



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 9, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development) 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road
17-061Z-PDP Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal: Rezoning ±45.4 acres from Rural District to Planned Unit Development District to facilitate the future development of 91 single-family homes and up to 200 living units for seniors with varying levels of care in one or more buildings and approximately 12.7 acres of open space.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.050-153.056.

Applicant: Wes Smith, Schottenstein Real Estate Group, and Laura Comek, Laura M. Comek Law LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-061

MOTION: Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to table the request for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan.

VOTE: 6 - 0

RESULT: The Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 9, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development) 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road
17-061PP Preliminary Plat**

Proposal: Subdivide ±45.4 acres into one lot for a senior care facility and 91 single-family lots, rights-of-way for five public streets, and six open space reserves.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.050-153.056.

Applicant: Wes Smith, Schottenstein Real Estate Group, and Laura Comek, Laura M. Comek Law LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-061

MOTION: Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to table the request for a Preliminary Plat.

VOTE: 6 - 0

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



~~Mr. Woodings responded that it would not; it would be a cut-through to Emerald Parkway. Currently, their plan proposes a 100-ft. right-of-way onto Bright Road. He assumes that would be two lanes of traffic separated by an island, then another two lanes of traffic from Sawmill Road to the roundabout.~~

~~Mr. Fishman stated that could destroy part of the wood.~~

~~Mr. Woodings responded that it would destroy it by a distance of 26 feet wide.~~

~~Mr. Fishman advised looking at that idea with caution. It is not consistent with the Community Plan, and the neighbors highly value that property.~~

~~Mr. Supelak stated that it becomes a value judgment of routing some of the traffic out to Emerald Parkway versus the roundabout below. Such a consideration would have to be done carefully, and it would not work with the proposed layout.~~

Ms. Newell stated that Cases 1 and 2 would be heard together.

**1. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road
17-061, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for a recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan of ± 45.4 acres from Rural District to Planned Unit Development District to permit the future development of 90 single-family homes and up to 200 living units for seniors with varying levels of care in one or more buildings and approximately 12 acres of open space. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road.

**2. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road
17-061, Preliminary Plat**

Ms. Newell stated that this application for the same site is a request for recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary Plat subdividing the site.

Ms. Newell swore in staff and members of the public who intended to address the Commission on this case.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council of a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and Preliminary Plat for a residential development of 90 single-family lots and a 200-unit Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) with 12.4 acres of open space and six public streets. The 45.5-acre site is located on the east side of Hyland-Croy Road at the intersection with Post Road. The site is surrounded by existing developments, including Post Preserve, Park Place and Jerome Grand. The site is comprised of two parcels totaling approximately 45.5 acres in size. The site is rectangular with 3,300 feet of frontage along Hyland-Croy Road and 500 feet of frontage along Post Road. As it exists today, a farmhouse and outbuildings are located on the south side of the property near Post Road and two houses are in the center of the site with access off Hyland-Croy Road. The site currently has two driveways from Hyland-Croy Road for the existing homes and one driveway from Post Road to the south.

History

This application was previously scheduled on the Commission's December 12, 2019 meeting agenda, but was tabled at the applicant's request. On January 9, 2018, City Council passed Ordinance 87-17, accepting the annexation of the property from Jerome Township, Union County to the City of Dublin. On May 21, 2015, the Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for 32, four-unit residential buildings totaling 128 units, and an independent and assisted living facility containing 125 units. At the time, the Commission encouraged the applicant to meet with residents to address their concerns with the three-story height of the independent living facility as well as the proposed road connections through the site. The applicant met with the neighbors in 2015 and again in December 2019.

Community Plan

The Future Land Use Map in the Community Plan has two land use classifications for the site. The northern third is Suburban Residential Low Density (1-2 dwelling units per acre), while the remaining two thirds are Mixed Residential Low Density (up to 3 dwelling units per acre). When calculated, the Community Plan's recommendation would be 121 residential units, either single family or single-family attached or low-density multifamily units on the 45.5 acres.

