S):** If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I, <u>James L. Lipnos</u> , the owner, hereby authorize <u>Chris Cline</u> to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.	
Signature of Current Property Owner: 	Date: <u>3/31/16</u>


☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document


Subscribed and sworn before me this 31 day of March, 20 16

State of Ohio

County of Franklin


Notary Public





TRACY LYNN FOLTZ  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE OF OHIO  
Comm. Expires  
August 19, 2019

**VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY:** Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I, <u>James L. Lipnos</u> , the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.	
Signature of applicant or authorized representative: 	Date: <u>3/31/16</u>

**VIII. UTILITY DISCLAIMER:** The Owner/Applicant acknowledges the approval of this request for review by the Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission and/or Dublin City Council does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.

I, <u>James L. Lipnos</u> , the owner or authorized representative, acknowledge that approval of this request does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.	
Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: <u>3/31/16</u>

**IX. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT:** This section must be completed and notarized.

I, <u>James L. Lipnos</u> , the owner or authorized representative, have read and understand the contents of this application. The information contained in this application, attached exhibits and other information submitted is complete and in all respects true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief.	
Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: <u>3/31/16</u>

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31 day of March, 20 16

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public



TRACY LYNN FOLTZ  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE OF OHIO  
Comm. Expires  
August 19, 2019

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
Amount Received:	Application No:	P&Z Date(s):	P&Z Action:
Receipt No:	Map Zone:	Date Received:	Received By:
City Council (First Reading):		City Council (Second Reading):	
City Council Action:		Ordinance Number:	
Type of Request:			
N, S, E, W (Circle) Side of:			
N, S, E, W (Circle) Side of Nearest Intersection:			
Distance from Nearest Intersection:			
Existing Zoning District:		Requested Zoning District:	



# AVONDALE WOODS

## Avondale Woods - Property Owners Within 150 Feet

Parcel Number	Owner	Parcel Address	Mailing Address			
			Street	City	State	Zip
010-265644	AVERY ROAD COLUMBUS LLC	0 AVERY RD	1311 AUTUMN HILL DR	COLUMBUS	OH	43235
010-291877	HAYDENS RUN ONE LLC	0 EAGLE RIVER DRIVE	23775 COMMERECE PARK STE 7	BEECHWOOD	OH	44122
272-000488	BALTES-SPRING ELIZABETH R	5239 AVERY RD	3590 STERLING PARK CIR	GROVE CITY	OH	43123
274-001522	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	5215 AVERY RD	880 E 11TH AVE	COLUMBUS	OH	43211
274-001505	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	5215 AVERY RD	880 E 11TH AVE	COLUMBUS	OH	43211
274-001504	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY	5215 AVERY RD	880 E 11TH AVE	COLUMBUS	OH	43211
274-000021	DALLAS ANGELO J TR, DAMICO JOHNG. TR, SCHEEL VALERIE M TR, DAMICO JODELLE M TR	6333 RINGS RD	3297MCKINLEY AVE	COLUMBUS	OH	43204
274-000117	DVORAK JAMES A & KEMME DIANCE D, DVORAK MICHAEL T	0 RINGS RD	2315 EDINGTON RD	COLUMBUS	OH	43221
272-000498	CITY OF COLUMBUS	5067 AVERY RD	90 W BROAD STREET	COLUMBUS	OH	43215
274-000034	FENDER PAUL & CELESTE	6555 RINGS RD	6555 RINGS RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
272-000489	HADJARPOUR SAEED HASJARPOUR MOJGON	5243 AVERY RD	4200 DUBLIN RD	COLUMBUS	OH	43221
272-000484	HELLER GEOFFREY C & DEBORAH J MUNTZ	5223 AVERY RD	5223 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
274-000137	HOMEWOOD CORP	5215 AVERY RD	5215 AVERY ROAD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
272-000486	JORDAN GREGORY A & CHERYL A	5231 AVERY RD	5231 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
010-279301	AVERY BROOKE LLC	5315 AVERY RD	400 S 5TH ST STE 400	COLUMBUS	OH	43215
272-000491	HEINL MARK URBAN II	5251 AVERY RD	5903 BUECHLER BEND	HILIARD	OH	43228
010-286777	HAYDEN FARMS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION INC.	0 GINGREY RD	5550 BLAZER PKWY STE 175	DUBLIN	OH	43016
272-000485	MULLINS NORMAN V III & MARY A	5227 AVERY RD	5227 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
272-000487	MYHER DANIEL E & SUSAN M	5235 AVERY RD	5235 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016

## AVONDALE WOODS

274-000018	PATCH DAVID W JR	6661 RINGS RD	6661 RINGS ROAD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
010-265638	PF FARM LLC	RINGS RD	PO BOX 156	AMLIN	OH	43002
010-265636	PULTE HOMES OF OHIO, LLC	5038 COSGRAY RD	3350 PEACHTREE RD NE, FLOOR 1600	ATLANTA	GA	30326-1057
272-000483	REED MATTHEW D	5219 AVERY RD	5219 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016
272-000490	RICH MATTHEW L RICH LORRAINE A	5247 AVERY RD	5247 AVERY RD	DUBLIN	OH	43016

**119.335 ACRES**

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, located in Virginia Military Survey Numbers 3453 and 3012, being all of the remainder of that 137.274 acre tract conveyed as Parcel Number 1 and all of the remainder of that 2.6 acre tract conveyed as Parcel Number 2 to Homewood Corporation by deed of record in Official Record 23250A17 (all references refer to the records of the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio), being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

BEGINNING at a northeasterly corner of the remainder of said 2.6 acre tract, a northwesterly corner of that plat entitled "Avondale Senior Village Amended" of record in Plat Book 114, Page 41, the westerly right-of-way line of Avery Road of record in Plat Book 114, Page 41;

thence with the perimeter of said "Avondale Senior Village Amended", the following courses and distances:

South 10°44'43" West, a distance of 120.81 feet to a point;

South 55°47'16" West, a distance of 35.38 feet to a point;

North 79°10'10" West, a distance of 313.92 feet to a point of curvature;

with the arc of a curve to the right, having a central angle of 11°25'51", a radius of 456.00 feet, an arc length of 90.98 feet, and a chord that bears North 73°27'15" West, a chord distance of 90.82 feet to a point of reverse curvature;

with the arc of a curve to the left having, a central angle of 24°33'25", a radius of 516.00 feet, an arc length of 221.16 feet, and a chord that bears North 80°01'02" West, a chord distance of 219.47 feet to a point;

South 87°42'16" West, a distance of 333.40 feet to a point; and

South 06°09'16" East, a distance of 1032.59 feet to a point in the southerly line of said 137.274 acre tract;

thence with the perimeter of said 137.274 acre tract, the following courses and distances:

South 83°28'01" West, a distance of 583.81 feet to a point;

North 39°15'59" West, a distance of 1857.05 feet to a point;

North 83°02'04" East, a distance of 492.25 feet to a point;

North 06°22'31" West, a distance of 1549.32 feet to a point;

North 84°15'41" East, a distance of 1947.00 feet to a point; and

South 05°46'37" East, a distance of 2128.26 feet to a point at the northwesterly corner of said 2.6 acre tract;

thence North 87°27'47" East, the northerly line of said 2.6 acre tract, a distance of 173.28 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING and containing 119.335 acres of land, more or less.

EVANS, MECHWART, HAMBLETON & TILTON, INC.



# LAKESIDE AT AVONDALE WOODS

1  
2

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin and in Virginia Military Survey Numbers 3012 and 3453, containing 19,349 acres of land, more or less, said 19,349 acres being part of those tracts of land conveyed to **HOMEWOOD CORPORATION** by deed of record in Official Record 23250A17, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

The undersigned, **HOMEWOOD CORPORATION**, an Ohio corporation, by **JIM LIPNOS**, President, owner of the lands platted herein, duly authorized in the premises, does hereby certify that this plat correctly represents its "**LAKE SIDE AT AVONDALE WOODS**", a subdivision containing areas designated as Reserve "A", Reserve "B" Reserve "C", Reserve "D" and Reserve "E", does hereby accept this plat of same.

The undersigned further agrees that any use or improvements on this land shall be in conformity with all existing valid zoning, platting, health or other lawful rules and regulations, including applicable off-street parking and loading requirements of the City of Dublin, Ohio, for the benefit of itself and all other subsequent owners or assigns taking title from, under or through the undersigned.

Easements are hereby reserved in, over and under areas designated on this plat as "Easement", "Sidewalk Easement" or "Drainage Easement". Each of the aforementioned designated easements permit the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public and quasi public utilities above, beneath, and on the surface of the ground and, where necessary, are for the construction, operation, and maintenance of service connections to all adjacent lots and lands and for storm water drainage. Within those areas designated "Drainage Easement" on this plat, an additional easement is hereby reserved for the purpose of constructing, operating and maintaining major storm water drainage swales and/or other above ground storm water drainage facilities. No above grade structures, dams or other obstructions to the flow of storm water runoff are permitted within Drainage Easement areas as delineated on this plat unless approved by the Dublin City Engineer. Easement areas shown hereon outside of the platted area are within lands owned by the undersigned and easements are hereby reserved therein for the uses and purposes expressed herein. Within those areas designated "Sidewalk Easement" on this plat, an additional easement is hereby reserved for the construction and maintenance of a sidewalk for use by the public.

In Witness Whereof, **JIM LIPNOS**, President of **HOMEWOOD CORPORATION**, has hereunto set his hand this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

Signed and Acknowledged  
In the presence of:

By  
**JIM LIPNOS**, President

STATE OF OHIO  
COUNTY OF FRANKLIN ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared **JIM LIPNOS**, President of **HOMEWOOD CORPORATION**, who acknowledged the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his voluntary act and deed and the voluntary act and deed of said **HOMEWOOD CORPORATION**, for the uses and purposes expressed herein.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

My commission expires \_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public, State of Ohio

Approved this \_\_\_\_ Day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_  
Director of Land Use and Long Range Planning,  
Dublin, Ohio

Approved this \_\_\_\_ Day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_  
City Engineer,  
Dublin, Ohio

Approved this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, by vote of Council of the City of Dublin, Ohio.

In Witness Thereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.  
Clerk of Council,  
Dublin, Ohio

Transferred this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.  
Auditor,  
Franklin County, Ohio


Deputy Auditor,  
Franklin County, Ohio

Filed for record this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ M. Fee \$\_\_\_\_\_  
Recorder,  
Franklin County, Ohio

File No. \_\_\_\_\_

Recorded this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.  
Deputy Recorder,  
Franklin County, Ohio

Plat Book \_\_\_\_\_, Pages \_\_\_\_\_



LOCATION MAP AND BACKGROUND DRAWING  
NOT TO SCALE

## SURVEY DATA:

**BASIS OF BEARINGS:** The bearings shown hereon are based on the Ohio State Plane Coordinate System (South Zone) as per NAD83. Control for bearings was from coordinates of Monuments FCGS 8876 and FCGS 2221, having a bearing of North 83°53'20" East between said monuments, established by the Franklin County Engineering Department, using Global Positioning System procedures and equipment.

**SOURCE OF DATA:** The sources of recorded survey data referenced in the plan and text of this plat are the records of the Recorder' Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

**IRON PINS:** Iron pins, where indicated hereon, unless otherwise noted, are to be set and are iron pipes, thirteen sixteenths inch inside diameter, thirty inches long with a plastic plug placed in the top end bearing the initials EMHT INC.

**PERMANENT MARKERS:** Permanent markers, where indicated hereon, are to be one-inch diameter, thirty-inch long, solid iron pins. Pins are to be set to monument the points indicated, and set with the top end flush with the surface of the ground and then capped with an aluminum cap stamped EMHT INC. Once installed, the top of the cap shall be marked (punched) to record the actual location of the point.

SURVEYED & PLATTED  
BY



We do hereby certify that we have surveyed the above premises, prepared the attached plat, and that said plat is correct. All dimensions are in feet and decimal parts thereof.

- o = Iron Pin (See Survey Data)
- = MAG Nail to be set
- © = Permanent Marker (See Survey Data)

By \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Professional Surveyor No. 7865

# LAKESTIDE AT AVONDALE WOODS

**NOTE "A":** The purpose of this plat is to show certain property, rights of way, and easement boundaries as of the time of platting. At the request of zoning and planning authorities at the time of platting, this plat shows some of the limitations and requirements of the zoning code in effect on the date of filing this plat for reference only. The limitations and requirements may change from time to time and should be reviewed to determine the then current applicable use and development limitations of the zoning code as adopted by the government authority having jurisdiction. The then applicable zoning code shall have control over conflicting limitations and requirements that may be shown as on this plat. This note should not be construed as creating plat or subdivision restrictions, private use restrictions, covenants running with the land or title encumbrances of any nature, except to the extent specifically identified as such.

**NOTE "B":** At the time of platting, all of the land hereby being platted as Lakeside at Avondale Woods is in Zone X (Areas determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance flood plain) as designated and delineated on the FEMA Flood Insurance Map for Franklin County, Ohio, and Incorporated Areas, map number 39049C0133K with effective date of June 17, 2008.

**NOTE "C" - MINIMUM FRONT, SIDE AND REAR YARD SETBACKS:**

Reserve "A" (Subarea "A"):

Building Setbacks:

Avondale Woods Blvd. 25 feet off south boundary (Water Meter Building 10 feet)

West Boundary 20 feet

North Boundary 20 feet

East Boundary 5 feet

a minimum distance of 12 feet between buildings

Pavement Setbacks:

Avondale Woods Blvd. 25 feet\*

West Boundary 20 feet

North Boundary 20 feet

East Boundary 0 feet

\*except entry drives to access units and patios

Reserves "C", "D" and "E" (Subarea "E"):

Building Setbacks:

Front: 20 feet

Side: 20 feet

Rear: 20 feet

Pavement Setbacks:

Front: 20 feet\*

Side: 20 feet\*

Rear: 20 feet\*

\*except bike/pedestrian paths

**NOTE "D" - ACREAGE BREAKDOWN:** Lakeside at Avondale Woods is out of the following Franklin County Parcel Number:


274-000137 19.349 Ac.

**NOTE "E"- RESERVE "A" AND RESERVE "B":** Reserve "A" and Reserve "B", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by an association of the owners of the fee simple titles to the units in Lakeside at Avondale Woods subdivision, Subarea A Home Owners Association (SHOA) for the purpose allowed by the then current zoning.


**NOTE "F" - RESERVE "C" AND RESERVE "E":** Reserve "C" and Reserve "E", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned and maintained by an association of the owners of the fee simple titles to the lots in Avondale Woods subdivisions and the owners of the fee simple titles to the units in Lakeside at Avondale Woods subdivision, collectively call the Master Home Owners Association (MHOA) for the purposes allowed by the then current zoning.

**NOTE "G" - RESERVE "D":** Reserve "D", as designated and delineated hereon, shall be owned by the MHOA and maintained by the City of Dublin for the purposes allowed by the then current zoning.

**NOTE "H":** At the time of platting, electric, cable, and telephone service providers have not issued information required so that easement areas, in addition to those shown on this plat as deemed necessary by these providers for the installation and maintenance of all of their main line facilities, could conveniently be shown on this plat. Existing recorded easement information about Lakeside at Avondale Woods or any part thereof can be acquired by a competent examination of the then current public records, including those in the Franklin County Recorder's Office.



CURVE TABLE					
CURVE NO.	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH	CHORD BEARING	CHORD DISTANCE
C1	111°10'05"	176.00'	341.48'	N 36°42'42" W	290.38'
C2	3°15'42"	456.00'	25.96'	S 77°32'19" E	25.95'
C3	8°10'09"	456.00'	65.02'	S 71°49'24" E	64.96'
C4	44°59'32"	176.00'	138.21'	N 69°47'58" W	134.68'
C5	66°10'32"	176.00'	203.28'	N 14°12'56" W	192.17'
C6	13°30'28"	201.13'	47.42'	N 85°35'21" W	47.31'
C7	152°59'03"	93.01'	248.34'	N 02°20'35" W	180.87'
C8	13°30'28"	201.13'	47.42'	N 80°54'11" E	47.31'
C9	13°30'28"	201.13'	47.42'	S 85°35'21" E	47.31'
C10	152°59'03"	93.01'	248.34'	S 02°20'35" E	180.87'
C11	13°30'28"	201.13'	47.42'	S 80°54'11" W	47.31'





## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**AUGUST 11, 2016**

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

- 2. Avondale Woods** **Avery Road**  
**Subarea A (Lakeside at Avondale Woods), Subarea C (Section 1, Lots 1-24), and**  
**Subarea E**  
**16-034FDP/FP** **Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

**Proposal:** To develop a residential subdivision containing 48 condominium units in 24 buildings within Subarea A, 24 single family lots within Subarea C, stormwater management and an entry feature in portions of Subarea E, and associated parks and open space within the Avondale Woods Planned Unit Development, located on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of Rings Road.

**Request:** Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and the review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

**Applicant:** Homewood Corporation LLC; represented by Chris Cline, Blaugrund, Herbert, and Martin.

**Planning Contact:** Logan Stang, Planner.

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

**MOTION#1:** Deborah Mitchell moved, Amy Salay seconded, to approve this Minor Modification to the Development Text because these text modifications are minor in nature and meet the applicable review criteria and provide a refined level of detail for the development that will benefit this application and any future amendments.

- 1) To modify the development text to outline that reserve ownership and maintenance will be indicated with each final development plan and that reserve names may change from the preliminary development plan;
- 2) To modify the development text to permit a 10 foot setback from Avondale Woods Boulevard for the water meter building in Subarea A;
- 3) To modify the development text to permit structures covering stoops, porches, and patios to encroach up to 6 feet into a building setback for buildings 15-24 located in Subarea A;
- 4) To modify the development text to include landscaping requirements for the condominium units and permit one third of those plantings in Subarea E and two thirds in Subarea A;
- 5) To modify the development text to include regulations regarding patios, decks, and fences for Subarea A; and,
- 6) To modify the development text to outline project phasing timelines based on the current application.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Minor Text Modifications were approved.

#### RECORDED VOTES:

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





City of Dublin

**Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**RECORD OF ACTION**

**AUGUST 11, 2016**

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

**2. Avondale Woods**

**Subarea A (Lakeside at Avondale Woods), Subarea C (Section 1, Lots 1-24), and**

**Subarea E**

**16-034FDP/FP**

**Avery Road**

**Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

**MOTION#2:** Robert Miller moved, Amy Salay seconded, to approve this Final Development Plan because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to determine an appropriate light fixture that matches the style of the condominium buildings;
- 2) That the applicant replace the post mounted sign at the southern entrance of The Lakeside at Avondale Woods with the pier mounted sign; and
- 3) That the high density urethane signs be replaced with etched natural stone, subject to staff approval.

\*Chris Cline agreed to the above conditions.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Final Development Plan was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

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

**MOTION #3:** Chris Brown moved, Robert Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council of this Final Plat because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with three conditions:

- 1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to submitting for City Council;
- 2) That the applicant ensures any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and,
- 3) That the appropriate method for documenting the private drive for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods be determined prior to City Council submittal, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

\*Chris Cline agreed to the above conditions.


**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Final Plat will be forwarded to City Council.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

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

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Logan Stang  
Planner

~~Ms. Mitchell asked why such a large sign was needed and said she thought it was a lot of real estate for one brand. Mr. Stidhem said the intent was so that the sign looked similar to the others. Mr. Brown clarified the sign should look like the others but be proportional for one tenant and not three.~~

~~Mr. Brown asked if this process of adding a sign from the dais was appropriate. Mr. Papsidero said this should not be an on-going practice with applications and that this is a unique situation.~~

~~Mr. Brown restated that there are grandfathered signs in a district that has been rezoned and re-specified what signs are permitted. He said instead of having multiple 50-square-foot signs on multiple elevations plus multiple ground signs we are defining a master sign plan for what is permitted on this particular site, which does appeal to Sawmill Road, which will become part of an urban grid surrounded on all four sides to dissipate traffic over multiple paths. He said he thinks the process tonight is serving the client, the taxpayer, and the developer. He asked the applicant if he is in agreement with all of the provisions.~~

~~Mr. McCauley said he agreed.~~

~~The Vice Chair asked both Planning and the Assistant Law Director if they were fine with the proposal as revised and they both responded affirmatively.~~

~~Ms. Salay asked that if the tenant changes if the requirements revert back to BSD Code. Mr. McCauley said he could not agree to that or they would never be able to lease that space again. Mr. Brown said the Commission would not want it to revert back to BSD Code for this site because this master sign plan is limiting the number of signs.~~

### **Motion and Vote**

~~Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the three conditions:~~

- ~~1) That the provision permitting a second wall sign for future tenants be eliminated;~~
- ~~2) That the Secondary Image/Logo provisions meet the Standard Sign Code §153.158(C)(2); and~~
- ~~3) That one additional ground sign be permitted for the 6525 tenant only to be located at the entrance on Dublin Center Drive and designed to match the design and proportions of the approved ground signs as detailed in the MSP, not to exceed a 10-square-foot sign panel in the graphic area, and not to exceed overall sign size of 6 feet in height and not to exceed 5 feet, 8 inches in width; to be submitted to staff for approval prior to sign permitting.~~

~~The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, no; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, no; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 3 – 2)~~

## **2. Avondale Woods 16-034FDP/FP**

## **Avery Road Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

Logan Stang said the following application is a request to develop a residential subdivision containing: 48 condominium units in 24 buildings within Subarea A; 24 single-family lots within Subarea C; stormwater management and an entry feature in portions of Subarea E; and associated parks and open space within the Avondale Woods Planned Unit Development on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of Rings Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations (Chapter 152 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances).

Mr. Stang presented the history of approvals for this Planned Unit Development. He presented an aerial view of the site at the southern edge of Dublin and the site plan that is the preliminary layout for the

entire development as approved at the rezoning. He explained Phase 1, the focus of this application, consists of three subareas: Subarea A, which is 48 condominium units with a private drive and a 1-acre private open space; Subarea C - Section 1, which is 24 single-family lots, right-of-ways for 4 public streets, and a 2.25-acre public open space; and Subarea E, which contains a stormwater management pond, a subdivision entry feature, and a clubhouse that will be approved with a future application.

Mr. Stang presented a close-up view of the site and explained the proposed layout in more detail. He said a few text modifications are proposed with this application, one of which is in regards to the names of the reserves along with their ownership and maintenance responsibilities to be presented at the Final Development Plan stage to ensure a proper record is kept and to identify how the reserve names have changed from the Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Stang presented the drive elevation and the main elevation of the proposed condominium buildings in Subarea A that are required by the development text to be approved by the PZC. He explained the architecture is required to have a craftsman appearance with additional architectural details such as: carriage style garage doors; front porches with accent columns and railings; and minimum roof slopes to create unique massing. He presented the left and right elevations of the condominiums and described the appearance consisting of: lap siding painted dark grey with board and batten siding on the upper levels; white trim throughout; and a limestone accent primarily for the water table and chimney. He added dimensional asphalt shingles are proposed for the main roof with a metal roof proposed for the porches.

Mr. Stang said the applicant has brought samples of all the materials and colors proposed for the buildings. He stated there are two landscape options proposed for the buildings that will alternate between adjacent buildings and provide vacant areas for plantings by the owner.

Mr. Stang noted another text modification proposed to outline the details for fences, patios, and decks. He said each unit has a patio with a maximum size limit to allow for expansion and a privacy fence is permitted only along the patios with a maximum length of 8 feet and maximum height of 6 feet. He noted a related text modification proposed to permit structures covering porches, stoops, and patios to encroach into the building setback by 6 feet that only applies to buildings located along the edge of the subarea.

