



Engineers, Surveyors, Planners, Scientists

March 19, 2019

Mr. Logan Stang
Planner I
City of Dublin
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Subject: Hyland-Croy Gateway East
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat
Response Letter

Dear Mr. Stang,

In response to the comments received from City of Dublin on August 25, 2017, the plans have been modified as described herein.

Development Text

1. Please look at revising sections with “may” instead of “shall” for fences, signs, and building height to avoid confusion on establishing a maximum height versus requiring a maximum height.

Response: Where appropriate, these have been updated in the text.

2. Section II(C)(3)(a) should be revised to reduce the 40 foot encroachment for drive aisles to a more appropriate encroachment.

Response: This encroachment has been reduced to 30’.

3. Section II(E)(1) should be revised as follows: The open spaces in this subarea shall be owned and maintained as detailed on the preliminary development plan.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

4. Section II(E)(2) should be revised as follows: Street tree species shall be provided as approved by the City Forester.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

5. Section II(E)(3)(b) refers to Section 155.133 for landscaping requirements, should be revised to 153.133.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

6. Section II(E)(3)(b) should be revised to require landscaping along the rear of the garages. The garages cannot be used for screening requirements for the ACLF facility.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

7. Additional screening is required along the northern boundary line of Subarea A similar to what is required along the eastern boundary, please update accordingly.

Response: This has been added in the text to Section II(E)(3)(b).

8. The maximum building height for Subarea A should be revised to 45 feet.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

9. Section II (H)(2) needs to be revised to include only one option that the applicant would like to pursue for this subarea. More discussion may be needed between the City and the applicant with how to approach this provision.

Response: A single option for the sign at Post and Hyland Croy has been indicated in the text.

10. Section II (H)(3) should be revised as follows: Any sign permitted within the median for a public street shall be installed and maintained by the owner of Subarea A pursuant to a right-of-way encroachment permit to be obtained from the City.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

11. Section II (A)(1) does not regulate the single-family detached as being age restricted, are only the twin units age restricted?

Response: Twin units are no longer proposed in the Development Plan and the single family lots are not age restricted.

12. Section III (A)(4)-(5) refer to code sections that were recently changed as part of a code amendment. Model homes are now regulated under Section 153.073(B) and Home Occupations are regulated under Section 153.073(A). Refer to Ordinance 14-17 (Amended) for updated code sections.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

13. Section III (C)(4)(d) allows for eaves to encroach two feet into the five foot side yard setback. This may create building code issues with separation between buildings and should be verified or addressed upfront.

Response: The text remains as originally proposed.

14. If solid fences are anticipated then Section III (C)(4)(e) should be revised to permit solid fences as approved at the final development plan.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

15. Section III(D)(2) outlines that final locations for on-street parking shall be approved as part of the final development plan. Is the intent to mark on-street parking spaces?

Response: On-street parking spaces shall not be marked.

16. Please verify the sub-sections under Section III(G)(2). No subsection "c" is present. The Post Preserve sign will need to be incorporated into this development text to allow for another subdivision sign based on the drawings previously provided. More discussion may be necessary between the applicant and the City regarding the number of signs.

Response: The missing subsection "c" has been revised in the text. Language regarding the Post Preserve sign has been incorporated into the text.

17. Please revise Section III(H) to meet the residential appearance standards as outlines in Section n153.190.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

18. Are 1 ½ story homes permitted in Subarea B or is height limited to one and two story structures as regulated by Section III(H)(1)?

Response: The text has been updated to include 1 ½ story homes.

19. Please remove Section III(H)(2)(d) from the development text.

Response: The text remains as originally proposed.

20. Are architectural drawings required to be approved for Subarea B with the final development plan or is this provision optional as listed under Section III(H)?

Response: This has been revised in the text.

21. Section III(H)(8)(c) is covered by existing sections of the Zoning Code and should be removed.

Response: This has been revised in the text.

Preliminary Development Plan

22. Reserves "B" & "E" should be completely maintained by the HOA to correspond with similar development on Hyland-Croy Road. Reserves "C" & "D" will have split maintenance between the HOA and the City as indicated on the plans.

Response: With the site plan update, Reserves have been relabeled. Reserve B is now A and Reserve E is now D. Both revised Reserves B and D are now indicated to be maintained by the HOA and Reserves B and C, formerly C and D, are indicated for split maintenance.

23. Please look into adjusting the pond locations to preserve trees #52-64 and 86.

Response: Trees will be removed to accommodate the development of Lot 55 and storm water volumes required due to removal of the sand filter/ storm water area from the previous submittal. Tree 86 will be evaluated when a user is determined in Subarea A.

24. The critical root zone for tree #90 of the survey extends into this site and tree protection fencing will be required to preserve this tree.

Response: The tree protection fencing for tree # 90 is shown on the plan and envelopes trees adjacent to it (# 91-93.)

25. Tree #78 of the survey is in good condition, please revise.

Response: This was re-evaluated in March of 2019 with a condition of fair to good. The chart has been revised to show condition as "good" per recommendation.

26. Please revise locations of paths and utilities to ensure protection of critical root zones and limit grading within the critical root zone of preserved trees.

Response: These have been reviewed with some adjustments made and will be re-evaluated as necessary at time of Final Development Plan.

27. Please verify the driveway locations for Lots 12, 22, & 55 as there appear to be conflicts between the sidewalk crossings and driveways.

Response: The site plan has been revised to remove twin single lots. Driveway locations will be reviewed at time of Final Development Plan and confirmed with Final Engineering to avoid conflicts with sidewalk crossings and driveways.

28. Fire hydrant locations are not currently shown on page 15/23, please revise.

Response: These have been included on sheet 15/23.

Preliminary Plat

29. Please add widths to easements that are split between multiple properties i.e. a 20-foot easement running along the rear property line has 12-feet on one side and 8-feet on the other.

Response: These have been updated on the Preliminary Plat.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (614) 775-4710.

Sincerely,

EVANS, MECHWART, HAMBLETON & TILTON, INC



Linda M. Menerey ASLA, PLA
Associate/ Senior Project Manager