Proposal

The proposal includes a residential development with an Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) with a maximum of 200 units and a maximum of 90 single-family homes with associated site improvements on a 45.5-acre site. An ACLF-type facility is considered a commercial use in the Zoning Code, which would have a Future Land Use classification of General Institutional. It can also be residential in nature.

Ms. Fox inquired how many acres are in Subarea B.

Ms. Martin responded that Subarea B is comprised of 35.5 acres. Subarea A is 9.9 acres.

Ms. Call inquired how many units are permitted in General Institutional.

Ms. Martin responded that the General Institutional classification does not designate a density. The reviewing body would review and make a determination on a case-by-case basis. The proposal is for 200 units.

Ms. Martin stated that the Northwest/Glacier Ridge Special Area Plan recommends detached single-family homes adjacent to the existing, established neighborhoods. It also recommends the rural roadway character, which has been observed by the majority of the neighborhoods that have been developed along Hyland-Croy Road. This proposal complies with the rural roadway character. The Thoroughfare Plan designates Hyland-Croy Road as a Minor Arterial Road. Hyland-Croy Road is located within the Union County jurisdiction. That plan does make recommendations for future rights-of-way. The City and Union County coordinate in the review of applications adjacent to both jurisdictions. Therefore, the applicant is dedicating an additional 50 feet of right-of-way. In 2016, the City, Union County, Jerome Township, and the City of Marysville undertook a multijurisdictional planning effort, the Crossroads Area Plan, to evaluate existing conditions and propose common land uses, infrastructure, and economic development strategies for the area located at the crossroads of U.S.33/S.R. 161/Post Road, and Hyland-Croy Road. The Crossroads Area Plan Land Use recommendations for this site align with Dublin's Community Plan recommendations.

Site Plan

Size:

The site is 45.5 acres in size; Subarea A is approximately 10 acres and is where the Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) is proposed to be located, which will have up to 200 residential units. Subarea B is approximately 35 acres and will have 90 single-family lots. Subarea B will be developed in two sections. The delineation between those sections is the North Fork of Indian Run. The southern portion of the site will have 54 lots; the northern portion will have 36 lots.

Access:

Three new access points on Hyland-Croy Road are proposed. The southern-most point is in Subarea A, and is a right in/right out, intended to provide access to ACLF. There are two access points in Subarea B, one north of the stream and one south. These will be full access points. This proposal depicts future public rights-of-way that will be dedicated with the plat. It also shows the extension of the existing street stubs from Post Preserve through the Dublin Gateway Development to Hyland-Croy Road. The alignment shown is consistent with the City's 2006 approval of additional connectivity in the area due to anticipated improvements at SR161/Post Road interchange.

Subareas:

The Preliminary Development Plan establishes uses and development standards for each subarea. Subarea A is the ACLF with supporting uses, including open space and parking spaces. Subarea B is the single-family detached homes, including open space, parking space, model home and home occupation. Specific development standards, including setbacks, lot coverages and parking requirements are provided in the development text. Staff has recommended that all encroachments be eliminated from the residential sideyard setback. Varying residential lot standards are provided for perimeter versus interior lots. Perimeter lots, adjacent to Post Preserve and Park Place, will be larger, have greater setbacks and a lot coverage of up to 60%. The interior, new lots will be significantly smaller, have reduced setbacks and an increased lot coverage of up to 70%. Code permits up to 45% for PUDs unless otherwise approved by the Commission.

Architecture:

The applicant has also provided proposed architectural and building standards for the two subareas. In Subarea A, it is anticipated the ACLF will be a three-story structure with 200 units. The proposed maximum height is up to 45 feet. Staff is recommending the maximum height be reduced to 35 feet, and that there be a maximum height of 25 feet for accessory structures, which may be located closer to property lines than the primary structure. In regard to the building standards for Subarea B, the maximum height is 35 feet. Primary and secondary materials are designated; dimensional shingles are required; metal standing seam roofs are permitted. Garages are limited to 47.5% of the front façade of the home. Staff recommends that number be rounded to 50%, as it is more easily administered.