With regard to tree preservation, Mr. Stang said the site was used for agriculture and is mostly clear of trees with the exception of a large wooded area in the northwest portion of the site. He said a smaller wooded area exists near Avondale Woods Boulevard and the applicant has confirmed that this area will not be impacted by construction on the site and has provided tree protection fencing along the west and north edges of the woods.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed landscaping in a number of areas on the site, the first being on the western edge of Subarea A. He said the development text requires that a landscape buffer be present between the condominium buildings and adjacent single-family lots. He said the applicant has provided a sufficient buffer that will minimize the visual impacts of the private drive and condominium buildings. He noted the condominium buildings, being multi-family, are also required to provide landscaping for building coverage to which the applicant has completed throughout Subarea A. In addition to the plantings around the site, he said the applicant is proposing a text modification that will allow one-third of the building coverage landscaping to be planted in Subarea E to improve the natural environment around the pond. Lastly, he said there are three entry features proposed with this phase, the first being a feature for the entire development located at the corner of Avery Road and Avondale Woods Boulevard. The other two he said are proposed at the ends of Estuary Lane; the private drive that services Subarea A and will contain signs for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods community.

Mr. Stang presented the water meter building plan located within the southern entry feature for Lakeside at Avondale Woods. He said a setback modification will be required just for this building, which is



appropriate given how it has been incorporated into the entry feature with additional landscaping and the architecture will reflect the materials and colors used throughout the development.

Mr. Stang said that a sign is proposed in correlation with each entry feature. He explained the development text does not have specific sign regulations except that the signs will be permitted as approved at the Final Development Plan stage. He noted the main entrance sign off of Avery Road and Avondale Woods Boulevard will be approximately 20 square feet in size and illuminated from the ground with two floodlights. He said the other two signs are for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods and that the post mounted sign located at the southern entrance in front of the water meter building and the pier sign will be located at the northern entrance. These signs, he said will be identical at a size of approximately 7.5 square feet. He noted all proposed signs will have a dark gray background with white trim and lettering.

Mr. Stang presented the Final Plat for Lakeside at Avondale Woods, which also contains the stormwater pond. He stated there are three conditions with the plats. The first he said was that the applicant will need to show the location of the shared access easement for the private drive but after discussing this condition with the applicant, Staff is proposing to revise the condition to determine the appropriate method for documenting the private drive prior to City Council submittal, subject to approval by the City Engineer. He explained this revision is more technical and still addresses the City's concern but does not place the applicant into a legal bind. He said the second condition applies to both plats and that is to add a note outlining the intent to vacate existing easements through separate agreements. He explained this is due to a number of existing large easements that are shown on these plats, which if remained, would impact the development of these proposals. He said the third condition is that the applicant ensure any minor technical adjustments are made prior to submitting for City Council.

Mr. Stang summarized there are three motions to be made this evening and the first is for the six proposed text modifications as follows:

- 1) To outline that reserve ownership and maintenance will be indicated with each Final Development Plan and that reserve names may change from the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 2) To permit a 10-foot setback from Avondale Woods Boulevard for the water meter building in Subarea A;
- 3) To permit structures covering stoops, porches, and patios to encroach up to 6 feet into a building setback for buildings 15-24 located in Subarea A;
- 4) To include landscaping requirements for the condominium units and permit one third of those plantings in Subarea E and two thirds in Subarea A;
- 5) To include regulations regarding patios, decks, and fences for Subarea A; and
- 6) To outline project phasing timelines based on the current application.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the six text modifications as written.

Mr. Stang stated the second motion is for the Final Development Plan to which Staff is recommending approval with no conditions.

Mr. Stang concluded the third motion is for approval of the Final Plat to which Staff is recommending approval with three conditions:

- 1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to submitting for City Council;
- 2) That the applicant ensures any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 3) That the appropriate method for documenting the private drive for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods be determined prior to City Council submittal, subject to approval by the City Engineer.

The Vice Chair swore in the applicant.

Chris Cline, attorney, 300 W. Wilson Bridge Road, Worthington, Ohio, said they do not have a presentation but would entertain any questions. He said the Preliminary Development Plan was incredibly detailed.

Amy Salay said there is a lot to like here and personally likes that style of architecture. She inquired about the elevation views.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, noted the elevations without a garage are all located on internal private drives.

Ms. Salay asked where the proposed six-foot privacy fences will be located. Mr. Stang pointed the one out on the drive elevation and the other for the patio space on the main elevation. Ms. Menerey noted the private driveway on the private drive that loops around.

Ms. Salay indicated the individual post lamps do not look like the craftsman style and suggested the lamps match the architecture. Ms. Menerey said she would be happy to work with staff on a different light fixture.

Ms. Salay asked the applicant to use stone panels for the signs rather than wood poles with hanging signs as they could become a maintenance issue. Ms. Menerey answered the hanging sign was proposed as pressure treated and asked the Commission to consider a vinyl or different product. She explained the water meter building serves as the entry feature as it matches the craftsman element and is hesitant to add another stone element there.

Chris Brown agreed that the wood post would not last over time.

Ms. Menerey offered several options.

Ms. Menerey presented the material samples for the water meter building. Bob Miller inquired about other options and the maintenance of the structure. Ms. Menerey explained that the meter has to be elevated and it is proposed to be in the building on a concrete floor. She said the HOA is responsible for the maintenance.

Mr. Miller indicated he could not get past this building not looking like a storage shed. Ms. Menerey said they intended to have a simpler building, incorporating some of the craftsman elements.

**Mr. Miller asked for the feedback from Staff's discussions about the water meter building.** Mr. Stang said Staff did not struggle with this because it was incorporated into the entry feature with landscaping. He said the applicant is proposing windows on the sides to eliminate blank walls.

Mr. Cline noted the building along Post Road for the Village of Coffman Park and indicated it is a positive feature for the entry. Steve Stidhem said there is a similar building in Tartan Fields.

Mr. Stang clarified the building will sit 10 feet back from the right-of-way.

Mr. Brown said he thought the building might be acceptable since it appears to be well landscaped.

Mr. Miller asked if stone would dress up the building. Ms. Menerey said she would rather not have the building than to add stone to it.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the traffic congestion in that area.

Mr. Stang said a traffic study was completed at the rezoning process. In addition, he said there is an infrastructure agreement with the developers whereas they are limited to 126 units total before they would have to address some of those traffic concerns. He added if they were to exceed that number of units, they would be required to install a light at the intersection of Avery Road and Avondale. He said other portions of the agreement include investment in the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension as well as they are limited to 186 units for the entire development before either Tuttle Crossing is extended to Avery Road or Hayden Run extension on the south.

Mr. Cline indicated the tricky part with the traffic signal is a traffic warrant needs to be satisfied by the City of Columbus before a signal can be installed.

Ms. Salay noted there are a lot of growing pains in this area from an infrastructure standpoint. From a traffic standpoint, she said she believes this development will be the least impactful to the area.

Ms. Menerey pointed out the connectivity in the area.

Mr. Cline said the roadways Ms. Salay is referencing are under construction now and the City of Dublin is moving forward with the Tuttle Crossing extension.

Mr. Miller stated the whole property transitions really nicely from National Church Residence and applauded their efforts.

Mr. Stidhem asked if a path is planned for the pond. Ms. Menerey answered there is no path going around the perimeter of the pond. Mr. Stidhem asked if one could be installed. Ms. Menerey said she was concerned that if the path was not of a hard material there could be issues with ADA.

Mr. Stang clarified the City will maintain and own the central open space in the single-family section and the HOA will own the pond but the City will maintain it and everything else in Subarea A will be owned by either the master HOA or a subarea HOA in the case of Subarea A.

Mr. Miller inquired about the six-foot setbacks. Ms. Menerey explained the stoop elements along Scarlett and Avondale Woods Boulevard; the porch type structure comes a little bit closer and is covered by that stoop.

Ms. Salay asked if there would be enough room for a chair. Ms. Menerey confirmed there is six feet. She said the one façade that is pushed back does not need that articulation in front of the building.

Mr. Miller asked how many lots the six foot setback is specific to. Ms. Menerey clarified it is in the condominium area and offered to update that in the text.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about private drives. Mr. Cline said there really is not an option. He said in order for it to be a public road, they would have to meet municipal street standards, which they cannot do to maintain this type of close community.

Ms. Menerey said the details on the plans show the composition from top to bottom is similar to public streets, same width, utilities, and setbacks.

Mr. Cline recalled Council's concern for the level of burden being placed on the future 48 condominium owners and he listed the costs and said it was reasonable, similar to projects across the City.

Ms. Salay said she did not have a concern.

Mr. Stidhem restated he would like to see a pathway around the pond as it is a great amenity and he was not concerned with anything else.

Mr. Cline said he was not going to be able to consent to that this evening. He offered to revisit the topic before going to Council.

Ms. Salay inquired about the ADA requirements for a path in a private development. Mr. Papsidero answered it has to do with the slope and the width and not as much about the material used. He said he would need to consult with Engineering.

Mr. Brown said he did not know how a path would be accessible without invading private backyards.

Ms. Menerey explained the size of the pond will be enlarged and include two fountains; one phase to handle the entire development. She said the clubhouse would come later.

Mr. Miller asked about the possibility of removing the water meter building. Ms. Menerey said the water meter would still need to go in an elevated area of three feet so it can be drained out. She said they are also trying to avoid the existing trees.

Mr. Miller asked if it is cost effective to dress the building up better than proposed.

Mr. Cline referred back to the example of the water meter building at the Village of Coffman Park. He said there is a three-foot water table that is stone that goes around the base.

Ms. Salay asked if it would be noticeable since it will be heavily landscaped.

The Vice Chair asked the rest of the Commission if the water table building was a concern. [Hearing none.] He invited anyone else that wished to speak regarding the project. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Stang said he revised the third text modification that talks about the six-foot encroachment of structures and added the specific buildings that would apply to, buildings #15 – 24. Ms. Menerey said the applicant was in agreement with all the changes.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Mitchell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to accept the Minor Text Modifications. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to determine an appropriate light fixture that matches the style of the condominium buildings;
- 2) That the applicant replace the post mounted sign at the southern entrance of the Lakeside at Avondale Woods with the pier mounted sign; and
- 3) That the high density urethane signs be replaced with etched natural stone, subject to Staff approval.

Ms. Menerey agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with three conditions:

- 1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to submitting for City Council;
- 2) That the applicant ensures any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 3) That the appropriate method for documenting the private drive for the Lakeside at Avondale Woods be determined prior to City Council submittal and subject to approval by the City Engineer.

Ms. Menerey agreed to the above three conditions.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Recommended for Approval 5 – 0)

### **3. ~~Public Nuisance Regulations – Code Amendment~~ 16-036ADM**

### **~~Administrative Request~~**

~~The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, said the following application is a request for an amendment to the Zoning Code to amend the International Property Maintenance Code and relocate the Nuisance and Health/Safety Related Sections of the Code to §153.076, Public Nuisance Regulations. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for proposed amendments to the Codified Ordinances under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.232 and §153.234.~~

~~Steve Stidhem said he just had one question so a complete presentation may not be necessary. He referenced in the Planning Report...the elimination of the appeal process from Subsection E as it is no longer applicable. He asked why the appeals process was being eliminated.~~

~~Logan Stang indicated an appeals process was set up for that Code section in reference to weeds and basically stated if a property owner did not want to comply or would not comply with the weed regulations they could appeal to City Council. He said it seemed like an odd appeals process that Council would then be in charge of reviewing someone not taking care of weeds on their property so it did not seem applicable. Instead, in all the relocations, Staff added a penalty section that talks about the degrees of misdemeanors for repeat offenders. He said the outlining of the violations will also provide an appeals process that is separate from City Council review.~~

~~Mr. Stidhem asked if anyone had ever filed an appeal on that. Greg Jones answered we have never had an appeals to the mowing requirements.~~

~~Amy Salay said she was trying to understand what the Code states and does not state. She inquired about vans or trucks for businesses parked in front of homes or in driveways. She cited an example of someone parking their heating and air-conditioning business van in front of their house. She asked if that was permitted.~~

~~Mr. Jones said the vehicle is not to be stored on private property so if it was in the driveway, it would be a violation Code Enforcement would deal with. He said with the vehicle parked on the street, it is the police department's responsibility.~~

# Planning Report

Thursday, August 11, 2016

## Avondale Woods PUD

**Subarea A (Lakeside at Avondale Woods), Subarea C (Section 1, Lots 1-24), and Subarea E**

### Case Summary

Agenda Item	2
Case Number	16-034FDP/FP
Proposal	To develop a residential subdivision containing 48 condominium units in 24 buildings within Subarea A, 24 single family lots within Subarea C, stormwater management and an entry feature in portions of Subarea E, and associated parks and open space within the Avondale Woods Planned Unit Development.
Request	<p>Review and approval of a <u>minor modification to the development text</u> under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.</p> <p>Review and approval of a <u>final development plan</u> under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.</p> <p>Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a <u>final plat</u> under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.</p>
Site Location	West side of Avery Road approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.
Applicant	Jim Lipnos, President, Homewood Corporation, represented by Chris Cline, Blaugrund, Herbert, and Martin.
Case Manager	Logan Stang, Planner I   (614) 410-4652   <a href="mailto:lstang@dublin.oh.us">lstang@dublin.oh.us</a>
Planning Recommendation	<p><u>Approval of a Minor Modification to the Development Text</u></p> <p>In Planning's analysis, these text modifications are minor in nature and meet the review criteria and provide a refined level of detail for the development that will benefit this application and any future amendments. Planning recommends approval of the six modifications.</p>

#### Proposed Modifications

- 1) *To modify the development text to outline that reserve ownership and maintenance will be indicated with each final*



*development plan and that reserve names may change from the preliminary development plan.*

- 2) To modify the development text to permit a 10-foot setback from Avondale Woods Boulevard for the water meter building in Subarea A.*
- 3) To modify the development text to permit structures covering stoops, porches, and patios to encroach up to 6 feet into a building setback for Subarea A.*
- 4) To modify the development text to include landscaping requirements for the condominium units and permit one third of those plantings in Subarea E and two thirds in Subarea A.*
- 5) To modify the development text to include regulations regarding patios, decks, and fences for Subarea A.*
- 6) To modify the development to outline project phasing timelines based on the current application.*


#### Approval of a Final Development Plan

Planning recommends approval of the proposal because it complies with the final development plan criteria and the existing development standards. Planning recommends approval of this request with no conditions.

#### Recommendation of Approval for a Final Plat

Planning recommends approval of the proposal because it complies with the final plat review criteria and subdivision regulations. Planning recommends approval with three conditions.

- 1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and,
- 3) That the Lakeside at Avondale Woods plat be revised to include the location of the shared access easement for the private drive prior to City Council submittal.



City of Dublin

16-034FDP-FP  
Final Development Plan/Final Plat  
Avondale Woods  
Avery Road

0 300 600  
Feet



<b>Facts</b>	
Site Area	±120 acres (±33.7 acres associated with this application)
Zoning	PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Avondale Woods
Surrounding Zoning and Uses	<p>North: R; Rural District (Ponderosa Mobile Home Estates and Undeveloped Land)</p> <p>South: PUD; Planned Unit Development District, NCR at Avondale Woods (National Church Residences at Avondale Woods)</p> <p>East: Washington Township (Single-family Residential)</p> <p>West: City of Columbus (Single-family Residential)</p>
Site Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vacant and relatively flat undeveloped site.</li> <li>• Stormwater retention basin serving the existing NCR at Avondale Woods site located on the east edge, adjacent to the single-family homes.</li> <li>• Small wooded area north of Avondale Woods Boulevard near the intersection with Avery Road.</li> <li>• Heavily wooded areas in the northwest and southwest corners of the property.</li> <li>• Railroad tracks running along the western edge of the property.</li> <li>• The termination of Avondale Woods Boulevard on the southern edge of the site.</li> </ul>
Background	<p>City Council approved Ordinance #99-14 for the rezoning of approximately 120 acres from R: Rural District to PUD: Planned Unit Development District on October 13, 2014. The proposal included a maximum of 360 dwelling units, single and multi-family, along with 37 acres of park space including preserved wooded areas.</p> <p>The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval to City Council of a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat for the Avondale Woods PUD on August 7, 2014.</p> <p>The Planning and Zoning Commission tabled the rezoning/preliminary development plan/preliminary plat application at the request of the applicant on January 9, 2014.</p> <p>The Planning and Zoning Commission provided feedback on a Concept Plan for a residential development containing approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multi-family units on February 2, 2012.</p> <p>The Planning and Zoning Commission provided feedback on a Concept Plan for a 120 acre residential development containing approximately 360 dwelling units on September 2, 2010.</p>

Details		Minor Text Modification	
Proposal	The proposal includes minor modifications to the Overall Development Standards and Subarea A standards of the approved Development Text. The modifications to the Overall Development Standards are to address reserve ownership and maintenance and to revise project phasing deadlines outlined in the text to correspond with changes from the rezoning/preliminary development plan approval. Subarea A standards include modifications to setbacks and landscaping requirements for the multi-family proposal. The text provided shows additional changes that fulfill conditions of approval at the time of the rezoning/preliminary development plan/preliminary plat.		
Development Text	The Avondale Woods PUD rezoning and associated development text was approved in 2014 after a series of reviews. The rezoning approval had a number of conditions outlining required modifications to the development to address certain regulations. In addition to these modifications, the development text listed a number of items would be provided at the final development plan stage and the text would be modified accordingly. The proposed modifications are a result of this application and are necessary to ensure compliance of this proposal with the approved development text. These revisions include items such as setback requirements, landscaping requirements, and details for outdoor amenities.		
Text Modification	The applicant is proposing a total of three minor text modifications that are required to address unforeseen circumstances or provide further clarification on certain regulations. These modifications will benefit the proposal through the incorporation of detailed information that was not applicable at the preliminary development plan stage. The following are the six modifications associated with this application and the rationale behind each modification.		
	<i>Reserve Ownership and Maintenance</i>	The preliminary plat and preliminary development plan listed the reserves proposed with the entire development and outlined the ownership and maintenance requirements for each reserve. Due to Franklin County platting requirements the reserve names for single-family and multi-family developments will overlap creating duplicate reserves. The development text did not separate these reserve names instead creating a sequential list among the entire development. This modification will add a note stating that the responsibilities will be identified with each final development plan and that naming may change from the preliminary plans.	
	<i>Water Meter Setbacks</i>	The proposal for Lakeside at Avondale Woods includes a water meter building to access the main water lines that was not included in the preliminary development plan. The applicant has decided to incorporate it into the entry feature for the condominium area. Due to the location of the water line and entry feature this structure would not comply with the building setbacks from Avondale Woods	

Details	Minor Text Modification	
		<p>Boulevard. This modification will permit only this structure to have a smaller setback from Avondale Woods Boulevard and is appropriate since the architecture matches the character of the development and the structure is incorporated into the entry.</p>
	<p><i>Stoop, Porch, and Patio Setbacks</i></p>	<p>Due to the location of Estuary Lane and Avondale Woods Boulevard a number of condominium units are placed on the setback line. These units all propose porches and patios that could potentially encroach into these setback requirements. The City permits patios to encroach up to 5 feet however no structures such as a pergola can encroach into these areas. This text modification will permit porches, patios, and stoops to encroach into the setbacks by up to 6 feet and allow the associated structures to encroach as well. This request is appropriate so that the architectural design elements can be applied to all condominium units.</p>
	<p><i>Landscaping</i></p>	<p>Multi-family uses are required to provide additional landscaping based on the ground coverage of all structures in the development. The applicant is providing the required landscaping to ensure this requirement is met and is proposing an amendment to permit one third of the plantings in Subarea E, the stormwater management pond. The remaining two thirds has been incorporated into Subarea A around the condominium buildings.</p>
	<p><i>Patios, Decks, and Fencing</i></p>	<p>The approved development text had a provision stating all outdoor amenities would be provided at the final development plan for approval. This text modification will add the specific requirements for outdoor amenities including the permitted materials, maximum size, and permitted locations. This will create a consistent set of regulations that compliments the architectural style of the development.</p>
	<p><i>Project Phasing</i></p>	<p>The approved development text included the anticipated project phasing for the development including approval and construction of the first phase. Some of these dates have come to pass and therefore the applicant is proposing to revise these dates to correspond with this application.</p>




<b>Analysis</b>		<b>Minor Text Modification</b>
Process	Code Section 153.053(E)(2)(b)4b permits the Commission to approve a modification to the development text and Zoning Code if they determine that all of the appropriate provisions are satisfied.	
Request	<p>The requested modifications are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>To modify the development text to outline that reserve ownership and maintenance will be indicated with each final development plan and that reserve names may change from the preliminary development plan.</i></li> <li>2) <i>To modify the development text to permit a 10 foot setback from Avondale Woods Boulevard for the water meter building in Subarea A.</i></li> <li>3) <i>To modify the development text to permit structures covering stoops, porches, and patios to encroach up to 6 feet into a building setback for Subarea A.</i></li> <li>4) <i>To modify the development text to include landscaping requirements for the condominium units and permit one third of those plantings in Subarea E and two thirds in Subarea A.</i></li> <li>5) <i>To modify the development text to include regulations regarding patios, decks, and fences for Subarea A.</i></li> <li>6) <i>To modify the development to outline project phasing timelines based on the current application.</i></li> </ol>	

<b>Recommendation</b>		<b>Minor Text Modification</b>
Approval	Planning supports the minor modifications to the development text as they meet the review criteria and provide a refined level of detail for the development that will benefit this application and any future amendments.	

<b>Details</b>		<b>Final Development Plan</b>
Process	The final development plan conforms with and provides a detailed refinement of the approved preliminary development plan. The final development plan includes all of the final details of the proposed development and is the final stage of the PUD process.	
Proposal	This proposal is for the first phase of development for the Avondale Woods subdivision including the platting and development of 24 single-family lots, 48 condominium units designed as duplex structures, a stormwater pond servicing the entire subdivision, dedication of public open space, and the expansion and construction of four new public roadways. This application consists of three of the seven subareas located in the Avondale Woods PUD and prepares the site for future phases of development.	
Layout	This application contains Subarea A, Subarea C, and the majority of Subarea E of the Avondale Woods development, see site plan below. Subarea A is a	


## Final Development Plan

condominium community known as the Lakeside at Avondale Woods and contains a winding single private drive (Estuary Lane) that connects Avondale Woods Boulevard on the south to Scarlett Lane on the north. This Subarea contains 48 condominium units contained in 24 duplex buildings that site on either side of Estuary Lane. A one-acre green space is provided in the center of the community with a walking path located on the perimeter that connects to all of the adjacent units. An entry feature is proposed at each entrance and a total of nine visitor parking spaces are provided along Estuary Lane.



Subarea E is located on the east edge of the site adjacent to single-family residences in Washington Township. A large pond for Stormwater management for the entire subdivision is proposed in the center of this Subarea with a landscape perimeter and two aerators. The south portion is a wooded area that continues to Avondale Woods Boulevard near the intersection with Avery Road. A community entry feature is proposed at the intersection and a future club house will be developed in the northwest corner with access off Scarlett Lane.

Subarea C is the single-family portion of the development and this application comprises Section 1. This Section is the central point of the development expanding Avondale Woods Boulevard to the west around a central green space with connections to future phases. Langley Drive is the proposed north connector from the central green space and will intersect with Scarlett Lane that extends

Details	Final Development Plan
	<p>east towards the pond. Scarlett Lane provides the second access point for Subarea A, Lakeside at Avondale Woods, and curves north to intersect with Tanseyclose Lane and the future entrance to the clubhouse. Eventually Scarlett Lane will connect with Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the north and provide access to Subarea D. Section 1 contains 24 single-family lots with 8 larger lots located around the green space and 16 cluster lots along Scarlett Lane.</p>
<p>Architecture/Building Materials</p>	<p>The development text contains a list of architectural requirements that overlap between the subareas to create a theme. The architectural theme for the community is to have a Craftsman influence along with design elements such as porches with accent columns and railings. The color palette is a historic palette chosen from a major paint manufacturer with consistencies between all subareas.</p> <p>Garages are to have decorative elements with carriage door styles and coach lighting and additional bracket details are required on main roof gables. Windows are to be wrapped in trim and shutters are permitted so long as they are appropriate to the character of the building. Primary materials include brick, stone, stucco, and wood or fiber cement siding along with asphalt shingle, wood shingle and shake, metal tile, and ceramic tile roof materials. The elevations for the condominium units are required to be reviewed and approved at the final development plan.</p> <p>The proposed condominium buildings, shown below, emphasize the Craftsman style by incorporating various detailed elements. The buildings include cedar lap siding and limestone on the lower façade with a transfer to vertical battens on the second story. Both the batten and lap siding will be painted "Dorian Grey" with "White Dove" cedar trim as an accent. The limestone covers the watertable for the majority of the main and drive elevations and highlights the massing of the lower structure to create the appearance of two units. The main roof is constructed of "Estate Grey" asphalt shingles while the porch roof is metal to match the dark grey color of the shingles. The windows are vinyl with simulated divided light and the doors will be black with a full light style on the main elevation.</p> <div>  </div> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Drive Elevation</b></p>

Details	Final Development Plan
	<div> </div> <div> <p><b>Main Elevation</b></p> </div> <div> <p>The elevations for the single-family homes, Subarea C, are not required to be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The architectural requirements and permitted building materials are consistent with the requirements outlined in other subareas. The architectural theme and color palette will be continued throughout the development with this and future phases.</p> </div>
<p>Tree Preservation and Replacement</p>	<p>The applicant has provided a tree preservation plan and survey for both the large wooded areas on the north and west sides of the site as well as the wooded area adjacent to the single family residents on the southeast side of the site. The tree survey indicates that in the southeast area only five trees will be removed due to their condition. These trees are not required to be replaced since they are considered dead and the applicant has acknowledged they will not replace these trees. The remaining wooded area will be protected on the north and west sides by tree protection fencing during all stages of construction.</p>
<p>Landscaping</p>	<p>The proposal contains a significant amount of landscaping due to the proposed land uses and the existing site conditions. Subarea A has a number of landscaping requirements as outlined in the development text and Code requirements for multi-family developments. The text requires that a landscape buffer be provided on the west side of Subarea A adjacent to the single-family in Subarea C. This buffer provides 75% opacity through the incorporation of numerous evergreen and deciduous trees and will reduce the visibility of Estuary Lane from the single-family properties. The proposal also contains two options for condominium unit plantings that will alternate between adjacent buildings and can be personalized by the future homeowners.</p> <p>In addition to the text, the applicant is required to provide 1 caliper inch per 300 square feet of building coverage by the condominium buildings. Based on the coverage the applicant is required to plant an additional 267 inches or 107 - 2.5" caliper trees. The proposal shows 134 trees provided throughout Subarea A including plantings along Avondale Woods Boulevard and around the central green space. With approval of the text modifications the applicant is also permitted to plant one third of these trees in Subarea E and has indicated that 34 of the required plantings will help supplement the proposed landscaping for</p>



Details	Final Development Plan
	<p>the pond.</p> <p>Subarea E containing the pond, entry feature, and future club house does not have any specific landscaping requirements listed in the development text. The applicant is proposing landscaping around the pond to enhance the buffer from the single-family properties on the east and create a natural environment that will improve the aesthetics of the area. Landscaping around the club house will be provided at a future final development plan. Similarly the single-family properties in Subarea C will submit landscaping plans at the building permit stage to correspond with each home. Street trees have been provided on all public right-of-way and continue the look that is currently established on Avondale Woods Boulevard. The City Forester has reviewed the proposal and provided feedback to the applicant on changing some of the proposed species of trees to which the applicant has addressed.</p>
Signs	<p>A total of three signs and associated entry features are proposed with this application. The development text does not have any regulations for signs except that entry features and signs are only permitted as approved at the final development plan. The first sign is a neighborhood sign located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Avery Road and Avondale Woods Boulevard. This entry feature contains an arched limestone wall at a height of 5 feet 9 inches with two typical Dublin stone walls adjacent. The sign is an oval shape with a <b>dark gray background and "Avondale Woods" written in the center in white with white trim along the border.</b> The sign sits approximately 4 feet 9 inches from grade and has two ground floodlights illuminating the sign. The plans have a note limiting the size of the text area to 20 square feet.</p> <p>The second and third signs are part of the entry features to the Lakeside at Avondale Woods condominiums. The first sign is a post mounted sign located in front of the water meter building on Avondale Woods Boulevard. This is opposite the main entrance to NCR at Avondale Woods. The post stands approximately 9 feet 6 inches tall while the sign hangs by brackets at a height of 8 feet. The sign is the same dark gray background with white lettering and trim as the main entry sign and has <b>"Lakeside at Avondale Woods"</b> written in the center. The sign is an oval shape, double sided as it sits perpendicular to the roadway and a single halogen light illuminates the sign on each side.</p> <p>The last sign is located at the corner of Estuary Lane and Scarlett Lane and is a limestone pier at a height of 7 feet 9 inches. This sign is an exact replica of the post mounted sign sitting at a height of approximately 5 feet 6 inches with a single floodlight illuminating the sign. Both the pier and post mounted signs are limited to a text size of <math>\pm 7.5</math> square feet. Details on the signs and lighting have been provided in the final development package.</p>
Stormwater Management	<p>The site contains an existing stormwater pond that was developed in conjunction with the NCR at Avondale Woods development on the south side of Avondale Woods Boulevard. This proposal expands that stormwater pond to serve the</p>

Details	Final Development Plan
	<p>needs of both the neighboring development and the Avondale Woods subdivision. The area identified for the pond is located in Reserve "D" and encompasses approximately 7.2 acres of land. The pond will utilize the existing solar aerator located on site and the applicant will install a second aerator prior to the City taking maintenance responsibilities of the site. The Master HOA will retain ownership of the land. Appropriate connections will be installed with the planned public and private infrastructure allowing future phases to connect and utilize this detention basin.</p>
<p>Utilities, Lighting and Grading</p>	<p>The existing site is relatively flat with a minimal grade and detention basin. The proposal includes increasing the detention basin and associated grading for the public and private infrastructure. The grading across the site will directly correspond with the development and is minimal overall.</p> <p>Subarea A will be serviced by a master metered private water system, including private fire hydrants. Subarea C will be serviced by public water system including public fire hydrants.</p> <p>No lighting is proposed for any of the public or private drives. All public utilities are included in the right-of-way and necessary easements have been established for existing utility lines and any proposed on private property. Subarea A containing the condominium units has identified any public services that cross the site but utilities serving the individual buildings will be developed privately.</p>

Analysis	Final Development Plan
<p>Process</p>	<p>Section 153.050 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval for an amended final development plan. Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.</p>
<p>1) <i>Consistency with the approved preliminary development plan.</i></p>	<p><b>Criterion met with Text Modification:</b> The proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Zoning Code and the Avondale Woods PUD development text based on the proposed minor text modifications. The revisions to the text improve upon the existing zoning regulations by refining code requirements that weren't identified at the preliminary review. These modifications will serve to create an aesthetically appealing and high quality development.</p>
<p>2) <i>Traffic and pedestrian safety</i></p>	<p><b>Criterion met:</b> The proposal provides safe pedestrian and vehicular connections throughout the entire site. The private site improvements connect seamlessly with public sidewalks and roadways for a cohesive system that will continue to expand with future phases.</p>
<p>3) <i>Adequate public services and open space</i></p>	<p><b>Criterion met:</b> The site has access to adequate utilities and has defined appropriate future services for the development. Open space dedication meets the requirements and details outlined at the preliminary development plan.</p>

Analysis	Final Development Plan
4) <i>Protection of natural features and resources</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> Due to the former agricultural use of the site the majority of the property was cleared of any natural features. The features that exist today are large wooded areas that the applicant will preserve through the course of this development. The proposal ensures that the natural resources on the site will be preserved during all phases of construction and properly maintained thereafter.
5) <i>Adequacy of lighting</i>	<i>Not applicable.</i>
6) <i>Signs consistent with preliminary development plan</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> The proposed signs meet all applicable height, size, and location requirements outlined in the development text. The signs are appropriate given the nature of the subdivision and are appropriately designed with the associated entry features.
7) <i>Appropriate landscaping to enhance, buffer, and soften the building and site</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> The applicant has met and in some instances exceeded the requirements for landscaping and buffering. Single-family properties located in the development and adjacent are provided a significant natural buffer from the stormwater pond and condominium area. Landscaping enhances the character of the proposed architecture while linking existing neighboring developments with the community to truly assimilate into the environment.
8) <i>Compliant stormwater management</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> Stormwater information provided by the applicant demonstrates compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53.
9) <i>All phases comply with the previous criteria.</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> The first phase proposed with this application meets all applicable requirements of the development text and Zoning Code. The proposal provides the development and infrastructure necessary to complete future phases of the Avondale Woods subdivision.
10) <i>Compliance with other laws and regulations.</i>	<b>Criterion met:</b> The proposal meets all other applicable laws and regulations.

Recommendation	Final Development Plan
Approval	In Planning's analysis, the proposal complies with the final development plan criteria and the existing development standards. Planning recommends approval of this request with no conditions.

Details	Final Plat
Process	<p>The purpose of the final plat is to assure conformance with the requirements set forth in Sections 152.085 through 152.095 of the Code, exclusive of other standards in the Code.</p>
Plat Overview – Lakeside at Avondale Woods	<p>The proposed plat encompasses Subareas A and E of the Avondale Woods PUD. The plat consists of 19.349 acres of land on the north side of Avondale Woods Boulevard being subdivided into five reserves. Reserve “A” and Reserve “B” correspond with Subarea A comprising a total of 8.056 acres and are to be owned and maintained by the subarea’s HOA. Reserve “A” will contain the condominium units along with a private drive, Estuary Lane, while Reserve “B” is a 1 acre private open space for use by the entire subarea. No right of way dedication is proposed with this plat as all drives are privately owned and maintained.</p> <p>The remaining reserves; Reserve “C”, Reserve “D”, and Reserve “E” correspond with Subarea E comprising 11.293 acres. Reserve “C” consists of 2.15 acres in the southeast corner of the site including the entry feature at Avery Road and existing wooded area. This reserve is to be owned and maintained by a Master HOA for all of Avondale Woods. Reserve “D” is approximately 7.2 acres located in the center of Subarea E and will contain the stormwater management pond for the entire subdivision. This reserve is to be owned by the Master HOA and maintained by the City. Reserve “E” is approximately 1.9 acres along future Scarlett Lane and will be owned and maintained by the Master HOA. Reserve “E” will eventually include the clubhouse and associated amenities but is not being proposed with this application.</p>
Plat Overview – Avondale Woods Section 1	<p>The proposed plat consists of 14.355 acres subdivided into 24 single-family lots, public open space, and right-of-way. The plat includes the expansion of Avondale Woods Boulevard to the west around a central green space, Reserve “A”, and proposed right-of-way for Scarlett Lane, Langley Drive, and Tanseyclose Lane. Reserve “A” is approximately 2.25 acres that will be dedicated to the City for public open space. Two additional reserves, Reserve “B” and Reserve “C”, consisting of landscape medians for Avondale Woods Boulevard will be owned by the City and maintained by the Master HOA. Lots 1-8 are located around Reserve “A” and range in size from 0.336 acres to 0.637 acres while Lots 9-24 are cluster lots that range in size from 0.201 acres to 0.365 acres.</p>
Reserves	<p>The Avondale Woods PUD consists of a large number of reserves due to the mix of single-family and multi-family sections. At the time of the rezoning a complete list of the reserves along with ownership and maintenance responsibilities was provided for reference for future applications. However, due to platting requirements by Franklin County many of these reserve names will change as the subdivision continues to develop. Single-family and multi-family sections are required to proceed separately in alphabetical order thus creating a series of duplicate reserve names with different ownership and maintenance responsibilities. The applicant has provided documentation to ensure that there is a proper record of all changes from the preliminary development plan/preliminary plat.</p>

Details	Final Plat
Easements	<p>Along with the platting of new easements the site contains a number of existing easements that run through the majority of the property. These easements are identified to remain with the platting of these sections even though there are some conflicts with the proposed single-family lots and reserves. The applicant has indicated that portions of these easements will be vacated through separate amendments to comply with the proposed development. The applicant will provide documentation to the City of the amended easements when they become available and staff is requesting that a note be added to both plats outlining the details of vacating these easements.</p> <p>The Lakeside at Avondale Woods plat contains a private drive with a connection between Avondale Woods Boulevard on the south and Scarlett Lane on the north. The reserve currently shown does not provide an access easement which would typically be required to ensure location and details regarding the easement. The applicant will be required to revise the drawings to include a shared access easement prior to City Council review.</p>

Analysis	Final Plat
Process	Following a recommendation by the Commission, the preliminary and final plat will be forwarded to City Council for final action. The plat can be recorded after City Council approval.
1) Plat Information and Construction Requirements  Conditions 1 & 2	<b>Criterion met with conditions:</b> This proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Code. The applicant will need to provide a note on both plats outlining that existing easements will be vacated through separate amendments in order to comply with this proposal. Any additional minor technical adjustments shall be made prior to Council review.
2) Street, Sidewalk, and Bikepath Standards  Condition 3	<b>Criterion met with condition:</b> Public streets and sidewalks throughout both plats are located within the right-of-way. Necessary easements are provided for all public sidewalks that encroach onto private property. An access easement is not provided for the private street and shall be revised to include the location of the easement prior to City Council submittal.
3) Utilities	<b>Criterion met:</b> This plat establishes necessary easements for the construction and maintenance of utilities in accordance with all applicable standards.
4) Open Space Requirements	<b>Criterion met:</b> All open space dedication, ownership, and maintenance responsibilities are identified on the plat drawings. Reserve "A", Reserve "B", and Reserve "C" in Avondale Woods Section 1 are to be dedicated to the City of open space.



<b>Recommendation</b>		<b>Final Plat</b>
Summary	This proposal complies with the preliminary and final plat review criteria and approval of this request is recommended with three conditions.	
Conditions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) That a note be added to both plats indicating the intent to vacate existing easements through separate amendments, prior to City Council submittal;</li><li>2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and,</li><li>3) That the Lakeside at Avondale Woods plat be revised to include the location of the shared access easement for the private drive prior to City Council submittal.</li></ol>	

### **MINOR DEVELOPMENT TEXT MODIFICATION**

Code Section 153.053(E)(2)(b)4 b permits the Commission to approve a modification from the development text and Zoning Code if they determine that all of the following provisions are satisfied.

- (i) The Planning and Zoning Commission determines that, for this Planned District, the code compliance is not needed in order to ensure that the Planned District is consistent with the Community Plan and compatible with existing, approved, or planned adjacent development; and
- (ii) The Planning and Zoning Commission determines that the proposed modification does not significantly alter the list of permitted or conditional uses, cause an inappropriate increase in density or cause inconsistencies with the Community Plan;
- (iii) The proposed modification results in a development of equivalent or higher quality than that which could be achieved through strict application of the requirement(s);
- (iv) The principles of § 153.052(B) are achieved; and
- (v) The development, as proposed on the amended final development plan, will have no adverse impact upon the surrounding properties or upon the health, safety or general welfare of the community.

### **FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

#### Review Criteria

In accordance with Section 153.055(B) Plan Approval Criteria, the Code sets out the following criteria of approval for a final development plan:

- 1) The plan conforms in all pertinent respects to the approved preliminary development plan provided, however, that the Planning and Zoning Commission may authorize plans as specified in §153.053(E)(4);
- 2) Adequate provision is made for safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the site and to adjacent property;
- 3) The development has adequate public services and open spaces;
- 4) The development preserves and is sensitive to the natural characteristics of the site in a manner that complies with the applicable regulations set forth in this Code;
- 5) The development provides adequate lighting for safe and convenient use of the streets, walkways, driveways, and parking areas without unnecessarily spilling or emitting light onto adjacent properties or the general vicinity;
- 6) The proposed signs, as indicated on the submitted sign plan, will be coordinated within the Planned Unit Development and with adjacent development; are of an appropriate size, scale, and design in relationship with the principal building, site, and surroundings; and are located so as to maintain safe and orderly pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
- 7) The landscape plan will adequately enhance the principal building and site; maintain existing trees to the extent possible; buffer adjacent incompatible uses; break up large expanses of pavement with natural material; and provide appropriate plant materials for the buildings, site, and climate;
- 8) Adequate provision is made for storm drainage within and through the site feeding into regional stormwater basin which complies with the applicable regulations in this Code and

any other design criteria established by the City or any other governmental entity which may have jurisdiction over such matters;

- 9) If the project is to be carried out in progressive stages, each stage shall be so planned that the foregoing conditions are complied with at the completion of each stage; and
- 10) The Commission believes the project to be in compliance with all other local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

### **FINAL PLAT CRITERIA**

The Zoning Code does not contain specific criteria to guide the review of plats. Planning bases the evaluation on the conformance of the plat with the requirements set forth in Chapter 152: *Subdivision Regulations* of the Code, which are summarized below:

- The proposed final plat document includes all the required technical information.
- Construction will be bonded and completed in an appropriate time frame, inspections will be conducted by the City in accordance with Engineering standards for improvements, and maintenance will be completed as necessary.
- The proposed lots, street widths, grades, curvatures, intersections, and signs comply with the standards set forth in these Code sections.
- The proposal includes provisions for water, storm drainage, sanitary sewer, electric, telephone, and cable supplies in accordance with approved standards.
- The proposed development complies with the open space and recreation facility requirements or payment into the Parkland Acquisition Fund is made in lieu of dedication.

In addition, the Planning and Zoning Commission is to determine that the final layout and details of the final plat comply with the approved preliminary plat. The Commission is to consider several factors in making its recommendation:

- 1) The final plat conforms with the approved preliminary plat;
- 2) The plat conforms to the adopted Thoroughfare Plan and meets all applicable parkland dedication and open space requirements; and
- 3) The final plat conforms to the subdivision and zoning regulations, municipal stormwater regulations, and other applicable requirements.



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long  
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**AUGUST 7, 2014**

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

**1. Avondale Woods – Avery Road  
12-084Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/ Preliminary Plat**

**Proposal:** A new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road.

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

**Applicant:** Jim Lipnos, Homewood Corporation, LLC.

**Planning Contact:** Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.

**Contact Information:** (614) 410-4675, [chusak@dublin.oh.us](mailto:chusak@dublin.oh.us)

**MOTION #1:** Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend **approval** of the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with the following 15 conditions:

- 1) That the development text be revised to eliminate a fence as an option to indicate demarcations between open spaces and rear lot lines and require their approval at the Final Development Plan stage;
- 2) That the development text be revised to address unit separation and require a minimum distance between units of at least 12 feet required for all multiple-family subareas;
- 3) That the front setbacks for Lots 37 through 40 to be separately addressed in the development text;
- 4) That the development text be revised to require front-loaded garages to be located behind the front façade of the home;
- 5) That the applicant continues working with Engineering on the roundabout design details in Subarea D, prior to submitting for a Final Development Plan;
- 6) That the applicant works with Staff to further review the proposed street names for the development;
- 7) That Lot 58 is eliminated from the proposal;
- 8) That the development text be revised to eliminate vinyl as a permitted as a primary building material;
- 9) That the roundabout center and splitter islands be included as HOA maintained reserves on a plat;
- 10) That the applicant enters into an infrastructure agreement with the City, prior to submitting the first Final Development Plan, for the development thresholds and public project contributions and that the infrastructure agreement details are referenced in the development text;

**1. Avondale Woods – Avery Road  
12-084Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/ Preliminary Plat**

- 11) That the development text be revised to require a divided light grid pattern for all windows on all four sides of the buildings of all subareas;
- 12) That the development text be revised to limit the height of a fence if used as part of the landscape buffer to six feet;
- 13) That the western buffer along Subarea A not be permitted to include a fence;
- 14) That all details for outdoor amenities including decks, patios, and or fences for the multiple-family units be included for approval at the Final Development Plan stage; and that the development text be revised to reflect this requirement; and
- 15) That the entry feature details be submitted for approval at the Final Development Plan stage for each section and also that the development text be revised.

\* Mr. Chris Cline agreed to the 15 conditions as amended.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** The application for Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 15 conditions was **approved**.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

**MOTION #2:** Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend **approval** to City Council for the following Preliminary Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the plat be revised to include the roundabout center and splitter islands as reserves and a table listing each reserve size and intended maintenance responsibility.

\* Mr. Chris Cline agreed to the above condition.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Preliminary Plat with one condition was **approved** to be forwarded to City Council.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II



Avondale Woods, and Bridge Park East. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

**1. Avondale Woods Avery Road  
12-084Z/PDP/PP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road. She said the Commission will forward the recommendation on this to City Council. She said two motions are required: 1) Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan; and 2) Preliminary Plat. She asked the two members that had questions if they needed a presentation. Ms. Kramb and Mr. Zimmerman both said they did not need a presentation as they just had a series of questions for clarification. The Chair asked if anyone else needed to see a presentation. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb inquired about the fence height. She said she could not find any reference to a fence in the development text but in the Planning Report there is a six-foot fence mentioned for along the railroad tracks.

Claudia Husak said it can be found in the buffering landscaping section.

Ms. Kramb said it mentions six feet of "screening" that can include a fence but it does not mention the height of the fence. It was stated that since there is no mention of a maximum height for a fence, a discussion ensued among the members and staff that included all the different fences and buffering in the different areas of this site.

Ms. Kramb also inquired about the development text that allows for entry signs at every subarea but it does not specify the number or size of signs.

Ms. Kramb said there was no mention anywhere about tree replacements and asked if Code was just being followed to which Ms. Husak agreed.

Ms. Kramb said because this is going to be in phases, and Scarlet Lane is stopping to the north and to the west, she is curious as to how those roadway ends would be treated.

Todd Zimmerman referred to page 11 of the Planning Report. He questioned the limit of 185 units when the road network is in place.

Ms. Husak said there was a phasing plan on page 12 in the development text and Phase 1 was identified as the attached residential just north of the entrance. She said Phase 2 is the single-family lots around the central green. She thought that the 185 were all single-family units and this multi-family.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to Subarea B and asked how many one-car garages are in the plans.

Ms. Husak said she did not have that information at this time. She said the development text requires two-car garages for all of the three-bedroom units but how that is mixed up is not known.

Mr. Zimmerman inquired about the windows to carry a grid pattern throughout and wanted to make sure it was for all four sides of the single-family units and not just the front.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to approach the podium and begin by stating their name and address for the record.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, New Albany, Ohio, 43054, said she wanted to split the four issues mentioned: fencing, entry signs, tree replacement, and street phasing. She wants to talk through the fencing to get a consensus. She said they are going to do tree replacement. She asked if the street phasing was answered.

Ms. Kramb said she got the phasing and was more curious about the termination treatment but understands that will come up at the Final Development Plan (FDP).

Ms. Menerey asked if it was ok that it was decided at FDP and Ms. Kramb said she was comfortable with that.

Ms. Menerey confirmed there is a mix of garages and encouraged Mr. Zimmerman to look at the plan. She said their client, Jim Lipnos has agreed with the window grid pattern on all four sides.

Ms. Menerey asked to discuss the fencing issue. She asked if the Commission was ok with mounding/fencing of a minimum of 6 feet and maximum of 8 feet, the applicant was in agreement with that. She offered this be left for the FDP.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested this be decided later.

Victoria Newell suggested adding one line that states the fence as an individual component cannot exceed a height of six feet to which everyone agreed to the solution.

Mr. Zimmerman asked who was responsible for the maintenance of the fence.

Ms. Menerey said it was the applicant.