Open Space/Signage:

An open space and connectivity plan has been provided. There is a total of 12.4 acres of open space, a portion in each Subarea and a continuous section along Hyland-Croy Road. Per the rural roadway corridor recommendation, a 100-ft. setback will provide a green buffer. There are two reserves in Subarea A, which will be owned and maintained by the ACLF, which is typical for commercial facilities. There are six reserves in Subarea B, which the applicant has proposed to

be owned and maintained by the HOA. Staff has recommended that these reserves be owned by the City and maintained by the HOA, with the exception that the City will maintain the stormwater retention basins and the shared use paths. The shared use path along Hyland-Croy will connect to the regional network and to Glacier Ridge Metro Park. Sidewalks will provide connectivity within the neighborhood. The development text provides sign allowances for each Subarea; four signs are proposed. The applicant has the opportunity to submit a comprehensive sign package requesting additional signage with the Final Development Plan.

Traffic Impact Study:

A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is being conducted, as required for proposed rezonings. The applicant is working with the Union County and City of Dublin engineers to finalize the study. The TIS will make recommendations to mitigate the traffic impacts of this neighborhood on the larger road network. Those mitigations will be included in an infrastructure agreement for Council's approval. The TIS is looking at eight intersections along the Hyland-Croy corridor; three are new intersections provided by this development, and five are existing intersections. The TIS looks at daily trips generated. Included are some of the preliminary improvements that may occur as a result of the TIS findings. The TIS must be finalized prior to City Council's review. The outcome of that study will result in the final recommendations for mitigation.

Preliminary Plat

Ms. Martin stated that the Preliminary Plat for the 45.5 acres depicts Subarea A with 9.9 acres and creates a developable area for the ACLF. Subarea B depicts 90 lots for the residential single-family homes, six public streets and six reserves of open space. The required parkland dedication is 5+ acres; however, approximately 10 acres are provided. Staff recommends the acreage be dedicated to the City and maintained by the HOA. It also recommended that the applicant work with the City Engineer regarding the street names.

This application has been reviewed against the Code review criteria, and staff recommends a recommendation of approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with 11 conditions to City Council, and a recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Plat with four conditions to City Council.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that the development text indicated that the responsibility for maintenance of the open space would be provided by more than one HOA. She requested clarification. Staff indicated the applicant would provide clarification with their presentation.

Ms. Fox stated that the Thoroughfare Plan talks about the continuity of the visual elements along Hyland-Croy Road. The developer was requested to use a masonry and open metal fencing. How does that create a continuous, unified look up Hyland-Croy Road? What was requested of the other developments along the road in regard to fencing?

Ms. Martin responded that the condition referred to fences within Subarea A that were over six feet in height. She would expect those to be behind the building. With assisted care facilities, the City has granted requests for fences that are taller than Code. In those cases, the fences were required to be open fences that periodically were broken up with piers. They would be

consistent with what currently exists – a split rail fence with stone piers. The preliminary landscape plan will be further developed in the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if this becomes its own neighborhood, effectively, or is it part of the adjacent neighborhood.

Ms. Martin responded that it would become its own neighborhood, called Dublin Gateway.

Mr. Fishman inquired if, per Conservation Design Guidelines, 50% open space was being provided.

Ms. Martin responded that it is not.

Mr. Fishman inquired if 75% of the lots would be adjacent to open spaces.

Ms. Martin responded that they would not.

Mr. Fishman inquired if 100-200 ft. setbacks are provided.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if curvilinear streets would be provided.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman stated that Lots 1-37 have nothing but road frontage along the backyards of those lots. Essentially, the Conservation Design requirements are not being met at all.

Ms. Martin responded that it is correct that they are not met here fully. Typically, compliance with Conservation Design Guidelines has been required with larger-scale neighborhoods, where there is more opportunity to vary the site layout.

Ms. Husak noted that because this is a field, there is nothing to conserve. The Conservation Design resolution refers to heavily wooded areas on the outskirts of town in the northern portion of the City, i.e. Tartan Ridge, Oak Park and Tartan West to some extent. This site is not a prime site for applying those requirements.

Mr. Fishman inquired if those guidelines were applied here whatsoever.

Ms. Husak responded that they were not.