Chris Cline, applicant, said they are comfortable with the Commission passing on this until the FDP but would like flexibility to do a good quality job.

Ms. Amorose Groomes concluded that the Commission would like to see the whole plan at the Final Development Plan and asked if Ms. Husak could write the conditions based on their discussion.

Ms. Kramb inquired about patios and where they could possibly be placed.

Ms. Menerey said this goes back to the 2010 – 2012 period when they finally got some footprints in front of the Commission. She said those units are double-sided. She said as seen on the site plan, they feel like a two-sided unit and explained further what she meant. She said the front is not intended to have a six-foot fence but a four or six foot fence could go on the back for a little privacy.

Ms. Kramb noted that when driving by, all that would be seen are the garages and privacy fences.

Ms. Menerey asked the Commission if they would prefer a four-foot fence be stipulated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that before they are willing to issue the ability for fences, they want a lot more detail and again is in favor of deciding at the FDP to which Ms. Menerey agreed that a condition should be written to state that.

Ms. Husak summarized that the condition should state that any kind of exterior amenities, including patios and fences, will be part of the Final Development Plan to which everyone agreed.

Ms. Menerey referred back to the entry feature issue.

Ms. Kramb thought there should be a limit to the size and numbers of these entry features.

John Hardt thought it would fall under the same conversation as the site amenity statement.

Mr. Cline said their intent was not a large intrusive sign but one that tastefully identified the neighborhoods.

Amy Salay suggested something should be written so that any materials used must be of natural quality to endure the elements and not burden the neighborhoods with all the open space they will need to maintain.

Both Ms. Kramb and Mr. Zimmerman stated all their questions were answered satisfactorily.

Ms. Salay asked what parts of this development are going to be maintained and deeded to the City as public parkland and what is going to be private.

Mr. Cline said there is a table in the text that spells out who owns what and who maintains everything.

Ms. Salay said there are very few homes that are required to maintain a large amount of open space in a couple different areas of our community. She said when things are decided at Commission, they do not know how it will all shake out and how much it will cost to maintain this private open space. She said neighborhoods find themselves burdened with high fees and struggle to maintain these areas. She thought the way it is written opens it up to too much interpretation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the table and stated which areas were owned by the City but the maintenance on the various areas differed.

Ms. Salay maintained it could still be problematic. She asked if Mr. Hahn, of Parks and Open Space, could consider what the City is going to be doing and what it is the private sector is supposed to be doing so that it could be spelled out - how areas are to be maintained and if it would come back to Council.

Ms. Husak said Mr. Hahn did send a mark-up map to staff that was forwarded to the applicant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further questions or concerns from the Commission. [There were none.] She asked the public to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.] She asked Ms. Husak to reveal the conditions.

Ms. Husak said there would be two motions: 1) Rezoning and the Preliminary Development Plan; and 2) Preliminary Plat. She said for the first motion there were 10 conditions and noted the first 8 on a slide with no changes. She said conditions 9 and 10 were retained from the Planning Report. She said conditions 11 through 15 were added per the discussion:

- 11) That the development text be revised to require a divided light grid pattern for all windows on all four sides of the buildings of all subareas;
- 12) That the development text be revised to limit the height of a fence if used as part of the landscape buffer to six feet;
- 13) That the western buffer along Subarea A not be permitted to include a fence;
- 14) That all details for outdoor amenities including decks, patios, and or fences for the multiple family units be included for approval at the Final Development Plan stage; and that the development text be revised to reflect this requirement; and
- 15) That the entry feature details be submitted for approval at the Final Development Plan stage for each section and also that the development text be revised.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he agreed to those 15 conditions as amended.

Mr. Cline agreed.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval of the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan with 15 conditions:

- 1) That the development text be revised to eliminate a fence as an option to indicate demarcations between open spaces and rear lot lines and require their approval at the Final Development Plan stage;
- 2) That the development text be revised to address unit separation and require a minimum distance between units of at least 12 feet required for all multiple-family subareas;
- 3) That the front setbacks for Lots 37 through 40 to be separately addressed in the development text;
- 4) That the development text be revised to require front-loaded garages to be located behind the front façade of the home;
- 5) That the applicant continues working with Engineering on the roundabout design details in Subarea D, prior to submitting for a Final Development Plan;
- 6) That the applicant works with staff to further review the proposed street names for the development;
- 7) That Lot 58 be eliminated from the proposal;
- 8) That the development text be revised to eliminate vinyl as a permitted primary building material;
- 9) That the roundabout center and splitter islands be included as HOA maintained reserves on a plat; and
- 10) That the applicant enters into an infrastructure agreement with the City, prior to submitting the first Final Development Plan, for the development thresholds and public project contributions and that the infrastructure agreement details be referenced in the development text.
- 11) That the development text be revised to require a divided light grid pattern for all windows on all four sides of the buildings of all subareas;
- 12) That the development text be revised to limit the height of a fence if used as part of the landscape buffer to six feet;
- 13) That the western buffer along Subarea A not be permitted to include a fence;
- 14) That all details for outdoor amenities including decks, patios, and or fences for the multiple family units be included for approval at the Final Development Plan stage; and that the development text be revised to reflect this requirement; and
- 15) That the entry feature details be submitted for approval at the Final Development Plan stage for each section and also that the development text be revised.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the following Preliminary Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the plat be revised to include the roundabout center and splitter islands as reserves and a table listing each reserve size and intended maintenance responsibility.

Mr. Cline agreed to the condition as written in the staff report.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long  
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600  
fax 614.410.4747  
www.dublinohiousa.gov

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**JANUARY 9, 2014**

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

**2. Avondale Woods – Avery Road  
12-084Z/PDP/PP**

**Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/  
Preliminary Plat**

**Proposal:** A new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road.

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

**Applicant:** Jim Lipnos, Homewood Corporation, LLC.

**Planning Contact:** Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.

**Contact Information:** (614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

**MOTION:** Richard Taylor moved, John Hardt seconded, to table this rezoning/preliminary development plan/preliminary plat application at the request of the applicant.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** This Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan was tabled.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

Claudia D. Husak, AICP  
Planner II

12-084Z/PDP/PP  
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat  
Avondale Woods  
Avery Road



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION****MEETING MINUTES****JANUARY 9, 2014****2. Avondale Woods – Avery Road  
12-084Z/PDP/PP****Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/  
Preliminary Plat**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said following application is for a new residential subdivision with a maximum of 360 single and multiple family units on 120 acres on the west side of Avery Road, south of the intersection with Rings Road. She said this is a request for a recommendation to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan and also a request for approval of a preliminary plat.

Claudia Husak presented this application. She said this is the first time the Commission is reviewing a rezoning application for this site. She said the previous reviews have been for concept plans by this applicant in February of 2011 where the comments were focused on architectural concept and a review of proposed layout and use of the site in September of 2010. She said this is a rezoning from the Rural District to a Planned Unit Development District and includes 120 acres and the rezoning would establish a planned district with regulations specific to this site.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site is the very southern tip of the City of Dublin surrounded by the City of Columbus, next to the CSX railroad line and in the City of Hilliard School District. She said there is a number of major future roadway projects that are going to take place, south is the Hayden Run Boulevard extension and to the north out of the Community Plan is the future extension of Tuttle Crossing. She said to the north is the Ponderosa Development and had gotten quite a few inquiries about the application including that piece and for the record that it does not include the Ponderosa Development.

Ms. Husak said this site will share an access off Avery Road with National Church Residences and Avondale Woods Boulevard has been constructed to this site.

Ms. Husak said there are seven subareas proposed for this site. She said the proposal is a mix of multi-family as well as single family residential units with open spaces and the woods to be preserved. She said there was a lot of analysis in the Planning Report that they talked about at the concept plan about the Community Plan and the Southwest Area Plan and there is a lot of discussion about having residential product in this area that is inclusive and has different options and choices, so the applicant is meeting the intent of those documents.

Ms. Husak said they are proposing two stub roads going to the west and to the north that are not going to any other development taking place on either boundaries of the site. She said the open spaces of Avondale Woods as well as the triangle woods area are to be preserved as such. She said Avondale Woods Boulevard is terminating into a center green space which is shared by the single family residences as well as multi-family residents. She said that a club house with a pool and stormwater management pond also to be shared by the entire neighborhood which makes this a more inclusive development is proposed along the eastern boundary.

Ms. Husak said Subarea A is just north of Avondale Woods Boulevard and shown as an attached product with two units within a building and the development text has a maximum of 48 units and is exactly what is shown on the plan with 24 two unit buildings. She said there is a one-acre open space included. She said the text describes these units as being double fronted where they are fronting onto the main street or the open space and designed in a manner that does not showcase that there is a rear to the building.

which a private interior road function like a service road or an alley and the units have sidewalks from the front or rear to the interior walkway that loops around the entire area.

Ms. Husak said Subarea B is the area of most concern to Planning, mostly because of the location and the outside influences to the area and the design. She said it is 19 acres and the development text permits a maximum of 132 units, the total for the development is 360 which is the maximum density of the Community Plan which is 3 units to the acre. She said there are 4, 3 and 2 unit buildings proposed and there are some units fronting along the 2 acre green space and all have sidewalks to the walkway around the green space. She said that the bikepath will be incorporated along the railroad line as stated in the concept plan.

Ms. Husak said along the south side is the planned Columbus extension of Hayden Run Boulevard and she mentioned that Planning asked the applicant to put together some perspective drawings because the road is essentially designed and they wanted to show the Commission some of things they are concerned with. She said the applicant has increased the setback along the south property line to 100 feet and at the edge of the setback about 10 feet away there is a proposal to build an MSE (Mechanically Stabilized Earth) wall that goes 20 feet into the air with a slope that goes farther with the road sitting even higher on top of the wall and slope. She said looking at the wall the view would be the wall with cars on top of it and there is not any screening or buffering requirements being included in the development text and the concern is the view and feel of the residents experience and would much prefer road frontage and units neither back up or front along that property boundary.

Ms. Husak said the western boundary of Subarea B backs up to the railroad tracks and previously there was a 50 feet setback proposed and the applicant has increased it to 100 feet and CSX has requested a 200 feet setback at minimum. She said there are 16 trains traveling that line and is a fairly busy line and does not include the count of trains that carry coal, but there are coal carrying trains that utilize this line with 5 trains indicated to be traveling during night time hours.

Mr. Hardt asked why CSX requested 200 feet setback. Ms. Husak said it was a standard request without explanation.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has tried to pull the units back and there is a buffer for this boundary and it is proposed as a six-foot mound with evergreens and deciduous trees as well as a six-foot tall fence that is on top of the mound. She said there are still a substantial number of residential units backing up closely to the rail line and using the units to buffer the sound for the remainder of the units seems not to be providing for a quality of life that would hope they could get. She said having the road frontage and these units pulled in more is something asked of the applicant to look at.

Ms. Husak said they are concerned with the design of the private streets within this development, the streets do not have curb or gutters and where there are sidewalks they are only on one side of the street and interrupted a lot by the driveways with a small tree lawn proposed along the ending of the asphalt and would be a lot of driving over the fairly skinny tree lawn. She said overall they are concerned with the pedestrian character or lack thereof within this subarea as well as the safety and the view of garages is not something the land use principles have envisioned with multi-generational and varying types of residential development.

Ms. Husak said Subarea C is the single-family area in the center of the development proposed for 78 detached homes with 8 fronting onto the central green, the applicant is requiring side loaded garages for those to have more pedestrian environment within the area. She said there are some fairly narrow 55-foot lots on the west boundary and no lot size requirement and 55 is the minimum lot width and some areas where lots are wider. She said the applicant is proposing a minimum front setback as well as a maximum front setback, but the text is unclear as to what the requirement actually is between the minimum and the maximum as well as the preliminary plat that accompanies this application does not

show those requirements correctly. She said there are no rear yard setback requirements except the lots backing up to the park and there is a 20-foot tree preservation zone, but the text does not include a definition of that zone and makes provisions for utilities being allowed within that zone and making tree preservation challenging. She said there is a path included that would allow access to the park between two of the lots and has some concerns with lot 53 with all the easements causing the buildable area to be a small rectangle shape and would be separated from all the other lots and it creates isolated open space and is an awkward layout of the lot.

Ms. Husak said there are some provisions in the development text to delineate where the lots end and the woods start because there are concerns of encroachment and the provision of a proposed fence is not supported because it does not help with tree preservation.

Ms. Husak said Subarea D is the northeast portion of the site adjacent to a multi-family development that was zoned in the City of Columbus with 10 to 12 units to the acre. She said the applicant is allowing for a maximum density of 102 dwelling units and shown on the plan are 72 in the four-unit buildings and the applicant is not certain how this area may layout and maybe one of the areas that comes last as the phasing progresses through the site. She said they are supportive with the way it lays out with the streets functioning as alleys including on-street parking spaces and how the units are fronting the public street having sidewalks to the public streets. She said the subarea includes an emergency access point for fire and EMS services through the development that will take place within the City of Columbus but needs to be analyzed further by Washington Township. She said they have asked the applicant to do some traffic calming measures along the public street to be named Scarlet Lane because it is long and straight and encourages speeding. She said there are some notes on the plan that says there will be traffic calming, but they need to have a commitment as to what those measures would be and reviewed by Engineering.

Ms. Husak said the architecture and building materials are required through the development text and the Commission would see final detailed architecture for the multi-family within the development but would not see the architecture for the single family residential. She said the influences throughout the neighborhood are intended to be craftsman with those types of details and highlighted in the development text intended to provide a unified element through the development for architecture and vinyl siding is still listed as an option as a permitted material even though there is a requirement built in that the Commission has to approve it at the final development plan. She said they have been concerned about vinyl being on the list and cannot support this material to warrant maximum density permitted and does not create the characteristics and the design that is preferred for this development within Dublin.

Ms. Husak said Subarea E is the club house and the stormwater pond and is 11 acres of open space and the club house includes a pool and a parking lot. She said the applicant had moved it to this area of the development based on the recommendations by the Commission and is intended to serve the entire neighborhood.

Ms. Husak said the last two Subareas F and G are the Avondale Woods almost 30 acres of preserved woodlands and almost 5 acres in the triangle woods.

Tina Wawszkiewicz said there are some offsite improvements that have been discussed with the applicant and at varied degrees of agreement for the applicant to contribute. She said the first requirement is to install a traffic signal at the intersection that already exists with Avondale Woods Boulevard and Avery Road, connect the north south street to the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with a gap between the parcel line and where they anticipate that new roadway to fall, and for the applicant to fund a two lane roadway from Avery to the access point at the north end of their site, contribute to a larger project that the City of Dublin is just starting to design which is the widening of Avery Road and the extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard from the east to Avery Road which includes two roundabouts at that intersection of Avery and Tuttle and a round-about at the southern intersection of Rings Road and

Avery Road at a total project cost of 11 million in the current estimate. She said the last contribution request for improvements is related to a limitation of development coming from a Franklin County request where they maintain the intersection of Hayden Road and Avery Road on the other side of the railroad tracks and they are at capacity so their request is to cap the development until the more regional connections like Hayden Run Boulevard and Tuttle come over to Avery so there is a reliever on that at the existing Hayden Run Road.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said the applicant has agreed to install the traffic signal at the intersection of Avery Road and Avondale Woods Boulevard except the right-of-way is owned and maintained by the City of Columbus, so there needs to be a partner with the project because there will be some significant delay getting in and out of the side street where there is a stop sign control because of the volumes on Avery Road, however there is not enough volume initially to warrant the traffic signal under the under the Federal requirements, so Columbus may not allow that signal to go in until this development is much further along than they would like to see it go in at and if this is a favorable response they would work with Columbus to try and get that traffic signal installed earlier. She said if that does not happen, the site needs an additional way out because there will be a lot of delay at that intersection and would require the connection up to the extended Tuttle and the access point over to Avery Road sooner with that scenario and the applicant has agreed to closing the gap.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said the request for the applicant to fund a two lane standard section roadway with pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the proposal is to actually build what they would see in the Community Plan which is a four lane divided much like Emerald Parkway, and they would fund the two lane portion into that larger project and the City of Dublin would lead that project, which they have not yet come to terms.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said the applicant has agreed to the contribution of the widening of Avery Road and the Tuttle extension to this point and over to the east at that intersection. She said their site contribution would be proportional to the amount of site traffic utilizing the improvements at 4.5%. She said they have agreed to cap their development as requested by Franklin County at 185 units until the Hayden Run Boulevard connection or the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension can carry traffic between Avery Road and I-270.

Ms. Husak said based on concerns with Subarea B and others highlighted in the presentation and Planning Report, as well as the Engineering concerns, they are not in a position to recommend approval of this application, so the recommendation is disapproval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Preliminary Plat that accompanies the application.

Chris Cline, with Blaugrund & Herbert, 300 W. Wilson Bridge Road, said they have Linda Menerey with EMH&T and Jim Lipnos, President of Homewood are present. He said since they were last before the Commission in 2012 they have met continuously with staff and done 5 complete submittals which is a very expensive and detailed process. He said this project has been continuously worked on by the applicant and by staff. He said this is envisioned as a multi-generational residential project which is pedestrian oriented and walkability has been at the forefront of the project goals. He said the key element to the architecture is the attached residential with different floor plans that are not apartments or townhomes, they are single-family floor plans that are attached with an open concept just like houses that are attached and these are not like apartments where there will be people cycling in and out like there would be in typical townhomes, they would envision a family to move in and stay and not consider it to be temporary renters and that people will be able to move within the different aspects of this community. He said the architecture, the layout and the interior quality all will help achieve those goals. He said the quality of the tenants and the longevity of the tenants, the renters and the ultimate quality of a multi-family project depends on what is inside and if they enjoy living there and living there over time. He said they meet the Community Plan and the Area Plan.

Mr. Cline said vinyl is not a primary material, the permitted materials are brick, stone, synthetic stone, wood and fiber cement siding. He said P.V.C. and vinyl are on the discretionary portion and if they propose the use during the final development plan they may want to use as the best option in a shake type product, he said this is not a vinyl project, but they request the option to bring back for approval.

Mr. Cline said roadway contributions have been committed with a significant amount of money. He said this development cannot bare that expense of the Tuttle Crossing extension. He said they would be able to do 126 units within Subareas A and C until Columbus builds 5 lanes along Avery or the Tuttle Crossing extension to the north.

Mr. Cline said there is a fire emergency access to the north and they have agreed with the Fire Marshal to build at their standards. He said that architecture every residential subarea requires a front porch, front walk with a public sidewalk, the private walk or the driveway.

Mr. Cline described the architectural elements focusing on the garage door requirements stipulated in the proposed development text. He said the biggest influence to this development is the railroad and he showed examples of setbacks through area residential communities, such as Linworth Village with 50 foot setbacks. He said if it is a nice community people are willing to live there. He said Hayden Run Boulevard with the elevated roadway, from a development perspective it is a positive and will not be affected except for the wall and will not inhibit the renting of the units or the long term value of the project.

Mr. Cline said they believe Subarea B is well done with similar driveways that cross a sidewalk as found throughout Dublin, as well as a bikepath system that connects the entire area.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said Subarea B has 132 units and showed a drawing showing green spaces that are disbursed throughout the site. She said Lot 58 is Subarea C has a lot of easements on it and is a big lot that has a sanitary and storm line that goes through it creating a development situation that serves the rest of the site but limits this lot but the buildable area is bigger than the other lots and it is odd and it is out there by itself but it is a buildable lot. She said they did increase the setbacks within Subarea B and have sound proofing incorporated and the landscape along Hayden Run will be augmented. She said they have deferred parking and other items such as driveways to the Final Development Plan. She said they are working through the issues outlined in the Planning Report with regard to the development text and wanted to get feedback from the Commission and move this project forward.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any one from the general public to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Fishman said the Community Plan is laid out as a suggestion for what things should be and it stresses him when there is a development being proposed at the maximum density. He said the railroad is requesting a 200-foot setback because the trains that carry coal and the dust gets on the houses. He said when you build along a track you have to build something creative and it should appear like the rest of Dublin. He said the housing should be away from the railroad tracks, and he thought the open spaces are great and is wonderful to have walkable community as long as there they have a place to go. He said if they are asking for the maximum density it has to be creative to get them to vote for the proposal. He said one car garages in his experience is not appropriate for couples and homes must provide two car garages to avoid having a car parked outside because it is not great visually to have cars sitting around.

Mr. Budde said they had looked at this development in the past and this plan is an improvement over the last and he recognizes that this is a difficult site with the railroad, the extension of Hayden Run and it is disconcerting that the staff analysis continues to say criteria not met and it is very difficult for him to support the application as it is proposed.



Ms. Newell said the elevated roadways are not very attractive and there are a number of properties had a beautiful view until the roadway was constructed to go over railroad tracks and is concerned with how they are going to deal with the roadway in the future. She said they are building too close to appropriated landscape or come up with a nice amenity. She said she is bothered by the railroad track and asked what bases are for the 200-foot setback request. She said when living near a railroad you get used to the noise and with the STC ratings of walls up to 50 and with her experience she uses 60 rating between classrooms to minimize noise from one room to the other and wanted an explanation to how they are coming up with 50.

Mr. Cline said this is new to them and 50 STC is their starting point and if there is a suggestion for a higher rating they could condition the requirement.

Ms. Newell said she is bothered by the continual straight line that is repeated on the site plan and knows it is because of the railroad track and the bikepath equally running parallel and if there was less density on the site they could do something creative with the bikepath and create a better landscape buffer. She said she envisions every driveway will be filled with cars and that is all the residents will be looking at and she does not see this plan being focused on foot traffic. She said the applicant has said they have things to yet work out as the staff report says the same thing she is not prepared to support this application.

Ms. Kramb said she is surprised to see a disapproval recommendation because this has been in twice and the proposal is similar to the last version. She said because the conditions are not written out she could not approve this application today. She said they are not that far away from an approval and the biggest issue is outside influences and the transportation stuff will work itself out and the agreements have to be made with Engineering and is not for the Planning Commission to decide. She said she would like more detail on the phasing and she does not have a big issue with the railroad track or the concrete wall. She said they have done a good job with the bikepaths, but she has concerns related to the access.

Mr. Hardt said he was surprised from the overall recommendation of staff as they had seen this a few times and they made comments and this proposal is largely in line with the last informal review and he is appreciative of the changes made and he does not have objections to the proposal. He said he is concerned with detail issues that need to be worked and he cannot yet vote. He asked about the status of the quiet zone efforts.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said they requested preliminary engineering at Cosgray in 2010 from CSX and just recently received that on that one crossing. She said the zone was related to 5 crossing and they only control 1 of those at Cosgray Road with this rail line. She said they need to complete 2 crossings for Franklin County in that same capacity and they have yet to receive theirs.

Mr. Hardt said they horns will continue.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz said it will take a while and funding to get measures into place with the rail and the Federal Rail Association to get the approval and actually stop the horns.

Mr. Hammersmith said in the capital improvements it has yet to be funded and it will be waiting for the state capital funds and corporation from other jurisdictions to make this happen and it is unlikely it would move forward any time soon.

Mr. Hardt said he sees a couple shapes for the pond and assumes that the image on the plat is what is being proposed and encouraged that version. He said he would want all the engineering issues addressed and with regards to Lot 58 if the house were to be turned sideways to be facing north he would be concerned. He said he is concerned with the long straight road and if they are building a road with traffic calming on day one it should be designed better with curves or with no problems in the beginning. He said in Subarea E he would like provisions made for a future connection to the east for future

development and he feels it is important that all residential developments are connected. He said there seems to be a lot of right-of-way issues and engineering issues of thing to be worked out and if wrapped up and resolved then he could support the overall project.