Ms. Call stated that one of the benefits of a PUD is that it provides more flexibility in how the requirements are met. There is a reduction in the number of ERUs from the 121 they are entitled to on this size property to 90 single-family homes and 200 additional units. That is a huge give. The zoning classifications of the adjacent neighborhoods are very similar to the R2 and R3 to which this parcel is entitled. Most of the Union County lots hover around 10,000 sq. feet. A few are 9,300 sq. feet in the lowlands; some are 14,000 sq. feet. In this plan, there are five lots exceeding 10,000 sq. feet; the remainder are 5,800 sq. feet, which is a significant reduction in lot size. If this area is being addressed as an R4 or R5, we need to be clear about what we are trying to accomplish. As it appears, the developer is getting the benefit in the residential area and also getting 200 ACLF units. We need to be clear as to what is being granted here. Currently, she is not supportive of this rezoning and preliminary plat. This will have a significant impact on the neighbors immediately adjacent. Three entrances are being introduced on an already congested road. Although the spirit of a PUD permits flexibility, all that is being provided here is increased density.

Ms. Newell inquired if Engineering anticipates turn lanes based on the preliminary TIS report that would ultimately affect this proposed plan.

Ms. Martin responded that turn lane improvements are anticipated, but the number and length has yet to be finalized.

Ms. Newell stated that factor could change the plan significantly, depending upon how much space they would take from this site. In regard to the lot width of 53 feet, there are a number of projects around the City where senior living type residences have been permitted on small lots. Are these comparable in size?

Ms. Martin responded that the most comparable development is The Hamlet, which was recently approved. Those lots are nearly identical in size with similar setbacks and lot coverages. However, that neighborhood is much smaller.

Ms. Newell stated that with that particular development, very detailed architecture was provided to illustrate how well-designed buildings on very small lots would be accomplished.

Applicant Presentation

Don Hunter, 4936 Pesaro Way, Dublin requested that the Commission consider this application in context with the City's roadway system and goals. They have been working diligently with staff this past year on this plan. The first staff report for the Commission contained 37 conditions, which they accepted. The report for this meeting has 11 conditions, and they have accepted those, as well. The roundabout at Hyland-Croy Road is immediately southwest of this site. He described the anticipated roadway changes in the area, including the US33 interchange modification, which will result in the closing of the Post Preserve access from Post Road, per ODOT regulations. As part of the planned interchange, a new residential street will provide access to the Post Preserve neighborhood from Hyland-Croy Road, as approved by City Council in 2006. This proposed development must be designed to integrate with the Post Preserve neighborhood, and the City has required that the proposed roadway system will separate the site into three sections. That is the non-negotiable difficulty of this site. This development plan is based upon the City's roadway plans. The single-family homes in the plan are targeted toward empty nesters. With a density of 2.5 du/acre, it is consistent with the Community Plan. Although Subarea A would be a logical location for retail, that use would not be responsive to the community's needs. They do not believe that single-family homes would be appropriate in Subarea A. He asks the Commission to consider the fixed points for this site – the roundabout, the closing of the Post Preserve Boulevard access and the connections with the three existing stub roads in Post Preserve. The facility in Subarea A will provide memory care and independent senior living. They are confident that this development on this site will provide the appropriate transition that will protect the property values of the single-family homeowners; have a low impact on the school system; and provide the transportation system required by the City.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Fox stated that the development text indicates there will be more than one HOA.

Mr. Hunter responded that there will be a master HOA and a separate HOA for each of the subareas.

Ms. Fox inquired if there are any private streets within this development.

Mr. Hunter responded that within the residential area in Subarea B, the streets are all public. In Subarea A, there would be one private street.

Ms. Husak clarified that it is not considered a street; it is a private access drive to Subarea A.

Ms. Fox stated that there appear to be only four architectural styles for 90 homes. What is the possibility of increasing the number of architectural design styles?

Mr. Hunter responded that he does not believe they have submitted architectural styles with this application.