Mr. Taylor said this plan is essentially the same as 2 years ago and he is fine with the overall layout of the project. He said there are a lot of details that are suggested and this is a step in the right direction. He said most of the technical issues are with engineering. He said in some ways this plan is more walkable with several green spaces and a lot of density which is part of being walkable and a passive park in the center of the community and thought the next step is that the applicant work on the issues with Engineering and come back with a list of conditions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agrees with what has been said and does not have a problem with the application and thought there is a significant amount of work to do and she is concerned with Subarea B and could not support any application without curb and gutters on streets. She is concerned with the fairly narrow streets and no on-street parking and would like to see some parking centrally located to serve Subarea B for the visitors of the residents. She said she is concerned with lot layout with the small lots being back to back and she thought they should be off-set and configured some other way with some staggering. She said the landscape details and the plan need to be to scale and significant landscape plans with details of trees pits and tree wells, labeled trees and make sure to create livable environments. She said the vinyl is being proposed as an option and she would like to close the door so there are no surprises down the road. She said she appreciates the response to their comments and connectivity throughout the community with sidewalks on one side of the road is not bothersome and within her neighborhood there are no sidewalks and only walking trails and serves them well. She said she would like to know why there was a change in the CSX thinking on the setbacks. She said she could support the application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant what they would like to see happen with this application.

Mr. Cline requested a tabling.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor moved to table the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes called for a brief break at 9:15 p.m.

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**FEBRUARY 2, 2012**

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

**3. Avondale Woods  
10-036CP**

**Avery Road  
Concept Plan**

Proposal:	A residential development with approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multiple-family units on a 120-acre site located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road.
Request:	Further review and feedback regarding architecture for a concept plan under the provisions of Code Section 153.050.
Applicant:	Homewood Corporation; represented by Christopher Cline.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

**RESULT:** The Commission informally discussed this request for feedback on a residential development with approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multiple-family units on a 120-acre site located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road. As a secondary review, comments focused on architecture and materials and whether or not the proposal warrants a maximum density of 3 units per acre.

#### COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Chris Amorose Groomes  
Richard Taylor  
Todd Zimmerman  
Warren Fishman  
Amy Kramb  
John Hardt  
Joseph Budde

#### STAFF CERTIFICATION



Claudia D. Husak, AICP  
Planner II

Mr. Taylor said it should remain Sawmill Center.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for other comments as it relates to the proposed area rezoning.

Ms. Kramb said she likes the Planning and Zoning Commission map to recommend to City Council; however, she did not support rezoning any properties until the Vision Plan is updated and until the Commission hears City Council's feedback about the proposed BSC Code. She said rezoning these properties is premature and too expansive given the properties will be reviewed under a brand new code that has not been used.

Mr. Langworthy said the Commission is only making a recommendation to City Council for the proposed rezoning map. He said City Council review the proposed BSC Code first and then they will review the proposed rezonings. He said if City Council identifies issues with the proposed Code they will have the opportunity to table Code and/or the rezoning map.

Mr. Fishman said he tended to agree with Ms. Kramb because he does not think they accommodated every existing business and he worries about the property owner's ability to remodel and expand existing businesses. He said he would support the area rezoning as it is only a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Husak said the motion should refer to the map date and title, and the six properties on North Riverview Street addressed as 17 – 53 North Riverview Street and 40 North Blacksmith Lane be zoned to the BSC Historic Core District.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Taylor made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of the Area Rezoning map dated February 2, 2012 and titled "Proposed BSC Zoning Map Recommended Changes from ARB and PZC Area Rezoning" with one condition:

- 1) That the six parcels on the north side of W. Bridge Street, west of North Riverview Street (addressed 17-53 North Riverview Street and 40 North Blacksmith Lane) be rezoned to the BSC-HC, BSC-Historic Core District.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 1.)

Mr. Langworthy expressed appreciation from the staff and the Administration for all the hard work the Commission has done. He said he has worked with dozens of Planning Commissions over his career and he cannot think of many that have worked as hard as they have to pour their way through this difficult Code. He said we really appreciate the work and effort the Commission has put into it the review of the Code and stated we could not have created this Code without this level input and it is very much appreciated. He said the discussions between Planning and the Commission have made the Code better. He said the staff is very appreciative of all the Commission's efforts.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked him and staff.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are going to take a short break and will resume at 8:00 pm.

### **3. Avondale Woods 10-036CP**

### **Avery Road Concept Plan**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application which involves a request for further review and feedback regarding architecture of a concept plan for a residential development with approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multiple-family units on a 120-acre site located on the west side of Avery Road



approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road. She said concept plan review is the first step in the establishment of a PUD and while no vote is taken, the Commission typically provides non-binding feedback to the applicants that would help them determine what considerations and changes need to be made and whether or not to move forward with a rezoning application.

Claudia Husak presented this application and said as written in the planning report this is the second time this concept plan is before the Commission, it was first reviewed in September of 2010 generally for land use concepts and the Commission suggested that they come back for a further refinement of their plan and include more details regarding the architecture.

Ms. Husak said the site is the very southern tip of Dublin surrounded by Columbus on the west and south side as well as the east side. She explained Avery Road is the closest major road on the eastern portion of the site and the CSX Railroad is a property boundary on the western portion. She said there is a significant tree stand with no other features on site and in the southeastern corner is the area that has been carved out of about 20 acres for the National Church Residences Development that the Commission approved and is now under construction.

Ms. Husak said the Commission had generally agreed that the proposal met the Community Plan for the future land use designation and liked the arrangement of the uses on site. She said the applicant moved the clubhouse to eastern open space and move the center open space to the south and changed the shape.

Ms. Husak said proposed is a development on 120 acres with a maximum total units of 360 which is a density of 3 units per acre and the site plan shows 88 single family units generally laid out in the center of the site with lots surrounding the central open space and there are smaller lots in the 50-foot wide range surrounding that and to the western portion of the site. She said there is also a significant piece of woods called triangle woods proposed to be preserved. Ms. Husak said single family lots are proposed in the northwestern portion of the site adjacent to the large woods proposed to be preserved as well. She said the applicant has moved the community center to the eastern open space that includes the stormwater management for this site and the National Church Residences with a small parking lot for that area.

Ms. Husak said one of the discussion points was regarding the north/south roadway that is a straight layout inviting potential speeding and they had suggested the applicant do something to the design to address the issue to make it less of a straight shot through the development. She said the applicant is proposing to change the roadway from a public road to a private and put a barrier there and it is not an appropriate way to handle the request for redesign.

Ms. Husak said the area that is accessed by the private gated or barriered street is a multiple family unit area proposed of about 20 units all of which are two unit buildings and they think it is a good way to propose development on this portion of the site and relates fairly well to the layout to the cottages proposed for the NCR development and the private street functions as an alley with the garages facing that street and the applicant can work with them to make this a true alley arrangement and include a piece of public street to provide frontage for those units.

Ms. Husak said the other large portion of multiple family development is in the southwestern portion of the site, there are 148 units proposed and the applicant is showing a mix of two, three, and four units buildings. They have worked with staff to create a layout that addresses the park by fronting units toward it and creating interior open spaces that some of the units will front onto and would like to see a 40 foot setback on the southern property line, like is in place for NCR including a bike path and along the railroad line as shown in the Community Plan. She said there was a letter distributed from CSX Railroad opposing residential developments near railroad lines for safety and noise concerns and they are suggesting at least a 100 foot setback incorporated along the rail line. The development shows about 50 feet and there needs to be more for buffering.



Ms. Husak said the applicant is deferring a 10 acre piece on the northeastern portion of the site to determine market conditions and what they are showing now is a max development potential that would get the site up to the 3 units per acre.

Ms. Husak said the focus of this discussion was to focus around the architecture and materials and the applicant has provided architectural elevations for the multifamily development portions and since there are no details for the single family that is one of staffs discussion points of what kind of considerations should be made to the architecture.

Ms. Husak said included is the front and rear elevations of the two, three, and four unit buildings and each appear to be able to be laid out with a front or rear loading garage with porches proposed for the majority of the units with vinyl siding as the primary building material with clad and stone bump out spaces and vinyl shake proposed for some of the roof gables, there are metal roofs on porches, so they have done a nice job with details on the units.

Ms. Husak said there have been a lot of discussion regarding vinyl with the Commission and it is not as high quality of the a material as is used to be used within Dublin and the applicant is here to address that specifically, but the concern is with maintenance, quality, reveal, the shadowing, and the general appearance of vinyl on a project as large as this one with as many units as are proposed and would like some feedback on the Commissions thoughts on this material.

Ms. Husak said the other consideration is with the other materials and colors within the area with the NCR development is rich darker tone colors and this proposal is a lot lighter and more monotone and would like to see a better relationship with the surrounding area in materials and colors.

Ms. Husak said previously the commission was focused on quality of materials and quality of the development being deserving of the 3 units to the acre density which is the max density the Community Plan would allow and would feedback if that has been achieved.

Chris Cline, 300 West Wilson-Bridge Road, Worthington, said they have the whole team to address any questions and there have been a lot of changes since they were here over a year ago. He said a lot has changed in Dublin's expectation for future residential housing with all the turbulence that has taken place and of course with respect to the Bridge Street Corridor and how the different types of housing stock fit into Dublin's future. He said they have readjusted a bit, but generally on the same track for a multi-generational cohesive neighborhood that melts both rental and owned housing products into one family oriented neighborhood and they believe they fit into Dublin's long term plan.

Mr. Cline said they are focused on three major challenges, the change in the residential housing market with fewer qualified buyers in the market, more families needing to live in rental housing and more families choosing to live in rental homes for more flexibility to follow different career options and not be tied to a home that they cannot sell on a short term bases. He said the result is that more families are living for longer periods in rental homes than in the past and therefore, the architecture needs to be responsive to quality of internal space as well as external appearance and the quality of the living experience and the contribution to the community and to the types of people you get to live there is the quality of the internal space as well.

Mr. Cline said the other issues with materials is that there is a need for increased efficiency in energy for the structures, there are new standards coming and the noise from the railroad tracks are a concern and they are looking at sound transmission and how to minimize that experience. He said one option and requested that they keep an open mind as they look at a product that is a composite product that combines insulation and cladding that has a vinyl cladding on top of foam insulation.

Mr. Cline said there is a new product called cedarmax or duramax that is a composite insulating siding and can be mounted in single planks so they do not have the fake look of vinyl. He said the material is available in 16-foot lengths because it is stronger and available in 50 mills. He said that this material is lessens the transmission of sound through the studs and also helps avoid energy loss. He provided pictures of a house in Grandview in this product.

Mr. Cline said that they are not sure what will happen in the northeast section and they would like to leave their options open as they move forward. He the market has become increasingly negative on single family alley products and with snow plowing and trash pickup and security issues, buyers do not like them, so they need to step back from that idea. He said they do commit to get the quality pedestrian oriented environment around the central green with single family homes.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, 43054, said there are many constraining existing conditions with the big woods on the north, the combined sanitary and storm easement just below the woods, the ATT easement in that area, and the water line easement on the south property line and the NCR which is the southeast corner of this site. She said all the drainage comes to the east and will outlet to the east property line into the ponds. She said the road layout with Avondale Woods Boulevard is the set to their eastern connection point to the green being two acres, extended into the multifamily area with the units circling all around it.

Ms. Menerey said the central green is now surrounded by ten 90-foot lots with no alleys and they are proposing shared curb cuts at the street and side-loaded garages toward the back with a limited number of curb cuts around the green. She said the club house is centered in the large green space where the ponds are and it is more visible with parking provided.

Ms. Menerey said that the multifamily area in the lower portion lining the railroad tracks is designed to only have 12 units back up to the tracks. She said their intent is to heavily buffer the area.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Bruck Architects, 309 South Fourth Street, Columbus, 43215, said that these are conceptual plans and materials have not been finalized. He said they were trying to focus on coming up with a plan that will respond effectively to a market that is under served. He said the people that are important to Dublin's future the 25–35 year old group that might be a home buyer in past generations and will take longer today. He showed many versions of floor plans that respond to the people that want to live there and have responded to their needs with a basement for utilities and will live like a single family home with an open plan with circulation to the rear and the garage is pulled back within seven feet of the front façade which allows for a nice porch. He said the proposed layouts allow for privacy and will not require fences for separating outdoor living space by way of placement of elements and general layout of rear elevations.

Mr. Sullivan said they are trying to develop something that is very pleasing in proportion in all the pieces and all the front doors are visible and there is a sense of ownership in the front door space, the windows will have window wraps and a fair amount of masonry and pick key points to where there is a stone house and see it three dimensionally and mix colors and materials to get a very pleasing character as you go down the street.

Mr. Sullivan said he is aware of the material issues and they would really like to have the clad board siding which is an appropriate material within the context of their region. He said vinyl siding is a very general term and is grouped into one type. He said that there are bad siding installations that fade and blow off of buildings. He said the proposed material is a insulation backed material and very rigid and provides a insulating quality. He showed a picture of a building in Grandview that is an example of the product he is referring to, the product has a lifetime warranty and is colorfast and will not fade and is available in a lot of color options. He asked that this be a consideration of one of the products that they can look at as an option to housing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone in the general public that would like to speak to this application.

David Patch, 6940 Rings Road, Amlin Ohio, said he does not want to address the architectural issues and just found out about this project and talked with Ms. Husak earlier, he said he owns the parcel on the northwest corner of this site and wanted to let them know he had never been contacted by the applicant and as a good neighbor it would have been nice if they had some discussion with them. He asked if they had intentions of putting fences along the woods or down near the road so that people are not coming onto his property or getting hurt. He said they have mentioned that the area is wet and he agreed it is. He said if their field floods it would be because the tiles have been damaged by this development. He asked to view the potential roadway connecting near his property.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone else that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes closed it off for discussion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked that they address the neighbor's questions first.

Ms. Husak said at this point they are proposing the east-west road to stub at Mr. Patch's property line. The mounding and fencing are not finalized and could consider them as this goes forward and the details would be required at the next stage of this application.

Aaron Stanford said what they would do with sewer and water is to extend utilities to serve areas that they are developing and typically extend utilities to the extent of the property boundaries of this development, they would look for opportunities to stub sanitary and water to areas that are backing to other lots so that they will provide stubs through certain lots to provide access to adjacent parcels.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the CSX request for a 100-foot setback and if there is a legal issue. Ms. Readler said they are asking for the setback and they could look to see if there are railroad standards or considerations.

Mr. Zimmerman said he is not a fan for the vinyl material used for the siding and when they look at the NCR project and they should blend with the architecture of the area in colors and materials. He said the max density of 3 units to the acre has to be earned through design characteristics and they are not there yet.

Mr. Fishman agreed with Mr. Zimmerman and said this project is very dense at 3 units per acre and if they are going to use vinyl siding they are not earning the density, they should be mandated to use a percentage of masonry and a more substantial high quality material and they need to set a trend for this area and keep the standards of Dublin. He said the letter on the 100-foot setback at the rail road track made sense to him because it is his experience that the noise and vibration from the tracks can be felt at 250 feet from the tracks. He thought they need to look at a minimum of 100 feet or maybe more and make sure it is mounded or something to limit the noise and vibrations. He thought layout needs to be tweaked and agreed with staff on the street layout and they need to do something creative with the railroad track.

Mr. Budde said he agrees that the vinyl does not catch his eye and does not meet the quality standards. He said the railroad track and a bike path along with the 50-foot lots are areas of concern. He was concerned with the layout and the number of units in the southern portion and wondered what the development potential was on a 50-foot lot.



Ms. Kramb said they are moving in the right direction by moving the clubhouse in a good location. She liked better from the original plan how the north south road curved over to the green. She said she likes the arrangement of the double duplex units on the new plan better. She said in order to accommodate the curve in the road and the new plan for the apartments they would lose those top three buildings on the new plan, but she likes the curve idea better. She disagreed with the Planning recommendation with making it curve roadway up to the north by the woods and disagreed with any traffic circles or anything there. She is okay with the northeast corner and waiting to see what happens.

Ms. Kramb said the architecture should not take too much from the NCR development because she is not satisfied with that one and not comfortable with vinyl but once they see more details. She suggested that they pick an architectural theme and stick to it and use its cues for the single family portion as well. She was worried that as proposed the architecture would quickly look boring considering the number of units.

Mr. Hardt appreciated the applicant's desire to leave the northeast portion of the site open to address changing market conditions. He agrees with staff comments regarding connectivity and bikepaths both along the railroad tracks and along the triangle woods and other places and he felt that there cannot have too much connectivity. He shared Mr. Kramb's thought on the road that previously came off the Village Green and curved to the north east and along the woods seemed like a better solution because that that will connect to Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and having the residents of this development wind their way through residential streets to head up that northern road is a mistake.

Mr. Hardt said the previous layout with the possibility of a small traffic round-about or some solution that allows for easy traffic movement out of this neighborhood and to the north that also keeps speeds at a minimum is something he would be interested in seeing. He agreed with the staff comment that the intersection as proposed is awkward and needs to be solved. He asked the applicant to continue to show the parking associated with the woods to the north also on sales materials and marketing brochures and would like it to be clear that it will happen. He said the architecture generally is needed to have a variety and bolder colors, not bright, but something in the craftsman style. He said he is not usually in favor of vinyl but is willing to have an open mind and look at the example site and get the address to staff to be distributed to the Commission and he will make an effort to go and look at it.

Mr. Taylor said he agrees with the comments regarding the road to the north, the original conversation was about the connectivity of that and it is lost in this plan, the solution needs to be restored. He thanked them for moving the clubhouse. He said he has no concern that the architecture matches the NCR. He said density issue is deferred to Mr. Fishman's comments. He said he is not willing to close the door on the vinyl siding, but is not sold on the product presented yet, but will do a site visit. He agreed with Mr. Hardt that they should not be afraid to introduce color here. He said what is important to him is the quality of the material of the vinyl and the quality is how it is handled in the trim and they need to have nice trim. He said these buildings are nice buildings for what they are and the massing is nice and arrangements of the fenestration are nice. He said the details are not bad and somehow they got painted with the same color brush and took all the fun out of them and wanted them to restore the variety and the fun with some colors. He said the materials is not his preferred stone pattern and a ledge stone might be a better application or something with more texture to it than what is shown. He said they have done what they have asked them to do for the most part and is okay with seeing it next time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she appreciates the relocation of the clubhouse and echoed the comments about the road relocation. She said she is not necessarily thrilled with the new roadway treatment. She said she would like to see connectivity along the railroad tracks and significant buffering from the tracks to the buildings. She said it seems really close and would like to know how far the buildings are from the track. She said she likes the architecture and would like to see colors more attractive. She said she is not in favor of vinyl siding, but advised the applicant that they do not need to take any cues from NCR. She said the single family portion they normally do not get see and there may be some leeway as long as it

meets the code requirements. She is concerned about the garages and the size limitations to allow for family sized trash. She said she likes the garage doors and they will be vital to this development and they will need a really sharp garage door because it makes up such a large percentage of what they see.

Mr. Sullivan said they show all the garage doors were shown white because Dublin requires garage doors to match the trim, he would like dark garage doors and could liven this up with a lot of colors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they had a stained grade fiberglass front door and a matching garage door of a rich color it would be fantastic.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there is a code on the garage door and trim being white match blend.

Ms. Husak said there was not.

Mr. Sullivan said code says that the garage door is supposed to match the trim.

Mr. Langworthy asked for which Code he is referring.

Mr. Sullivan said the Appearance Code.

Mr. Langworthy indicated that is for single family homes and not multifamily buildings.

Ms. Husak said the PUD gives them flexibility.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission is okay with a variety of colors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said since there is no vote and that they do have their comments they look forward to seeing them back.

**4. Nationwide Children's Hospital  
Perimeter Center Planned District  
Subareas C, D, and M  
11-066Z/PDP/FDP**

**5675 and 5680 Venture Drive  
5700 Perimeter Drive  
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan  
Final Development Plan**

The rezoning with preliminary development plan/final development plan application was postponed prior to the meeting. Notification was mailed to adjacent property owners.

**5. Nationwide Children's Hospital  
Ohio Health Planned District  
11-067Z/PDP/FDP**

**7450 Hospital Drive  
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan  
Final Development Plan**

The rezoning with preliminary development plan/final development plan application was postponed prior to the meeting. Notification was mailed to adjacent property owners.

**6. Shoppes at River Ridge – Center Identification Signs  
12-007CDDS**

**4305-4335 W. Dublin-Granville Road  
Corridor Development District Sign Review**



**CITY OF DUBLIN**

Land Use and  
Long Range Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: [www.dublin.oh.us](http://www.dublin.oh.us)

*Creating a Community*

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**SEPTEMBER 2, 2010**

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

**2. Avondale Woods  
10-036CP**

**5215 Avery Road  
Concept Plan**

Proposal: A residential development with approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multiple-family units on a 120-acre site located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road.

Request: Review and feedback for a concept plan under the provisions of Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Homewood Corporation; represented by Christopher Cline.

Planning Contact: Rachel S. Ray, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4656, [rray@dublin.oh.us](mailto:rray@dublin.oh.us)

**RESULT:** The Commission reviewed this proposal for up to 360 single- and multiple-family dwelling units on a 120-acre development site located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road. The Commissioners determined that the proposal is generally consistent with the recommendations of the Community Plan. The Commissioners discussed the fact that this site is surrounded on three sides by the City of Columbus and the planned traffic improvements and the land use plans for this area may have significant effects on this site. The Commission also commented on the land use arrangements and road network, and recommended that the applicant provide for internal pedestrian and bicycle routes with connections to other external routes. The Commission also asked about this development's relationship to the National Church Residences senior housing community (on the 20 acres at the southeast corner of the parcel), and that the applicant should be prepared to discuss architectural themes, building materials, and additional development details at the next review.

#### STAFF CERTIFICATION

  
Rachel S. Ray  
Planner I

12-084Z/PDP/PP  
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat  
Avondale Woods  
Avery Road



direction than just 'reduce asphalt.' She said if they want green created they need to know what kind of long term objectives they want in that greenspace.

**2. Avondale Woods  
10-036CP**

**5215 Avery Road  
Concept Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for review and approval of a Concept Plan for a residential development with approximately 130 single-family lots and 230 multiple-family units on a 120-acre site located on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road. She explained that the concept plan is the first step in the establishment of a PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and while no vote is taken, the Commission typically provides feedback that may help applicants determine what considerations and changes need to be made and whether or not to move forward with a rezoning/preliminary development plan application.

Rachel Ray presented this concept plan for a parcel surrounded on three sides by future development in the City of Columbus. She said there were many development constraints surrounding this parcel and the potential for intensive commercial development in the area, and as one of the last remaining large residential tracts in Dublin, Planning feels there are many special considerations with this application. She briefly explained the background for this proposal and explained the process. She said the 140-acre parcel was the southernmost parcel in the City of Dublin. She said the CSX railroad line runs along a portion of the western site boundary, and there are large tracts of undeveloped land and some large residential lots surrounding the site. She said the site is currently zoned R, Rural District, although a portion is zoned PUD as part of the National Church Residences (NCR) development. She said the Future Land Use Map, as part of the Community Plan designates the site as *Mixed Residential Low Density*, which is intended to provide a mix of housing options and a transition from the existing single-family neighborhoods in Dublin north of the site to what could be more intensive development in the City of Columbus to the south. She said the recommended maximum density for this Land Use classification is three dwelling units per acre, or a total of 420 dwelling units for the parcel.

Ms. Ray explained that the parcel includes 20 acres that were included as part of the NCR development at the southeast corner of the site which takes up a majority of the parcel's frontage on Avery Road. She said the NCR preliminary development plan includes a 200-unit senior housing development on a total of 17 acres with 2.6 acres of right-of-way dedication resulting in a net density of 11.8 dwelling units per acre. Ms. Ray said at the April 2009 rezoning hearing at City Council the property owner raised concerns that the NCR Development would potentially limit the development capacity for the remainder of this parcel. She explained that City Council agreed to consider the density of the NCR site separately from any future development proposal for the remainder of the parcel, agreeing to consider a maximum of three dwelling units per acre or a total of 360 dwelling units on the remaining 120 acres based on the merits of the proposal. She said this proposal is for the remaining 120 acres of the 140-acre parcel.