Ms. Fox stated that the text indicates there will be a variety of four different house styles. Mr. Hunter indicated that he agrees with her concern. Those styles will be submitted for the Final Development Plan, and they would work with staff to add clarifying language.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the "0" setbacks. If Subarea A were to develop into assisted living utilizing more than one building, the setbacks would have to change. The development text is very vague about what could happen in Subarea A.

Mr. Hunter stated that he does not believe her concern is with the perimeter setback. It is with the setbacks between buildings.

Ms. Fox stated that in Subarea A, it is indicated that interior setbacks would be "0." She assumes that is between buildings, not side setbacks. More specificity is needed in the text regarding Subarea A.

Mr. Hunter stated that he would refer to the Catholic Diocese development across the street as a reference. They are developing a 75-unit independent living facility and a 45-unit assisted living facility. There are two separate buildings on two separate lots, yet they are physically connected. They may be financing the independent living under one HUD loan, and the assisted living structure under a second HUD loan. Because the two structures are physically connected, there is a "0" setback. With this case, he is not the developer of this project. They will be purchasing the 10-acre site and selling lots off to potential developers.

Mr. Fishman stated that there is a long materials list, including vinyl and artificial stucco.

Mr. Hunter responded that those materials are in Subarea A only.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would like to see the materials list tightened up.

Mr. Hunter stated that they are willing to do so, but requested that he specify the materials of concern.

Mr. Fishman stated that some of the following materials should be clarified or eliminated -- synthetic millwork, synthetic stone, synthetic stucco, and vinyl. He would like that list to be tightened so the materials are only those expected to be used. He wants to ensure that this community will still be a quality community 20 years from now.

Mr. Hunter agreed that the list would be tightened up.

Ms. Newell stated that she has concerns about some of the building materials. She has no problem with brick, stone, synthetic stone, stucco, wood siding or fibrous cement. Synthetic stucco, however, could be panels -- with this product, you do not know what you are getting. She has the same issue with decorative, synthetic millwork for exterior applications, composite trim and vinyl trim. It is possible to have both good and poor versions of the materials. The text indicates the windows can be vinyl or alternatives, which essentially allows anything and everything. In previous applications, the Commission has required that those materials be removed from the list unless the applicant can provide a sample of the specific product that is requested. Once the Commission approves the development text, the architecture proposed with the Final Development Plan will be judged against the text. She supports rezoning the property and the proposed use for Subarea A. She understands the proposed drive configurations. What she is concerned with are the 53-foot interior lots. When the Commission has approved buildings on smaller footprints such as these in the past, the Commission was certain what it would be getting architecturally. They knew how the buildings would fit on the site and where the landscaping would go. The applicant addressed the small parcels in a very sensitive manner. Ultimately, she may be able to approve this rezoning, but at this point, there is insufficient information.

Mr. Hunter stated that none of those items is approved prior to the Final Development Plan approval.

Ms. Husak clarified that Subarea A is a commercial development, which will require Commission review and approval of the Final Development Plan. The Final Development Plan for a commercial development includes every architectural elevation with design drawings and material specifications. Subarea B is different. With a Final Development Plan for a residential development, the architectural details for the homes do not require Commission approval.

Ms. Newell stated that, previously, if the development had very small lots, such as these, there was some control of the architecture in the PUD. The Commission saw and reviewed those details. Ms. Husak stated that The Hamlet provided character drawings of the front elevation, as did Romanelli and Hughes for their recent development.

Ms. Newell stated that those visual character elevations defined the architecture against which the architecture could be judged.

Ms. Husak stated that the Commission could request that character detail with the Preliminary Development Plan or with the Final Development Plan, but it would not have the level of detail provided for a commercial development.

Ms. Newell stated that, as an architect looking at the text, it appears that anything "under the sun" could end up here, which has not been typical for other small-lot developments.

Mr. Hunter stated that they are willing to commit to all natural materials for the residential development component.

Mr. Fishman stated that the materials list is too lengthy. His experience is that when a lengthy list of building materials is provided, the developer chooses to use the less expensive or synthetic materials because they were included in the list. The list needs to be tightened.

Ms. Call requested that the Future Land Use Plan be provided. She inquired where the Catholic Diocese development, which is a comparable use, is located on that plan.

Ms. Martin indicated its location.

Ms. Call stated it is indicated within the Premium Office/Institutional area, which is a more intensive use.

Ms. Martin stated that the City designates future land uses outside its jurisdiction, but cannot require they be followed. The Crossroads Area Plan provides the most up-to-date land uses for the west side of Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Call stated that in regard to the parcels in question, per the City's Future Land Use designations, this area is designated Low Density/Residential. The proposed plan is requesting a Medium Density Residential subarea and a High Density Institutional use subarea. The property owner is entitled to Low Density/Residential. If it makes sense for the Commission to entertain a different type of project, that can occur. However, the Commission's role is to consider the text, maps and legislation that designates the Future Land Use for this particular area as Residential/Low Density. As a Commission member, she is tasked with enforcing what City Council has designated for the City; it is not within her purview to decide to rezone the area differently. The request is for a density of 200 units on the outparcel. She encourages the applicant to approach City Council with that request. She is not supportive of the project.

Public Comment

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, Dublin stated that the residents are concerned that the proposed plans lack specificity. Too much is left to chance. The lot sizes also are a concern. He would prefer to see larger lots and architecture with more character. Where he lives on Holbein Drive, there is a substantial tree line with a five to ten-foot setback. With only a ten-foot setback, some of the trees will be damaged. His home was built with a five-foot setback from the treeline, and many of the trees were damaged during the construction process. How will they protect the root systems of those trees?

Mr. Supelak stated that there is a robust tree line. With the ten-foot setback on the lots in the new development, there is concern that the trees are in danger.

Ms. Newell stated that there is nothing in the proposed text that would preserve those trees if they were actually located on the property that is being rezoned.

Ms. Martin stated that within Subarea A, the setback from the east property line is 30 feet. Within Subarea B, the rear yard setbacks along that east property line are also 30 feet. The intent was to match the rear yard setbacks in the adjacent neighborhood. The only time there is a 10-foot setback adjacent to Post Preserve is between the sideyards of two homes.

Mr. Razor stated that one of those lots is heavily wooded. That would not be an appropriate setback there. Would it be evaluated before proceeding?

Ms. Newell responded that once the setbacks are established in the text, no changes could be made.

Mr. Razor stated that the sideyard setbacks there should be increased slightly. There is a very nice tree line there, and it is likely some of the trees would not survive.

Ms. Martin responded that it could be easily resolved by the applicant's agreement that the sideyard setback along the east property line for those two lots be increased to 15 feet, which is generous setback for a sideyard.

Mr. Razor inquired if fences would be permitted in this neighborhood.

Ms. Martin responded that fences would be permitted in Subarea B; however, they would need to meet Code requirements for an open fence, a maximum of four feet in height.

Mr. Razor stated that it not consistent with what is in Post Preserve.

Ms. Martin stated that it can vary between neighborhoods.

Mr. Razor stated that he would assume they would want to make the fences consistent. He does not think the fences look good, particularly not along Hyland-Croy Road. Another issue is the size of the homes – 2,000-2,500 sq. feet. Homes of that size are obviously intended to be at a very low price point. This is concerning to the residents of his neighborhood. He believes the Commission's emphasis on higher-end, all natural materials is important. The other issues are the proposed level of density and the lack of character in the lots.

Jodie Bahnub, 6849 Holbein Drive, Dublin, stated that her concern is the same as Ms. Call's. How can Subarea A be approved with such little information? How can the residents provide any feedback on a 200-unit proposal with parking spaces? She is concerned about the appearance of that parking area behind these homes. Equally concerning is the level of traffic. When is construction of the roundabout scheduled? Will that coincide with the construction of this development?

Tina Wawszkiewicz, Traffic Engineer responded that the roundabout is a joint effort of ODOT, MORPC, Union County and the City of Dublin. Their most recent funding award filled the final funding gap for construction, and construction is scheduled to begin 2022.