Ms. Ray explained that a typical concept plan review includes a review by the Commission for non-binding feedback on the initial proposal, which may be reviewed by City Council. She said the next step would then be rezoning and preliminary development plan. She said Planning has recommended that the applicant consider a two-step concept plan review with all the land use

issues in the vicinity in addition to internal site issues. She stated that Planning recommended that after an initial concept plan review the applicant return with more details such as architectural themes and roadway character.

Ms. Ray reiterated that north of this site is the City of Dublin and farther south is the City of Hilliard, but the transitional area between is land designated as future development within the City of Columbus as part of the Draft Hayden Run Corridor Plan. She pointed out that the City of Columbus recently received a rezoning application for the parcel on the east side of Avery Road for a commercial retail development, despite being inconsistent with the office-oriented land uses designated in the draft plan. She said Columbus also plans to widen Avery Road, which is currently a two-lane roadway, to a six-lane roadway. She added that a portion of the Britton-Cosgray Connector has been constructed to the west of the CSX railroad, but it will eventually cross either over or under the tracks, coming back to grade at Avery Road, and then connecting to Britton Parkway farther east.

Ms. Ray said the site is located within the Southwest Area Plan of the Dublin Community Plan, which identifies coordination of land uses as a major planning consideration for this area given its location in a transitional area between Dublin, Columbus, and Hilliard. She said the Plan also recommends that site development consider the preservation of the wooded areas that are present on this property and a few adjacent lots. She explained the Plan also recommends balancing higher and lower density residential developments.

Ms. Ray described the existing site, including the wooded areas and utility easements.

John Hardt asked if the easements currently contained utilities, or if they were for future use. Ms. Ray confirmed that they contained existing utilities.

Ms. Ray explained that Avondale Boulevard will be constructed initially with the NCR development to provide access to the site from Avery Road, and is planned to be continued through the site. She said a future access point is proposed to the north up to Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, and a stub road will allow future access to the west. She said that Avondale Boulevard has the potential to become a signature entry into this neighborhood, but the applicant will need to conduct a traffic study as part of the rezoning and preliminary development plan to determine the improvements needed at the Avery Road intersection and ultimately the design of that road to accommodate the number of units proposed.

Ms. Ray said Planning is concerned that the north/south connector road shown might be too direct and may encourage speeding or cut-through traffic. She said Planning recommended breaking up the roadway in that portion of the site to help slow traffic, but otherwise, the road network will allow a great deal of connectivity among the different portions of the development. Ms. Ray added that an extensive bicycle and pedestrian network is shown throughout the site, but Planning recommends the provision of a bikepath along the railroad tracks for greater regional bicycle connectivity and consistency with the Community Plan.

Ms. Ray noted that adjacent to the NCR site, the applicant is showing multiple-family residences to assist with buffering the remainder of the site from the railroad tracks and the future roadway to the south. She pointed out that multiple-family units are also shown north of Avondale Boulevard to transition from the NCR site. She explained that smaller, single-family lots are

shown along the Triangle Woods and in the northeast corner of the site. She said that medium-sized 55-foot to 65-foot lots are shown with larger lots south of Avondale Woods.

Ms. Ray explained that at this stage of the process, the applicant has not finalized their phasing plans; however, the Fire Department has indicated that with Avondale Boulevard being boulevarded as part of the NCR development, if the boulevard is extended west to the center green, the Fire Department could serve all of the residential development south of Avondale Woods. She stated that the northeast portion of the residential development would need to have a secondary access in order to be served. Ms. Ray said that Planning has suggested that the applicant consider a potential secondary access east to provide secondary access to Avery Road.

Ms. Ray said approximately 37 acres of open space have been provided, including the wooded areas. She pointed out that the central green located at the terminus of the roadway into the site has the potential to become a centerpiece for this development. She said the applicant was proposing a recreation center in the central green for use by the entire development to help tie the neighborhood together. She said that Planning has recommended that the applicant consider providing on street parking around the central green and also to consider rear loading the lots fronting the green to assist with creating a real pedestrian-oriented environment and help enclose the central park space.

Ms. Ray said this proposal preserves many of the natural features on this site and is sensitive to the development context. She said that it was Planning's opinion that the general site layout can be conducive to the creation of a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood with some of the modifications discussed in the Planning Report to meet the Land Use Principles. She said some of Planning's suggestions have included creating pedestrian-oriented streets that break up the north/south road to reduce traffic speeds, and including on street parking to help enhance the pedestrian environment and to provide additional parking for this development.

Ms. Ray said while architecture has not been provided at this time, using consistent architectural themes, materials, and potentially matching site amenities can help reinforce that this is a connected, multi-generational neighborhood. She said recessed garages and/or rear loading units as well as front porches and reduced side and front yard setbacks, particularly in front of the center green space, and having sidewalks that connect the front doors to the sidewalks will assist in meeting the Land Use Principles.

Ms. Ray said it was Planning's opinion that at this stage, the applicant is proceeding in the right direction. She explained that Planning had suggested that the applicant approach this proposal in terms of looking at the general land use, subarea distribution, and the street network, and to focus on the external site constraints and internal site considerations before moving forward. She stated that Planning recommended that this application return to the Commission for a second concept plan review with more details.

Ms. Ray concluded that Planning had prepared discussion points for the Commission to provide feedback:

1. *Are the proposed land use relationships consistent with the Community Plan?*
2. *Are the land uses arranged in a manner that helps unify the site into well-related neighborhoods?*



3. *Are the proposed street and bikepath networks conducive to internal circulation and the creation of an interconnected, pedestrian-oriented development?*
4. *Since the timing of the Tuttle Crossing extension is unknown, and therefore a second access point serving the site could be some time away, to what extent should the site be developed without a second access point?*
5. *Should the units fronting the central green space be alley-loaded to eliminate driveways and garages from fronting on the central green?*
6. *Should the units fronting the central green space be alley-loaded to eliminate driveways and garages from fronting on the central green?*
7. *What design characteristics should be applied for the site to meet the Land Use principles and justify three dwelling units per acre density?*

Christopher Cline, Blaugrund & Herbert Incorporated, representing the applicant, Homewood Corporation, said that they feel their proposal responds very well to the Community Plan. He said that the most unique aspect of this site and proposal is that it is truly a self-contained neighborhood. He reiterated that the surrounding area could result in intensive commercial development, creating a number of barriers for this site. He stated that they believe that the site is well insulated from those influences and will not detract from the quality of their development. He said these barriers will cause this development to be a neighborhood within itself. He said this concept is for one neighborhood with a number of types of housing from rental multiple-family units to owner-occupied multiple-family and single-family homes of different sizes. Mr. Cline noted that this diversity will attract different types of people at different life stages.

Mr. Cline explained that they believe the village green will become a gathering place in the center of the site, with a shared clubhouse and pool which will be an amenity owned by the resident associations. He said the interlinked walking and bike trails will also contribute to the neighborhood feel. Mr. Cline described this proposal as a walkable neighborhood where people feel comfortable walking, with houses close to the street, and with front porches and walkways that go directly to the front door. He said they would be producing all new housing products for both the multiple-family and single-family units on the site.

Mr. Cline said the NCR project helps incorporate the multi-generational theme into this neighborhood. He said the amount of interface with the NCR project is unknown at this time, but it is going to have a presence. Mr. Cline explained their vision for this development as a multi-generational neighborhood.

Mr. Cline addressed the issues raised specifically by Planning. He referred to the photograph showing the surrounding land. He indicated that it would probably be seven years before they would be ready to develop the northern portion of the development based on current market conditions. He said they might consider using the 13-acre parcel to the east currently in the City of Columbus for a second access point required by the fire department at that point.

Mr. Cline referred to the suggestion in the Planning Report that the houses located around the village green should not have driveways in the front. He said that would require a new housing product with an alley, which is not common in Dublin or many other suburban developments; however, they understood Planning's recommendation and desired the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested clarification regarding Planning's comment about the garages. She asked if Planning did not want to see driveways around the central green at all, or if it was just the garage doors that were the issue.

Ms. Ray explained that Planning recommended that the driveways be eliminated entirely, which would eliminate sidewalk interruptions around the green and allow for on-street parking.

Mr. Cline said they could commit to doing that. He said they had put together a product that will fit on the lot that can work, but said that their preference was that only the homes that front on the park would be alley-loaded. Mr. Cline added that they would like to avoid having parking right in front of the houses, but would allow it around the central green.

Mr. Cline said the design characteristics are not being discussed tonight, but they were planning to provide consistent architectural themes, a consistent color palette, and certain elements that could be repeated throughout the development. He reiterated that they are designing a new product for this project.

Mr. Cline said the northern residential area is shown with 50-foot to 60-foot lots. He said that they probably would be asking the Commission for some flexibility on that part of the site as they proceed to the preliminary development plan because it is harder to forecast what housing product will make the most sense in that part of the site when they are ready to develop there.

Mr. Cline said regarding the bikepath along the railroad, they were not necessarily opposed to it, but it may not go anywhere because it may run into a roadblock at the railroad and future roadway. He said they think the road is going to go under the railroad tracks, but if it goes over the tracks, the bikepath would not be able to pass through. He pointed out that whether or not the bikepath would continue through or not is not in Dublin's control.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said when they began working on this site nine years ago, the large sanitary and stormwater easements were not there yet, but they came to the point where they had to commit and find a location given the development in Columbus to the east. She explained that the AT&T easement could be moved with coordination. She said with the approval of NCR, that stormwater needs to get into the storm system. She pointed out the two ponds on the east side of the site with the sanitary sewer easement through them and explained that both were likely necessary to accommodate stormwater on either side. She said NCR will have an easement that needs to come along the small woods there. Ms. Menerey explained that they started with a 140-acre parcel, and after taking out NCR, the woods, easements, and other things, they were left with little pieces to develop.

Ms. Menerey said that as this concept plan has evolved over the years, they have received a lot of input. She recalled that they were initially dealing with conservation design, and provided plans with more and less density, and then this plan has been through several renditions, but they were all comfortable at this point.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak with respect to this application. [There was no one.]

Richard Taylor thanked Planning for breaking this application into parts. He said handling it in phases would make it easier for the Commission to deal with and to measure their progress. He said he liked where the plan was headed. He noted that when they went through the NCR approval process, the Commission discussed the amount of traffic that Avondale Boulevard would have to support. He recalled that they specifically discussed what would happen when the entire parcel develops, and that is a subject that still needs to be addressed. Mr. Taylor said as this development phases in, the traffic will increase. He asked about the NCR project's status.

Ms. Ray reported that NCR received their grant funding award this past summer and they intend to proceed with filing the final development plan this fall.

Mr. Taylor asked about the character of the intersection planned at Avondale and Avery Road. Ms. Ray said at this point, it would just have a stop sign for the NCR development. She said the phased improvements for this development still needed to be determined but will likely include signalization.

Mr. Taylor said assuming that Avery Road is not six lanes before either of these developments happen, and assuming that NCR is in place and then the new project comes along, that is going to become a significant intersection. He said he was glad to hear that a second access is going to be considered as part of this proposal in the future.

Mr. Taylor said he liked the concept of the traditional small town that the applicant mentioned in the narrative they submitted because the site is so hemmed in. He thought it would help give the development an identity of its own, and that is a good thing. Mr. Taylor said typically in small towns, the larger houses face the central green, and the houses get smaller as the village moves farther from the center. He noted that is the opposite here, and he wondered if putting houses with rear loading garages around the central green was something that would be more acceptable on larger lots with larger homes as opposed to smaller lots. He said a garage size is not going to change a whole lot from a bigger house to a smaller one, but it is going to occupy a much larger percentage of the property on a smaller lot. He said as much as he liked the looks of houses with rear loading garages from the front and as much as he agreed that it would help give the appearance of walkability, people will still come and go from their cars in their garages, and 99 percent of the time, people will come down the alley, drive into their garage and enter their houses that way. He said that this neighborhood will have to have something to pull people out onto their front porches, potentially by doing something special with the bikepaths, wide sidewalks, benches, and lots of things going on in the park.

Mr. Taylor said regarding the park, he was not crazy about the idea of putting the clubhouse and the pool in the park. He said visually, it would become a barrier across the park itself and prevents residents from seeing across that central area. He said it also becomes a very active and noisy space, and may be very well-lit during the evening hours. He said a passive park would be something that might be used more for many different things. Mr. Taylor suggested moving one of the retention ponds to the central park, or at least provide a pond there, and relocate the clubhouse and pool to where the ponds are now shown. He said another reason for this is that a clubhouse and pool might be better at the edge to back up to future commercial uses than parkland, which will involve an abrupt change from what may be the back of offices, parking, and dumpsters.



Mr. Taylor asked if the Avondale Woods Park would be a neighborhood or community park. Ms. Ray said that she did not think that had been determined, but it will be dedicated to the City as parkland.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see that addressed. He mentioned Amberleigh Park, which is technically a community park, but built in a neighborhood. He recalled heated discussions from the neighbors at that time about bringing traffic into the neighborhood to access the park. He thought it *should* be a community park, but he asked that it be made easily accessible without having to drive through the neighborhood to get to it.

Amy Kramb said she did not like the idea of putting the clubhouse and pool in the central green because when driving in, it would look like every other apartment community. She suggested it be relocated to the far southwest corner. She said the green space should be open with benches and maybe a fountain and be somewhere where children can play, because with smaller lots and smaller yards, the central green can become their yard. Ms. Kramb said she liked the on-street parking in that area, at least on the side of the street closest to the park. She said she would like to see the far east bikepaths connected, and she pointed out that the bikepaths seemed to stop on the main road, and she thought there should be a wide sidewalk or bikepath the entire length of the road. She agreed with Mr. Taylor about the park traffic not entering through the neighborhood. Ms. Kramb said the rear-loaded garages were a great idea, but more details would be needed as to where the driveways and garages would be located.

Ms. Kramb said her answers to Discussion Points 1, 2, and 3 were all “yes.” She said when the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension is complete; anyone entering the neighborhood coming off I-270 is going to come from Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. She said it needs to be designed as a primary road for this development and built to discourage speeding.

Warren Fishman said currently, there is nothing in the area, so it is important that this development sets the right tone for the area. He said he was very interested in knowing what materials are planned. He said there would be a huge difference in this community since it is dense if it was built with vinyl siding and fiberboard trim versus stone, stucco, brick or masonry materials. He thought that NCR was an asset, and if played on correctly, this could be a lovely community. Mr. Fishman said this was Dublin’s southern border and Columbus and Hilliard will look at it closely. He agreed that the clubhouse and pool should not be located in central area.

Mr. Fishman referred to the City Council minutes which said they would consider a maximum of three units per acre, and he noted that that was what is currently presented. He did not think three units per acre were necessary. He said he was leery of 50-foot and 60-foot lots unless the homes were high quality with stone, masonry, and high-quality landscaping. He pointed out that condominiums do not necessarily stay condominiums, so he thought quality was critical.

Todd Zimmerman said regarding Discussion Point 1, that there is a section in the Community Plan that talks about bringing people together at different ages in different housing types, and he thought that because this site will be effectively land-locked; this is a good site for a multi-generational housing development.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the NCR project was meant to be part of this community or if it would be totally separate. Ms. Ray said Planning had recommended that they take into consideration

some of the design characteristics of NCR and find ways to make connections. She said they also discussed pedestrian connections between the two developments.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested finding a way for the NCR residents to use the community pool and clubhouse. He said the connectivity of the streets and the bikeways were important because this is going to be a clustered community.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to Discussion Point 4 regarding the second access point. He said he did not think the focus should be on *when* the area to the north is developed, but a happy medium needs to be reached.

Mr. Zimmerman said regarding the design characteristics, three dwelling units per acre is the maximum density recommended by the Community Plan, and to get to that level, there has to be real quality materials and architecture.

John Hardt said he agreed with the other Commissioners' comments. He thought this plan was heading in the right direction as well. He said he thought the Planning Report was on the mark, and he agreed that taking the clubhouse and pool out of the central green was a better option, but he did not want to see it end up within any specific residential area because he did not want it to feel like it 'belonged' to that area. He thought it needed to land in one of the park spaces to remain a community amenity. He agreed with the comments made about the secondary access and said he was willing to allow the details to be resolved in the future when more is known about what is going on to the east, as long as there is a commitment that that secondary entrance will happen in some form or fashion.

Mr. Hardt said he had favorable opinions of all of the discussion points, with the exception of Point 3, which he thought the answer was 'yes.' He said what the roads and sidewalks are not all that conducive to is external circulation. He said he realized that this will be a hemmed in community and that there is nowhere to go to the west, and Dublin does not control what happens on the east. He agreed that there is going to be significant commercial development to the east along Avery Road, probably retail, but he said that there is no bigger shame than to live two blocks away from a retail center and not be able to walk to it. Mr. Hardt said that some kind of provision to get pedestrian access in that direction would be very well received. He felt the same way about the land to the south.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see the applicant come back with a materials palette to earn the maximum three dwelling unit per acre density. She said the Commission has held NCR to a very high standard, and she expects the same from this development. However, she said she would like to hold the specific material palette discussion for the zoning conversation regarding density. Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission would like to communicate very clearly that the standard is going to be very high, particularly if they get to the three-unit maximum density.

Ms. Amorose Groomes addressed the discussion points. She said she thought the land use is completely appropriate. Ms. Amorose Groomes said in terms of the location of the pool and clubhouse area, she was in full agreement with the other Commissioners. She referred to Discussion Point 4 and said regarding the secondary access point, the reason she felt that the Commission needed to know where it was going to be was because they had to decide what the Avondale Woods Park is going to be before anyone moves into the development. Ms. Amorose

Groomes said she felt it was vitally important to know what is going to happen with this park prior to committing to anything on any portion of this parcel.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see the units facing the central park be rear loaded, but she has not yet seen a well-done alley. She said detached garages, as Ms. Kramb mentioned, would be a great way to do that, but with the narrow lots, it will be virtually impossible to have a rear-loaded garage with a driveway to the street. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would be interested in seeing the marketability of a home with a detached garage. She said they will have to come up with a creative solution if the lots remain that narrow.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought the design characteristics will have to be tremendous to justify three dwelling units per acre. She was not particularly in favor of having two separate ponds, but she understood why it was there. She said it was unfortunate to eat up that amount of land with two ponds, but did not know if there were any creative solutions. She said she would like to see some other options explored.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Commission had provided enough direction at this point.

Jim Lipnos, President of the Homewood Corporation, said they were willing to consider everything that had been discussed. He said they did not come prepared to discuss architecture, but they understood what the expectations were and will come prepared next time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked everyone for their time and said she hoped to see the applicants return with this proposal in the near future.

### **3. Multi-Modal Transportation Study 10-034ADM**

#### **Administrative Review**

Jonathan Papp presented a project update on the Multi-Modal Transportation Study that had been going on for a little more than a year and should be wrapped up by the end of this year. He quoted Fred Kent, President of Project for Public Spaces: *If you plan cities for cars and traffic, you get cars and traffic. If you plan for people and places, you get people and places.* He said he thought it was a great quote to begin a Multi-Modal project because we have great people and great places in the City, it was just a matter of getting people to and from those places efficiently and in environmentally-friendly ways.

Mr. Papp explained that a multi-modal study was a coordinated evaluation of transportation modes that currently exist or may be introduced into a city to assure that they all function as one system. He said several plans already exist in Dublin that have looked at different transportation modes, one of them being the Community Plan which includes the Thoroughfare Plan for the automobile and the Bikeway Plan for bike and pedestrian improvements. Mr. Papp said other studies recently completed were the Alta Bicycle Facilities Analyses and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. He said that the intent of this study is to further refine all these plans. He said this study also works from one of City Council's goals, which was to evaluate multiple modes of transportation such as bike lanes and public transportation as a possible implementation for future CIP projects.



## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

April 6, 2009

Page 4

Held

20

### Ordinance 13-09

**Rezoning of Approximately 19.62 Acres, More or Less, Located on the West Side of Avery Road, Approximately 4,000 Feet South of Rings Road, from R, Rural District, to PUD, Planned Unit Development District.** (National Church Residences at Avondale Woods – Case 09-007Z)

Ms. Swisher stated that at the hearing on March 16, Council requested clarification regarding the project's compliance with the Community Plan. The Homewood Corporation, owner of the 140 acres of which the 20-acre site is a part of, raised concerns about the development potential of the remaining 120 acres. Homewood has requested that Council consider the residual 120 acres at the Community Plan's maximum recommended density of three dwelling units per acre.

As outlined in the staff report, at the Plan's recommended density of three dwelling units per acre, this would result in a total of 420 dwelling units over the entire parcel. Excluding the NCR development site results in 360 dwelling units on that residual 120 acres. The effect of the three dwelling units per acre is that there are an additional 20 acres at three units per acre, resulting in a total of 60 dwelling units net increase. The impact of this requested density brings the density of the overall 140 acre parcel to four dwelling units per acre. While the NCR project density would not separately comply with the Plan at its proposed density, Planning believes there are unique characteristics associated with this development that justify this deviation:

- The Southwest Area Plan, as displayed, shows that it meets the general intent of the Plan, with greater density shown in the southeastern quadrant – the location of the NCR development.
- The Southwest Area Plan also includes a general note that additional senior housing options and alternatives are recommended in appropriate locations.
- Senior housing typically generates lower volumes of traffic than typical multi-family or single-family developments.
- Planning believes that this proposed land use would serve as a suitable land use buffer between Avery Road and the development on the remainder of that parcel.

Planning therefore supports Council's consideration of maintaining the Community Plan's maximum recommended density of three dwelling units per acre over the residual of that acreage. However, because that acreage is not part of this or any other rezoning proposal at this time, any future development would be evaluated on its merits, guided in part by the Community Plan. Any action Council takes tonight regarding the NCR development would be specific to that development. Approval does not commit or limit a future Commission to a specific zoning action on the remainder of that parcel.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher stated that at the last meeting, it was reported that Homewood Corporation would not sell the property to NCR, if the City did not agree to this pre-zoning density issue. What is the status of the sale of the property?

Ms. Swisher responded that she understands that NCR has moved forward with obtaining a land option from the owner. This has apparently been worked out between the parties.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher clarified that before Council tonight for rezoning is only the acreage related to the NCR development – not the entire parcel owned by Homewood.

Ms. Swisher responded that is correct.

Mr. Foegler added that the one item Homewood wanted clarification about was that by approval of this rezoning, Council was not as a matter of policy incorporating an offset and therefore a net reduction in the residual amount of housing left on the property. This has been addressed in the staff report.

Vice Mayor Boring added that on the reverse side, approval of the NCR rezoning application does not indicate to Homewood that the City is going to approve amending the Community Plan to four dwelling units per acre density for this property.

Ms. Swisher confirmed that is correct.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher asked Ms. Swisher to review the NCR proposal for the site.

She reviewed the details of the development, as shared at the meeting of March 16.

- The 20-acre site is part of a 140-acre parcel, as previously described. The site is located 4,000 feet south of Rings Road, in the southernmost portion of the City.

**10-036CP**  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

April 6, 2009

Page 5

Held

20

The City's corporation limits run along the site's eastern and southern boundaries, with frontage on Avery Road. There are parcels within Washington Township as well as the City of Columbus to the south and east of that development.