Ms. Bahnub stated that it is likely the roundabout construction would begin after this proposed project. That intersection is very dangerous. The City has placed a traffic signal there, which is appreciated, but the intersection remains difficult. The residents are unable to exit Post Preserve due to the traffic backup. Adding all these new homes and the units in Subarea A will increase the existing congestion, particularly since the roundabout construction is not intended to begin for a couple of years. Although they have indicated the new homes will target empty nesters, it would be better to make it a 55+ community. Otherwise, empty nesters will not be the only buyers of these homes. They could be considered starter homes, and there would be children – the same as in any other development. If the intent of the small lots is to fit the empty nester profile, then it should be made a 55+ community with corresponding requirements. Otherwise, it is not consistent with the Low Density zoning in their neighborhood.

Keith Hammond, 6965 Post Preserve Boulevard, Dublin, stated that his property abuts the proposed Subarea A. When the Post Preserve Boulevard entrance/exit is sealed off, their neighborhood will become completely isolated. Their access will be through the proposed development, so these small lots and homes will impact the character and property values in their neighborhood. As proposed, Subarea A is vague – will there be a three-story retirement home in their backyards? They are concerned that from their backyards, there will be a parking lot view. Nowhere else in Dublin has a retirement home been placed in the middle of a neighborhood. The one across the street is fine.

Nan Li, 6864 Royal Plume Drive, Dublin, stated that her home is in the adjacent neighborhood. She is concerned about the increase in traffic on Hyland-Croy Road. Did the traffic study look at the ingress/egress traffic from this community only? There is a significant level of development occurring to the north, which will put more traffic on Hyland-Croy Road. How much backup can be expected at the roundabout? During peak hours, it is difficult to exit Post Preserve Boulevard. Will residents be able to turn left out of the community? Will there be a traffic signal, or four-way stops to facilitate their access? In addition, a new middle school to the north would additionally impact the traffic.

Mr. Razor requested clarification about the review process. Is a separate rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan necessary or could all be done with the Final Development Plan?

Ms. Newell stated that they can be scheduled for review at the same meeting, but the Commission would vote on each separately. Two of the review items were scheduled for this meeting.

Mr. Razor stated that it would be easier if the details provided with the Final Development Plan were known, as well. Otherwise, there is distrust. It seems that the Commission has to approve something without knowing what they will get, and later, they could discover they will get something that was not anticipated. Presently, the plan is too vague. It would be helpful if the Preliminary and Final Development steps could be combined.

Mr. Boggs stated that with the PUD process provided by the City's Code, applicants could choose to bring both together and provide as much detail as possible. However, this is the rezoning

stage. The Commission's vote is to make a recommendation to City Council, then Council will conduct a separate public meeting review and vote on the rezoning. After that, a Final Development Plan containing more detailed drawings is brought to the Commission. That plan must be consistent with the rezoning. This process is not atypical.

Mr. Razor stated that, regardless, it would be easier to know what you will be getting. He inquired if the requested rezoning is not approved, would it remain zoned as it is?

Ms. Newell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Razor inquired what the current zoning is.

Ms. Martin responded that it is currently zoned Rural.

Ms. Newell stated that when any land is annexed into the City, it is initially zoned Rural. Typically, the property owner will request a rezoning in the future. At that time, the Community Plan analysis for future development within the City is considered. The Community Plan designates this area as either Suburban Residential/Low Density or Mixed Residential/Low Density, which provides up to 3 du/acre. The proposed plan would increase it above that density.

Ms. Li inquired about the possible expansion of Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Newell stated that consideration is not before the Commission tonight.

Ms. Li inquired if this is being considered independent of any possible expansion of Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Newell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Li inquired if the City is also working with Dublin City Schools to apprise them of potentially additional students. Although redistricting recently occurred, if this community is not limited to 55+, there is a potential that the increased students would result in Karrer Middle School being over capacity. If that is the case, redistricting may be needed again.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Commission has had that question for previous cases. These developments are not part of the redistricting plans.

Ms. Husak clarified that the Dublin Schools' redistricting considerations factor in the maximum density permitted by the Community Plan's Future Land Use map.