- The Community Plan specifies the overall parcel as mixed residential, low density – three dwelling units over that entire 140 acre parcel, with objectives of providing a mix of housing options and greater housing choices.
- There are a number of near future transportation improvements planned in this area, including the widening of Avery Road, extension of Tuttle Crossing, and a Britton/Cosgray connector, currently under construction by the City of Columbus, which will pass immediately to the south of this site.
- The Southwest Area Plan showed different densities of housing recommended for the overall 140 acres.
- The proposed preliminary development plan includes a single-story community center in the center of the site, fronted by two three-story residential buildings – containing a total of 100 dwelling units.
- To the south of the main building is a  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre outdoor recreational area with a variety of amenities.
- Around the perimeter of the site are 30 single-story cottage units, containing from 3-4 dwelling units each. They are intended to act as a buffer to the three-story building from future lower density residential developments to the north and west.
- She shared the proposed north and south elevations of the three-story buildings, constructed primarily of brick and stone with some architectural detail and changes to the roof and chimney lines. She also shared east and west elevations of the same building as viewed from Avery Road. There are three different styles of cottages – all intended to coordinate with the three-story buildings -- and utilizing brick and stone materials.
- The applicant has submitted a traffic impact study which has recently been approved by the City of Columbus, as this portion of Avery Road is within their jurisdiction as well as the City of Dublin's. It shows that turn lanes will be necessary from both northbound and southbound directions.
- Access to the site is provided by a proposed connector roadway along the northern boundary of the development. It consists of three lanes, tapering down to two, with two access points into the development off of the roadway. An internal roadway circulates throughout the site around a three-story building, with groups of parking spaces located in offset groups for safety and maneuverability by the residents.
- The Community Plan recommends a Dublin model roadway character, which is typical of mounding and varying bikepaths along that frontage. The applicant also shows a dry creek bed detention system along that frontage, which will be more naturalized.
- The applicant has provided approximately 3.85 acres of open space, counting the  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre outdoor recreation area and the walking path and bikepath systems that circulate throughout the site.
- This project is to develop within two phases, approximately within a year of each other, depending upon funding. The eastern halves of the three-story buildings, the community center and 15 northern cottages will be in Phase 1; the western three-story buildings and remaining single-story buildings will be developed with Phase 2.

Planning has evaluated this request based upon review criteria for a rezoning and preliminary development plan. Approval with four conditions, as outlined in the report is recommended.

Ms. Salay noted that in reviewing the minutes, she has questions about the group of five parking spaces being eliminated. This parking would serve residents from the north side who picnic in that area. Why did Planning Commission feel it was important to eliminate this parking?

Ms. Swisher responded that it was actually staff's suggestion, because all of the other parking spaces are located off the main roadway throughout the development. That creates a safer area for them in terms of backing out of spaces. With 60 spaces on the north side, staff felt the five in this location could be eliminated.

Ms. Salay asked if there was a specific reason for the developer proposing the parking in this location.

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10118

April 6, 2009

Page 6

Held

20

Ms. Swisher responded that they desired more parking spaces closer to the outdoor recreation area.

Ms. Salay stated that a Commissioner talked of putting trees and a tree canopy in the 20 feet of utility easement. In view of the City's *Right Tree, Right Place* program, she wants to ensure that the developer selects the proper planting material for this location.

Ms. Swisher stated that staff made it clear that coordination with the utility company would be important to ensure there would not be conflicts in the future.

Ms. Salay noted that the perimeter walking paths are a great addition. Will those be built with Phase 1?

Ms. Swisher responded that the applicant has indicated that all of the outdoor amenities will be constructed with Phase 1.

Ms. Salay pointed out that Council needs to make an effort to meet regularly with Planning & Zoning Commission. There was much discussion about this project not meeting density, and the Commission felt it was problematic for the site. In a Council study session, however, Council indicated their support of this project at a higher density than a typical Dublin project because of the affordable senior housing it offered. For those reason, Council felt it was appropriate to deviate from the Community Plan.

Ms. Salay asked how the Britton-Cosgray connector will cross the railroad tracks.

Ms. Swisher responded that it was originally to have been an overpass, but staff understands that it is now to be an underpass.

Ms. Salay stated that this will be more aesthetically pleasing than an overpass.

Mr. Reiner noted that the information identified as "Supplemental Information regarding Proposed Uses" is not part of the proposed text. Is there any reason for this?

Ms. Swisher responded that staff merely wanted to include the information. The applicant had submitted the information to staff as part of the text, but staff felt it did not fit in the zoning text. Staff felt it would be helpful for P&Z and Council to have the information to explain how NCR plans to operate.

Mr. Reiner thanked the applicant, staff, and the P&Z Commission for working together to create a beautiful project. Is there any other information to share about how the facility will operate? Is there any food service offered in the facility?

Ms. Swisher responded that there is not a commercial kitchen involved. The applicant can expand on this.

Jim Baugh and Matt McClure, National Church Residences addressed Council.

Mr. Baugh indicated that the property is operated as independent living, multi-family apartments with an affordability component and restricted to seniors 62 and over. There are no meal services provided. Typically, their properties are served by Meals on Wheels or food brought in by other volunteer groups. The community center has two components, serving as a center for the residents and an adult daycare for the community at large.

Mr. Reiner asked how applicants are selected for admittance to the facility.

Mr. Baugh responded that in the first phase, 80 of the 100 units are income restricted. The restrictions are prescribed by the low income housing tax credit program. The restrictions are both income and rent restricted. A typical set aside for income would be 60 percent of the area median income. That would be the primary screening mechanism. This level would vary by community.

The tax credit program is the primary funding mechanism. It is an equity program, administered by the IRS and promulgated by the state. The Ohio Housing Finance Agency administers the program in Ohio.

Mr. Reiner asked if there is any set aside for Dublin residents or for military veterans.

Mr. Baugh responded there is not such a set aside at this property.

Ms. Salay stated that when the City group toured other NCR projects in relation to the potential Dublin project, they talked of how the advertising is done in the community. They cannot set aside properties for Dublin residents, but they advertise the opening within the area at senior centers within this geographic area. Typically, a high percentage of

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



April 6, 2009

Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat

Page 7

12-084Z/PDP/PP  
Avondale Woods  
Avery Road

Held

20

residents moving into these neighborhoods are from the immediate area, close to their own homes.

Mr. Baugh responded that they have found that most seniors don't want to live more than five miles away from their current residence for reasons of proximity to doctors, family, places of business. NCR wants to lease the property as quickly as possible, and will advertise in the local area.

Mr. Reiner asked what the estimated rents for this property will be, based upon the median income in the area.

Mr. McClure stated the two-bedroom units will be in the \$900 range for the market rent. The tax credit rent is close to that as well.

Mr. Gerber added that this is a fantastic project. Several proposed developments have been submitted for this site previously. This is a needed product in Dublin. He is aware that there is a group in that area very interested in this project, and he is hopeful that any applications they submit will be given full consideration.

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road asked if there are any "greening" principles or mandates applicable to an enterprise of this type. He understands the City is gearing up to implementing such greening initiatives into the Code.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher responded that there are other projects, such as IGS, where staff is working with the developer to ensure LEED certification. In general, the focus is more on commercial projects to become LEED certified. Such certification generally increases costs for the developer. For this type of housing product, Council would support reasonable efforts toward this goal which would not substantially increase the costs.

Ms. Salay added that there has not been discussion of the City requiring buildings to be LEED certified, but developers are encouraged to do so.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Boring, yes; Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher noted that Council is looking forward to working with NCR as they develop this project in Dublin.

#### **Ordinance 14-09**

##### **Changing the Name of Wichita Street to Wichita Drive in the City of Dublin, Ohio.**

Mr. Hammersmith reported that there is no additional information to share regarding this proposed change. Staff recommends approval.

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road asked how the name "Wichita" was selected.

Ms. Salay responded that the street is part of the Indian Run Meadows subdivision, where there are many native American street names.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Salay, yes; Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Vice Mayor Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes.

#### **Ordinance 15-09**

##### **Changing the Name of Darby Street to North Street Beginning at High Street and Terminating at a Point Approximately 245 Feet West of High Street in the City of Dublin, Ohio.**

Mr. Hammersmith stated that staff recommends adoption at this time.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Boring, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher, yes.

#### **INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING - ORDINANCES**

##### **Ordinance 18-09**

**Petitioning the Board of County Commissioners of Franklin County, Ohio to Adjust the Boundary Lines of Perry Township in order to Exclude That Territory Which, as a Result of Annexation, Now Lies within the Corporate Boundaries of the City of Dublin, and Declaring an Emergency.** (Request to dispense with public hearing)

Mr. Keenan introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Smith stated that this provides for an adjustment of the township boundary in order to place this property in Washington Township. This is a follow-up to the annexation approved by Council on February 16. The intent is to have service provided by

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DANTON LEGAL BLANK, P.C. FORM NO. 10143

March 16, 2009

Page 4

Held

20

**Ordinance 12-09**

**Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Access Easement Agreement with Swickard Enterprises, Inc. Granting Rights of Access to Swickard and the City of Dublin over Certain Properties Owned by Each of the Parties Near the Intersection of Avery Road and Woerner-Temple Road.**

Ms. Salay introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Smith stated that when the Municipal Pool South was built, the City purchased a right of entry from the Swickards to allow the City access to the land. There have been numerous debates about the Swickard Enterprises' desire to have a curb cut on Avery to their property. Because the City won't agree to provide this curb cut, the City is providing such access to the City access road.

Ms. Salay stated that she spoke with Mr. Hammersmith about this matter earlier tonight. This is also the access point to the community pool, and many pedestrians and bicycles use this area. She has concerns with this serving as the access point for this property located on the corner, which will be developed in the future. Perhaps an alternative arrangement should be pursued to provide pedestrian and vehicular access to the pool, and perhaps put access to the Swickard property further to the west. Perhaps something can be agreed upon to separate the two properties. Patrons who are accessing the pool are cognizant of pedestrian and bicycle traffic, but those accessing a future mixed use on the other property would not have that level of attention to the pool-related traffic.

Mr. Smith suggested that he and Mr. Hammersmith review some of the options and report back to Council by memo prior to the second reading.

Vice Mayor Boring noted that the point is well taken, but when the road was built, was there no consideration given to access for this property?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that he was not involved in the design of Woerner-Temple. He will research this in the records. Based on where the access point is laid out and the median break, he believes it was intended to be a shared access, regardless of whether there would be a future pool or how the Swickard property would be developed. It was not known at that time that a pool would be located on the property.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher stated that the proposed legislation indicates a prohibition for large vehicles or equipment using this access. What would it then be used for?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that the intent is that it not be used for construction access of the Swickard property.

Vice Mayor Boring asked what compensation has been paid to the Swickards to date.

Mr. Smith responded that they were paid \$4,200 four to five years ago, based on an appraisal for a temporary right of entry at the time.

Vice Mayor Boring stated that it appears Swickard now wants the access back.

Mr. Smith responded that if she is suggesting that Swickard should now pay the City, those negotiations were not successful. Because they cannot have a curb cut on Woerner-Temple and cannot have one on Avery, staff felt this was the only feasible solution.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the April 6 Council meeting.

**Ordinance 13-09**

**Rezoning of Approximately 19.62 Acres, More or Less, Located on the West Side of Avery Road, Approximately 4,000 Feet South of Rings Road, from R, Rural District, to PUD, Planned Unit Development District. (National Church Residences at Avondale Woods – Case 09-007Z)**

Ms. Salay introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Swisher stated that is a request for zoning and preliminary development plan approval for 19.62 acres, including a 17-acre development site and 2.62 acres of dedicated right-of-way from R, Rural District to PUD, Planned Unit Development

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

March 16, 2009

Page 5

Held

20

District. The proposed rezoning would allow a 200-unit senior housing development and a one-story community center. The National Church Residences organization came before Council at the June 19, 2008 study session, where they discussed with Council their desire to locate a facility in Dublin. With support from Council, they worked with staff to identify potential sites. Ultimately, a concept plan application was filed and reviewed by P&Z in December of 2008. After incorporation of the comments from P&Z, the applicants have refiled for a rezoning/preliminary development plan, which was recommended for approval by P&Z on March 5, 2009 with five conditions as outlined in the memo.

- The site is located on the southeastern corner of the southernmost parcel in the City of Dublin. The city limits run along the development site on the southern and eastern property lines.
- The Community Plan specifies mixed residential, low density, which is intended to provide a mix of housing options for individuals of all ages. It recommends a density of three dwelling units per acre over the entire 140-acre parcel.
- The site is also identified in the Southwest Area Plan. Various bubbles on the Plan indicate different residential densities of land use. The higher density portion is located in the southern portion of that parcel, which is approximately where the NCR development is located. The lower density is located to the north and west of that area.
- The proposed rezoning would permit a single-story community center in the center of the site, with two three-story residential buildings on the north and south sides of that center. Both buildings would contain a total of 100 dwelling units. A three-fourths acre outdoor recreation area is located to the south of the community center. A total of 30 single-story cottages are located around the perimeter of the sites and contain the remaining 100 dwelling units for the development.
- Access to the site is provided from a proposed public roadway called Avondale Boulevard. It is a three-lane roadway tapering to two lanes.
- A traffic impact study has been submitted which will be finalized prior to final development plan approval.
- Two access points into the site are proposed from Avondale Boulevard, with a roadway that circulates throughout the site. Groups of parking spaces are located in offset groups off of the internal roadway.
- The applicant proposes providing a total of 23 percent open space for this development. Code would generally require 25 percent open space, but Council is permitted to allow a text with less than 25 percent. Based on the type of development and the quality of the open space, with amenities and walking path provided throughout the site, Planning's opinion is that the amount of open space is sufficient.
- The development would take place in two phases, with the eastern halves of the three-story buildings and the entire community center developing in the first phase as well as the northern 15 cottages. The remaining cottage units and western halves of the three-story buildings would be built in the second phase. All roadway improvements would be done with the first phase of the development.

Based on the P&Z's comments, the applicant has revised the architectural concepts for the development, recognizing the gateway location of this development. They have incorporated high quality materials and architectural elements.

Planning has evaluated this proposal based upon review criteria for rezonings and preliminary development plans, and recommends approval with the five conditions at the second reading.

Mr. Langworthy added that subsequent to the P&Z review, the property owner has come forward to NCR and indicated to them that they have an issue with the way the density for the property is being calculated. It is the property owner's understanding that these roughly 20 acres would be excluded from the density calculation for the entire site. When the P&Z reviewed this rezoning application and Planning presented their recommendations, they looked to the Community Plan for guidance regarding density. The Community Plan for this entire area reflects a density of three dwelling

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

March 16, 2009

Page 6

Held

20

units per acre, an increase from the 1997 Plan which reflected two units per acre. Homewood is asking for Council's consideration that the subject 20 acres be excluded from the three units per acre designation so that their remaining 120 acres of the 140 acre parcel would meet the three units per acre density. If the 20 acres at this proposed density were included in the overall property calculation, it would bump up the density for the 140 acres to four units per acre, which would not be consistent with the Community Plan. He noted that there is adequate time to work this issue out with NCR and Homewood prior to the second reading. After Council's input, staff would come back with a proposal that will attempt to be generally in compliance with the Community Plan, but will carve out these 20 acres to treat it as a separate piece of property.

Discussion followed regarding clarification of how the density calculations were done for the entire 140 acres owned by Homewood and how it would be impacted by allowing removal of these 20 acres from the calculation.

Mr. Lecklider stated that his assumption with the Community Plan in this area is that it was not contemplated that a segment of this property would be utilized for this population group. The senior housing would likely have fewer trips associated with it, resulting in less traffic impact.

Mr. Langworthy responds that is actually contemplated in the plan. The Homewood plan at first submittal called for higher density in the southern portion and lower density in the northern part. This project is essentially in line with that pattern, so the area plan did contemplate this. The density looked at was for the entire 140 acres – not just for this 20 acres. There are 12 units per acre in the piece highlighted on the map in red, and it drives up the density on the rest by one unit per acre. In total, it would add 60 units to the remainder of the Homewood project.

Mr. Keenan asked what is planned for the remainder of the Homewood land.

Mr. Langworthy stated that there is no proposal submitted at this time.

Mr. Keenan stated that the reason for allowing this level of density for NCR was to create some affordable housing for that segment of the community.

Mr. Lecklider asked about the traffic modeling, and whether it can be adjusted for this type of use.

Mr. Langworthy responded that an additional 60 units over this area of property would not likely result in a significant traffic increase, but he deferred to Mr. Hammersmith.

Vice Mayor Boring stated that the additional units could impact the number of students generated for the schools.

Mr. Langworthy agreed. The anticipation is that most of the units in the remaining portion would be single family.

Mr. Gerber recalled a previous proposal for this parcel. What density level was proposed?

Mr. Langworthy responded that it included 270 units over 140 acres – approximately two units per acre. It met the 1997 Community Plan density guidelines.

Ms. Salay asked how this complies with the intent of the Community Plan.

Mr. Langworthy responded if the density is spread over the entire 140 acres, it would meet the Community Plan densities. Homewood is asking for these 20 acres to be excluded from the calculation.

Mr. Gerber asked how this impacts the agreement with NCR.

Mr. Langworthy responded that from what staff has been told, Homewood would not sell the property to NCR if this land is not excluded from the overall density calculation.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher stated that this would therefore prevent the City from providing another type of alternative senior housing for residents.

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 19148

March 16, 2009

Page 7

Held

20

Mr. Langworthy stated that in fairness to Homewood representatives, who are present tonight, they did not understand how the density would be calculated. They indicated that they had believed that Dublin would pull these 20 acres out and treat it separately, due to the nature of the project.

Mr. Keenan asked Mr. Foegler to comment.

Mr. Foegler stated that it is worth noting that because there is no rezoning application submitted for the residual of this parent tract, there is no way for Council to confirm what that density will be when it is brought in for rezoning. What is being sought at this time is a sense that Council will view conformity with the Plan as being three units per acre over the residual tract, in addition to the rights established for these 20 acres. If Council would like staff to examine the basis for the density of the Plan and consider such factors as traffic and compatibility of adjacent uses, in order to see if there is a rationale for carving out this higher density, that can be done. This research could be done between now and the second reading.

Ms. Salay responded that she would find this analysis helpful, as well as information about how to memorialize what is agreed upon going forward.

Mr. Langworthy responded that staff will bring forward some text to be included in the minutes that would justify a departure from the Community Plan. It is Council's policy decision of whether or not to accept that deviation. It would be important to do so to avoid having future requests to take other portions of the site out of the 140 acres for separate density calculations.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher requested that staff review the traffic patterns carefully, in view of the high density areas of Columbus directly to the west.

Mr. Langworthy responded that they are aware of this, and have been in communication with the City of Columbus traffic department. The traffic study is still under review by both communities. The preliminary finding is that there will be left turn lanes needed on Avery. There are some differences in the City of Columbus and Dublin's future expansion plans for Avery Road. However, staff anticipates the communities can work this out prior to future improvements.

Mr. Keenan stated that Council will need to have this kind of information for future planning purposes.

Vice Mayor Boring stated that, at a minimum, there should be a compromise.

Mr. Langworthy stated that he has requested that Homewood be patient and allow time for this discussion to occur. What NCR needs at this point is discussion regarding their project and Council's views, absent this separate issue.

Mr. Reiner stated that the site plan is excellent and could likely be used for some other sites as well.

Mr. Langworthy responded that there may be a need to postpone this ordinance until the April 20 Council meeting to allow staff to work on these details.

Vice Mayor Boring asked if there is another site available that could accommodate the NCR project.

Mr. Langworthy responded that NCR representatives are present to address this. He understands that there is a deadline for grant submittal for this site which is of immediate concern.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher invited the applicant to testify.

Matt McClure, National Church Residences, 2335 North Bank Drive, Columbus thanked Council for their consideration of this project. He understands that it is Council's desire to have this type of housing available in Dublin for seniors. One point to consider is that the density for these types of projects is often higher for various reasons. Primarily, these campuses contain three-story buildings and cottages surrounding a community center, and all activities in this community feed from this

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC. FORM NO. 10148

March 16, 2009

Page 8

Held

20

center. To meet the three units per acre would require a much larger site and would not lend itself to the tight campus desired.

Ms. Salay stated that Council had understood at the outset that this project would have higher density, and they are supportive. Council's disappointment is with the seller of the land. Council is not being critical of NCR's project whatsoever.

Mr. McClure responded that his point is that Council should consider the density of their 17 acres. Objectively, he feels that Homewood is being asked to reduce the available units on their remaining property, and thereby to somewhat subsidize the NCR project's higher density.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the April 6 Council meeting.

### **Ordinance 14-09**

#### **Changing the Name of Wichita Street to Wichita Drive in the City of Dublin, Ohio.**

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Hammersmith stated this is a housekeeping item brought to staff's attention by the Franklin County Auditor's office. There appears to some discrepancy in the suffix of "street" and "drive" with this roadway, located north of Tara Hill Drive. Staff has contacted the nine affected residents to make them aware of this change, and has heard no feedback. Staff's understanding is that the residents have used "Wichita Drive" as their address over the years. Staff therefore recommends formal adoption of the ordinance at the April 6 Council meeting.

Mr. Lecklider asked if staff believes residents will have adequate time to respond to this issue.

Mr. Hammersmith responded that tonight's meeting is the best opportunity to publicize this change to the neighborhood.

Vice Mayor Boring noted her concern with the mapping software available and how such changes are communicated to them.

Mr. Hammersmith responded this is a good question. Staff has not had much success in contacting MapQuest regarding these changes. This same situation occurred with Hospital Drive versus Perimeter Loop Road. Over time, as mapping is updated through GIS at the county level, MapQuest and others will incorporate the new information.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the April 6 Council meeting.

### **Ordinance 15-09**

#### **Changing the Name of Darby Street to North Street Beginning at High Street and Terminating at a Point Approximately 245 Feet West of High Street in the City of Dublin, Ohio.**

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Mr. Hammersmith stated that in an effort to implement improved wayfinding in Historic Dublin, and making easier navigation for visitors, staff has recognized the confusion regarding Darby Street. The street actually begins at Bridge Street, between the vet hospital and the "BriHi" project, extends north, making a 90-degree turn at the library to head east, intersecting with High Street. This results in two intersections - Bridge/Darby and Bridge/High. Staff is proposing renaming the small piece of Darby Street between High Street and in front of the library to North Street, consistent with North Street on the east side of High Street. There are no addresses on this portion of Darby Street, so it would not require any changes in addressing.

Mr. Gerber noted that at the corner of Bridge and High, the project under construction is called, ""BriHi." Is the building to be called, ""BriHi?" What is the intent?

Mr. Hammersmith responded that ""BriHi" is the name of the privately-owned within the Stonehenge project.

Mayor Chinnici-Zuercher followed up, noting that the sign on I-270 indicates, "District 13" and "BriHi" is the name of the privately-owned within the Stonehenge project.

**10-036CP**  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**RECORD OF ACTION**

**NOVEMBER 18, 2004**



CITY OF DUBLIN

Division of Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: [www.dublin.oh.us](http://www.dublin.oh.us)

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

4. **Rezoning 03-139Z – Avondale Woods of Dublin – 5215 Avery Road**  
**Location:** 139.65 acres on the west side of Avery Road, 2,000 feet south of Rings Road.  
**Existing Zoning:** R-1B, Limited Suburban Residential District (Washington township).  
**Request:** Review and approval of a rezoning to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, under the provisions of Section 153.053.  
**Proposed Use:** A mixed-use residential development consisting of 190 single-family lots, 63 attached condominium units, and 49 acres of open space (35 percent).  
**Applicant:** Homewood Corporation, c/o J. C. Hanks, 750 Northlawn Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43214; represented by Christopher Cline, Blaugrund, Herbert, & Martin, 5455 Rings Road, Suite 500, Dublin, Ohio 43017.  
**Staff Contact:** Mark Zuppo, Jr., Planner.  
**Contact Information:** Phone: (614) 410-4654 or E-mail: [mzuppo@dublin.oh.us](mailto:mzuppo@dublin.oh.us).

**MOTION:** To table this Rezoning application.

\* Christopher Cline agreed to the tabling of this case.

**VOTE:** 6-0.

**RESULT:** This Rezoning application was tabled so that the outstanding issues such as traffic, access, site layout, stormwater and text clarifications, as outlined in the staff report, can be addressed by the applicant.

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



Daniel D. Bird, FAICP  
Director of Planning

08-100 CP  
Concept Plan  
National Church Residence  
5215 Avery Road

Mr. Gerber said the red was a little too orange. He said the ivory looked good, the blue was okay, but there were problems with the green and rust colors. He said the Commissioners wanted to see more of a burgundy color than red and the green should be about 2½ shades darker than what was proposed tonight.

Ms. Boring said when this case first came in as a preliminary, there was a nice sweeping Kroger scripted "K", and when the final design came in, there were big, bold block letters used. She said that had made a difference.

Mr. Hale said this store is actually called "Kroger Marketplace." He thought they would go back to the original sweeping script Kroger sign. He said he wanted to come back in a month to try to make the Commission happy with the sign illumination and colors.

Ms. Reiss said the colors should match the awning colors and the colors proposed tonight do not do that.

Mr. Gerber made the motion to table this Final Development Plan with respect to the signage only. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows: Mr. Messineo, yes; Mr. Sprague, yes; Ms. Reiss, yes; Ms. Boring, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Gerber, yes. (Tabled 6-0.)

Mr. Gerber said this case would be seen again in January. He said the light demonstration was fine and he appreciated it.

#### **4. Rezoning 03-139Z – Avondale Woods of Dublin – 5215 Avery Road**

Dann Bird said staff requested that this rezoning case be tabled. He said staff met with the applicant today to discuss refinements to the development, and as a result of the discussion, staff requests that the case be tabled so that the applicant and staff can work through refinements and opportunities to the development.

Christopher Cline, representing the applicant agreed to a tabling.

Rick Gerber said a tabling was a great solution at this point. He made the motion to table this Rezoning application.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows: Mr. Messineo, yes; Mr. Sprague, yes; Ms. Reiss, yes; Ms. Boring, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Gerber, yes. (Tabled 6-0.)

#### **5. Final Development Plan – 04-143FDP – Riverside Woods – Hard Road**

Mr. Gerber swore in those who wished to testify in regards to this case. There were no discussion or questions from either the Commissioners or the audience.

Rich Towle, the applicants' representative, agreed to the conditions as listed below.

Mr. Gerber made the motion to approve this Final Development Plan because it preserves the natural quality and character of the land consistent with accepted architecture, and engineering principles, it complies with the final de

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



CITY OF DUBLIN..

Division of Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/TDD: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

MARCH 4, 2004

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

**5. Informal 03-139I – Avondale Woods of Dublin – 5215 Avery Road**

**Location:** 139.65 acres on the west side of Avery Road, 2,000 feet south of Rings Road.

**Existing Zoning:** R-1B, Limited Suburban Residential District (Washington Township).

**Request:** Informal review of development options, as required by Resolution 48-03 regarding conservation design techniques, for a proposed PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District, subdivision under the provisions of Section 153.051.

**Proposed Use:** The following two residential development options are proposed for general discussion:

- 1) Option 1: A mixed-use, residential development consisting of 197 single-family lots, 81 attached condominium units, and 44 acres of open space (31.5 percent).
- 2) Option 2: A residential development consisting of 278 single-family lots, and 69.8 acres of open space (50 percent).

**Applicant:** J.C. Hanks, Homewood Corporation, 750 Northlawn Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43214; represented by Christopher Cline, Blaugrund, Herbert, & Martin, 5455 Rings Road, Suite 500, Dublin, Ohio 43017.

**Staff Contact:** Mark Zuppo, Jr., Planner.

**MOTION:** That this site is not conducive to Conservation Design.

**VOTE:** 5-1.

**RESULT:** After much discussion, the Commissioners decided that this site was not conducive to Conservation Design. Four of the Commissioners preferred the plans submitted December 2002 to these plans and all agreed the density should be lowered.

#### STAFF CERTIFICATION

Frank A. Ciarochi  
Acting Planning Director

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.



Mr. Gerber agreed, but said only because of the visibility the Commission should review it.

Gary Gunderman clarified that if changes to the Code had been adopted to consolidate the PCD with the PUD, this would not be before the Commission. Mr. Gerber understood.

Mr. Saneholtz made a motion to approve this revised development plan because it conforms to the existing Subarea J text and complies with the PCD provisions of Section 153.058, providing for the expansion and update of a successful Dublin business with seven conditions.

- 1) That vehicular display be prohibited on the proposed path and be noted as such on all plans, subject to staff approval;
- 2) That no colored lenses be used for any lighting on site;
- 3) That the proposed modifications comply with applicable Stormwater Regulations, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 4) That revised plans be submitted if a second door is required, subject to staff approval;
- 5) That proposed new signage be submitted that is directional in nature, subject to staff approval;
- 6) That relocated trees be replaced on an inch-per-inch basis if they die within five years, subject to staff approval; and
- 7) That the applicant utilize a rock that is more aesthetically suitable, subject to staff approval.

Mr. Gerber seconded the motion. Mr. Cline agreed to the conditions as listed above. The vote was as follows: Mr. Messineo, yes; Ms. Reiss, yes; Ms. Boring, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Saneholtz, yes; and Mr. Gerber, yes. (Approved 6-0.)

#### **4. Rezoning/Revised Preliminary Development Plan 03-045Z – NE Quad PUD Retail, Subareas 5A and 5B – Kroger Center – Sawmill Road**

Mr. Gerber noted this was a very large application. He said a Commission meeting was scheduled for March 18, but there are no applications currently ready to review. Instead of canceling the meeting, it made sense to hear this case then.

Ben W. Hale, Jr., representing the applicant, agreed to request a tabling in order to hear this application in its entirety at the next meeting. He said they were ready to go tonight and that they would not change anything in the next two weeks.

Mr. Gerber made a motion to table this case and made a motion. Ms. Reiss seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows: Mr. Messineo, yes; Mr. Saneholtz, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Reiss, yes; and Mr. Gerber, yes. [Ms. Boring had left the room temporarily.] (Tabled 5-0)

#### **5. Informal 03-139I – Avondale Woods of Dublin – 5215 Avery Road**

Mr. Gerber said this is an informal review of development options in order to address the objectives of the recently enacted Conservation Design Resolution. The discussion will be limited to thirty minutes.

Mark Zuppo said the applicant has filed for a rezoning application to request a change in zoning to PLR, Planned Low Density Residential District, but wanted to discuss the issue of

10-036CP

Concept Plan

Avondale Woods

5215 Avery Rd.



Conservation design prior to moving forward with the application. He said the Commission, on December 12, 2002, heard an informal proposal for this site on December 12, 2002.

The site is a peninsula at the southernmost portion of Dublin, west of Avery Road. It has approximately 4,000 feet south of Rings Road, and is surrounded by the City of Columbus on three sides. He said the site currently has Washington Township R-1B, Restricted Suburban Residential District zoning. Parcels within Dublin to the north are also zoned R1-B. The existing CSX railroad track has approximately eight to ten trains per day passing through the site. There is a 25-acre woodland in the northwest corner of the site and a four-acre triangular woods in the southwestern portion.

According to draft plans for the Hayden Run Corridor, office developments will abut this development on both the west and east sides of Avery Road. Several Traditional Neighborhood Development zoning classifications are to the southeast and southwest. Directly to the south is the location for the overpass of the future Britton-Cosgray connector.

Ms. Boring inquired about the densities of the Traditional Neighborhood designations. Mr. Zuppo said approximately six dwelling units per acre.

Option 1:

Mr. Zuppo showed a slide of Option 1, which included 197 single-family lots located north of the 81 attached condominium units (three units per building). He said Avondale Commons, the single-family portion of the site, is noted as Avondale Village on the site plan. It has approximately 44 acres of openspace, mostly woodlands on the northwest corner (28.5 acres) as well as four acres, and a small swale in the southeastern portion of the site.

He said the main access will be on Avery Road, and future access to Tuttle Crossing when it extends through, will be to the north. A retention pond is proposed in the east central portion of the site along with other small ponds in the condominium unit development.

Option 2:

Option 2 includes fifty percent openspace (69.8 acres). This option provides more openspace and a few more view sheds through the site. The main north-south boulevard will go through the site, abutting the woods. Homes along an east-west drive will back up to the woods.

Mr. Zuppo showed slides of the area for the two proposed options. He said staff did not have a recommendation on this informal application, but does believe the applicant has been amenable to staff's suggestions and would like feedback from the Commission to move forward.

Mr. Gerber said it was the Commission's role to determine if this site warrants a conservation development approach. He noted that this case began at 6:45 p.m. and so it will continue until 7:15 p.m.

Christopher T. Cline, Jr., representing the applicant, said he hoped tonight they would get a positive or negative answer on whether this site is appropriate for conservation design.

Mr. Cline said the site has been owned by Homewood since 1993. They were ready to file an application in 2003, and staff asked them to wait because of events with Columbus. They filed

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

this application on November 2, 2003, so they predated the Conservation Resolution by six weeks. He said there is a legitimate question as to whether it applies to this site. He said the Resolution just states that it will apply to “new” subdivisions. Nothing was said about grandfathering.

Mr. Cline said they had a big investment in time and resources in the original plan (Option 1), which is the one they preferred. However, he said that they completed conservation design as requested. He said preserving the woods significantly constrains the planning, particularly for conservation options. They set that as a priority because it is clear the City wants the woodlot preserved. They hope to develop a higher quality subdivision on this site with 75- to 95-foot lots. The homes are proposed to be 2,400 to 3,200 square feet in area. They would like to set the tone in this area before development commences in Columbus. Mr. Cline said conservation design does not apply to every project. For the sites and densities that it works for, it seems to plan itself.

Linda Menerey presented options that were submitted at the December 2002 hearing for this site. She said planning cannot be done in a vacuum, and everything must be considered as Mr. Arendt makes clear.

Ms. Menerey said when looking at property, locational context needs to be understood. The objectives of the developer and the City must be integrated into a plan. She said the reality here is that there will be 2,700 units to the west at six units per acre (17 percent openspace). Most of the openspace is contained along the Hayden Run, the high-pressure gas line easement, and along the railroad tracks.

She said Dublin’s Community Plan suggests 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre. Their biggest issue is when they look at everything happening around the site, it was hard to look at a conservation development in the true sense and figure what they are supposed to be doing.

Ms. Menerey said this parcel has one of the largest woodlands in the Southwest area. Keeping it as a feature of this development poses issues because conservation principles encourage providing greenspace throughout. The whole concept is to provide an integrated openspace network. Unless they develop the woods, they are stuck with 28 acres in the corner and seven acres remaining elsewhere on the site. Ms. Menerey said Dublin wants to protect the rural character. The applicant is attempting to do some of that by saving the woods, keeping the large openspace corridor along Avery Road, and preserving natural features.

An objective of diversifying housing choices is very clear. The plan submitted in November showed two different kinds of housing. The typical lot size is 75 to 95-feet and the other product, which is a three-unit building, is designed to offer a different price point/life style in the marketplace. Ms. Menerey said this plan has around 31 percent openspace.

She said in terms of integration, it is not necessarily all or nothing. While the plan is not 100 percent conservation design, it is not a standard subdivision plan. She said they did not believe that was necessarily the right solution. They would like to think there is a better solution that incorporates some of the conservation design objectives the City would like. Ms. Menerey said they did not think 100 percent conservation was the right way to go with everything that is happening in the surrounding area.

Ms. Menerey said Option 2 provides a combination of 50 by 110-foot lots and the other more “typical” lots. She said in order to get the 50 percent openspace and keep the woodlot, that shapes the lot sizes and product types. They also worked with staff in terms of road connections and some of the impacts with Avery Road. She said they had modified both plans in terms of entry points along Avery Road.

Al Berthold, Alfred Edwin Berthold Architect, said they considered a multi-family product. They thought about the massing and scale of the buildings and worked back to the interior design. He presented a small model of a building. He said they thought about putting three units in a building to provide a mix that included a ranch, a story-and-a half, and a traditional two-story in the middle. The garage locations can be varied, and stone was selected as a major material.

Ms. Menerey said the multi-family is generally located along the railroad.

Mr. Cline said over the past ten years the need to incorporate different demographics into the same developments has been discussed. He said the condos were intended to appeal to three different markets. Mr. Cline said in the remaining six minutes he wanted to hear from the Commissioners.

Ms. Reiss thought a good job was done in preserving the woods. Because the site is flat, it is important to have proper stormwater management. More ponds would be great. She was leaning toward the conservation approach (Option 2). The smaller lots are okay, and a good job has been done providing setbacks off Avery Road. She wondered about the Tuttle extension and suggested the last row of houses be eliminated. A buffer is also needed along the railroad tracks where the woods and detention will be. She understood the site is surrounded by higher density and leaned towards lower density because of traffic impacts.

Mr. Gerber said this was the third time he has seen this project. He did not think conservation options fit here. He thought the December 2002 plan was more appropriate.

Ms. Boring did not like any of the previous layouts. She agreed with Mr. Gerber that conservation design does not work because of the woods. She would like to see more frontage on the woods and thought the diversity in the multi-family was great. She would encourage a density of 1.5 du/ac and see what other things could be incorporated. Two dwelling units per acre was too high.

Mr. Messineo said 2.0 du/ac seemed to be more of a medium density and he did not like the condos on this site. He did not think conservation design was applicable, and he liked previous layouts better.

Mr. Zimmerman said conservation design did not fit the site, and he wanted to see the woods preserved. He liked the design of the condos, but would prefer a residential subdivision. Ms. Boring asked what was not “residential” about the condos. Mr. Zimmerman said he looked at it as multi-family on single-family lots. He said the previous layouts were more attractive.

Mr. Saneholtz said Option 1 with the condos was appealing to him, but he would eliminate 22 lots along the railroad for openspace. That would provide a density of 1.8 du/ac. He liked that there was nothing against the woods on the east side. He said the previous design layout with no units against the railroad was more appealing to him..

Mr. Gerber announced the time allotted had expired. He asked that the layouts be better identified for the record.

Ms. Menerey said the PLR design was what the Commission referred to as Option 1. The conservation development is Option 2. Discussion about the previous three layouts were for Options A, B, and C.

Mr. Cline counted four Commissioners that did not think conservation design would work.

Mr. Gerber added that the majority thought the 2002 proposals were better than these presented tonight.


Ms. Menerey added that there is a sanitary sewer easement running east-west through the site and per the City Engineer's office, that must go in a front yard.

Ms. Readler suggested that a motion be made to recommend that the site is not suitable for conservation design.

Mr. Gerber made a motion that this site is not conducive to conservation design. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows: Ms. Reiss, no; Mr. Saneholtz, yes; Ms. Boring, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Messineo, yes. (Motion Approved 5-1.)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Libby Farley  
Administrative Assistant  
Planning Division



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**RECORD OF ACTION**

**DECEMBER 12, 2002**



..CITY OF DUBLIN

Division of Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/TDD: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-761-6566  
Web Site: [www.dublin.oh.us](http://www.dublin.oh.us)

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

**1. Informal Review 02-139INF – 5215 Avery Road**

**Location:** Approximately 130 acres located on the west side of Avery Road, about 4,100 feet south of Rings Road.

**Existing Zoning:** R-1B, Limited Suburban District (Washington Township classification).

**Request:** Informal review and feedback for a proposed residential development and openspace.

**Proposed Use:** A new residential development.

**Applicant:** Homewood Corporation, c/o John C. Hanks, 750 Northlawn Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43214.

**Staff Contact:** Barbara M. Clarke, Planning Director.

**RESULT:** Three different residential plans were presented, all having nearly two units per acre, with parkland exceeding requirements. The Commissioners were concerned about preservation of the barn and wooded area, park access, buffering along the railroad tracks, lowering the density, and providing alternatives to single-family homes. No vote was taken on this informal review.

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

Barbara M. Clarke  
Planning Director

10-036CP  
Concept Plan  
Avondale Woods  
5215 Avery Rd.

~~Ms. Boring said her concern was that the Commission was led to believe the site was going to be used in a specific manner, and it now seems clear that it will not. The Commission would like it to revert back and wants to know if there is some way to do that.~~

~~Mr. Sprague said perhaps the site should be rezoned to the SO, Suburban Office District.~~

~~Mr. Gerber suggested a motion: To ask City Council to revisit the revised final development plan action for National Century Financial Services (Revised Final Development Plan 02-039RFDP – Muirfield Square (6025-6189 Memorial Drive) by the Commission, and to explore any options to set it aside which were available to the City. Mr. Ritchie revised his motion to include that wording. Ms. Boring seconded the revised motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Messineo, yes; Mr. Sanholtz, yes; Mr. Sprague, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Ms. Boring, yes; and Mr. Ritchie, yes. (Motion approved 7-0.)~~

### **1. Informal Review 02-139INF – 5215 Avery Road**

Bobbie Clarke said there are no rules for an informal review, except that it can last no more than 30 minutes. Its purpose is to present a new proposal the Commission, and then for the Commission to give feedback to the applicant.

This site is fairly isolated from other development. She said the developer has proposed three possible scenarios for the residential development. The site is the southernmost property in Dublin, located west of Avery Road. A railroad track runs diagonally on its west edge. It is flat, open farmland and still carries Washington Township R-1B zoning.

Ms. Clarke said the City of Hilliard wants a Hayden Run Road “bypass,” and its general alignment is somewhere very near the southern property line of this site. She showed a PowerPoint presentation. An aerial photo showed a major woodlot in the northwest corner of the site and one along the railroad tracks. She said the proposals show parkland along the front section. These options all have nearly two units per acre, with different amounts of parkland.

Option A is all single-family lots with varying widths, and all of the wooded areas are parkland. Option B integrates a second type of housing with the same parkland. Cluster housing is along the railroad tracks. Option C is a more standard-Dublin layout, and has less park. All show one access from Avery Road and stub streets to the north and west. She said another consideration is the Tuttle Crossing extension from Avery Road to Cosgray Road. There is no alignment even under study as yet. Ms. Clarke said all three proposals exceed Dublin’s parkland requirement.

J.C. Hanks, Homewood Corporation, asked for feedback. He said this site is basically a peninsula. Tuttle Crossing Boulevard will someday cross to the north and isolate it. It could be considered a transition area. On the other side of the train tracks, Dominion Homes projects 1,500 units in the City of Columbus. Nearby uses include a high-density mobile home park and a driving range. The most important factor is the stand of trees.

Linda Menerey, landscape architect for Homewood, said 30 acres of this 139-acre site is a diverse woodlot in the northwest corner of the parcel. The site is bounded on three sides by current or future City of Columbus ground. The transition is a trailer park to the north. There is also one to the south that impacts less. The driving range is illuminated at night, and to the west

is an active railroad track. Her drawings showed the planned development for M/I and Avery Road Dominion homes in Columbus at 6.5 and 7.5 units per acre. They need to develop a critical mass of housing with an Avery Road identity. She demonstrated the different jurisdictions on an aerial map. This site has the best woodlot in the area. Species include three kinds of oak, basswood, and elm. Homewood wanted plans preserving the woods and Landmark trees.

Ms. Menerey said Plan A is primarily a 75-foot, 10,000-square foot lot subdivision. It does not meet the Code's diversity requirements, but it saves 32 acres of woods as parkland. The plans maintain a 200-foot setback that is not included in the park calculation. The park requirement is roughly 17.5 acres based on the unit count. In Plan B, the trees remain as well. They introduced an 80-unit project at five units per acre. It may be a townhouse or ranch product, and the overall density will be two units per acre. Plan C is 75-foot lots and meets the diversity code, but it has 18 acres of park. A tree survey will determine which part of the woods will be developed. Ms. Menerey said Homewood prefers Plan A, but they would like the Commission's feedback.

Ted Saneholtz said the option "B" was most effective. The demographics require housing alternatives to single-family homes, especially as the population ages. He said the cluster of homes and/or condominiums of a one level design would be attractive.

Mr. Ritchie said he is familiar with the Columbus proposals, and he is concerned how they will all fit together. How does this relate to the other developments around it? He dislikes the higher density development having to access through the lesser density area. He is concerned about everyone having either visual or physical access to the woods.

Mr. Ritchie asked if the development along the Avery Road frontage is viable and will it be maintained. Ms. Menerey said there are a few large single-family lots on the west side of Avery.

Mr. Gerber said he likes Plan "B" for the same reasons stated by Mr. Saneholtz. He is concerned that there is only one entrance, in terms of safety and services. He said active railroad tracks are noisy, and noise abatement may be needed. He was unsure about water and sewer availability.

Ms. Menerey said they thought the cluster housing along the tracks would be a buffer, and it would permit a larger setback than a single-family layout.

Mr. Sprague said he likes all options, he said they all have strengths and some weaknesses. He said "A" seems to offer the most advantages, but he likes the diversity and creativity in "B". He said "B" may minimize the exposure to the track. They have to be concerned with diversity of housing and adequate housing. He thinks they have a good start, but there is work to be done.

Ms. Clarke said the staff had informed her that there are 8 to 10 trains per day on that stretch of railroad tracks, and the maximum speed is 50 mph.

Mr. Zimmerman said the train whistle blew at every crossing. He can hear it from his house.

Mr. Hanks said they will be looking at that very carefully, to address it properly.



Ms. Boring said people will see the railroad before they move there, and they will make their own decisions. She is concerned about the owners versus the renters. Several neighborhoods are experiencing problems with a number of rental homes, and a general lack of maintenance.

Mr. Hanks said this will not be a rental community; it will be a fee simple purchase community.

Ms. Boring said she did not like any of the three plans. The parks are for everyone in Dublin, not just those nearest to it. Neighbors sometimes think the woods are theirs. Park areas should not be closed off by the backs of houses. She said traffic calming should be incorporated into the design, and this seems too linear to keep the speed of traffic down.

Mr. Hanks said he had not talked with the Hilliard School District.

Mr. Zimmerman said the barn looked rough. Staff should check into the feasibility of keeping it. He said the area is flat, and the noise echoes. He thought having only one entrance was a safety issue. He noted the Community Plan calls for a density of 1-2 units per acre, but the planning should start at one unit per acre, not at 1.92 per acre. Mr. Hanks said he understood.

Mr. Messineo thought the Dublin lot diversity requirements should also be included in Plan A. Ms. Menery said the lot diversity would require developing part of the woods or reducing the density. Mr. Hicks said the plans presented are economically feasible. Mr. Messineo encouraged using a lower density plan. He was concerned about Plan B that shows multi-family, or lower priced units against the railroad tracks.

Ms. Menery said economics and site characteristics, such as the railroad tracks and being surrounded by Columbus, make a one unit per acre proposal unlikely. The next plans will probably be in the "high ones." She repeated the positive comments. They can create another entrance, work on the diversity, relocate the attached units, create a buffer along the tracks, etc.

Mr. Hanks thanked the Commission for the direction and input.

## **2. Revised Final Development Plan 02-121RFDP – Llewellyn Farms PUD - 5555 Frantz Road - American Cancer Society – Signage**

Chad Gibson presented this revised final development plan for a replacement sign using PowerPoint. The subject site is on the northwest corner of Parkcenter Avenue and Frantz Road, within the office section of the Llewellyn Farms PUD. The 28,000 square foot building is on a site of 3.1 acres. The sign is oriented towards Frantz Road.

Mr. Gibson said the existing sign is 6'-4" tall and 24 square feet in area. A replacement sign face was installed in August without a permit. Because the background of the sign face is not opaque, it does not meet Code. Code permits a maximum of three colors, and the existing sign has four colors (red, white, blue, and light blue). Code sections violated are Sections 153.158E (opacity) and 153.158C (number of colors). He noted that the site is zoned PUD, which allows the Commission to use its discretion in the final development plan to vary from the Code, as long as the proposal is consistent with the overall area and the approved plan.