Ms. Call stated that per the Community Plan, this area is designated as R1, R2, or R3. Dublin Schools do stay cognizant of what development applications are coming before the City, and if anything should be approved that is inconsistent with the existing Land Use map, staff would reach out to the Schools to make them aware. Therefore, it could be expected that Dublin Schools would not have forecasted for more than 3 du/acre on this parcel.

Mr. Hunter stated that this land is projected for growth by Dublin Schools, and it is consistent with the Community Plan, which allows multifamily here. On 35 acres, there are 90 homes. In recent years, Council has discussed the need for empty nester housing; that is what will be provided here, and no students would be generated from a retirement community in Subarea A.

Ms. Fox inquired about the size and price points of the homes on those smaller lots.

Mr. Hunter stated that the homes would range from 2,000 to 2,500 sq. feet. They have not yet priced the homes. Currently, they are in discussions with several homebuilders.

Ms. Newell stated that the development text does not indicate the homes would be designated for empty nesters. The introduction states, "this community will provide for the development of

single-family homes, varying lot sizes, as well as an Adult Congregate Living Facility. The ACLF will provide senior residential opportunities, as detailed in the zoning text being filed with this application." There is no limitation provided for senior housing, only an opportunity for it. There is nothing limiting this development to an age classification in Subarea A. It would appear that adults of any age could live in that building.

Ms. Martin responded that, based on the definition for ACLF, she does not foresee anyone else living there. It indicates that there would be "one or more levels of care, including, but not limited to, nursing care, onsite dispensary facilities for medications prescribed by a physician, providing care only to resident onsite dining facilities and assistance with other activities of daily living..."

Ms. Newell stated that description satisfies her concern.

Mr. Fishman stated that in Subarea B, the single-family homes, there is no guarantee that families with children will not move there, regardless of the lot size. This site is in the Jerome High School district, and many people are looking for homes to have their children in that school district. Would he be willing to dedicate that subdivision to be a 55+ community?

Mr. Hunter responded that he was not willing to do so.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is acknowledging that there will be children there. Previously, he indicated that this development would have no impact on the school system.

Mr. Hunter stated that it would have a low impact. He lives in Cortona, which is an age-targeted community, not an age-limited community. That has worked; there are no children in that community.

Mr. Fishman noted that the price ranges of the homes in Cortona are different than will exist here.

Mr. Hunter stated that the primary factors are not the cost, but the home size, lot size and desire for a maintenance-free lifestyle.

Ms. Call inquired about the definition of an ACLF in the Code.

Ms. Fox stated that the development text identifies an ACLF use. Once the PUD is approved, the development follows the text. She understands the concern, because the term ACLF is defined as "shall include but not necessarily be limited to...independent living, and assisted living facilities, field nursing, memory care, license care, and/or age-restricted congregate living apartments, nursing homes, medical rehabilitation facilities, either individually or in some combination thereof." That is an important paragraph, and its potential interpretation is a concern, as well as the 70 percent lot coverage. Does the 17,000 sq. feet indicated apply only to the building or is it across the subarea?

Ms. Martin responded that it is across the subarea, but that amount has been revised to 15,000 sq. feet per acre within that subarea. If they want to have 17,000 sq. feet, they would be required to submit a request for a Conditional Use to the Commission to ask for the additional density.

Ms. Fox stated that she is clarifying that a subarea can develop in a variety of ways with an assisted living use there.

Ms. Martin responded that density for a care facility is consistent with what currently exists in other areas of Dublin.

Mr. Hunter stated that they are willing to limit Subarea A to age 55+ and to a two-story building.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Community Plan permits a total of 120 single-family residences on the parcel. This proposal places 90 single-family residences in one subarea and an additional 200 units for senior living in a second subarea. Traffic is a concern. This intersection and area is very congested during peak hours. In general, she is supportive of rezoning Rural to Residential; however, the proposed density is high, when assessed against the Community Plan.

Mr. Supelak stated that this plan leaves a lot to chance. Generally, the Commission has some sense of what is proposed, and we do not have that with this proposal. He is concerned that this body will be deceived, and when the site is developed, it will not match the expectations. In addition to the 11 conditions staff recommended for the rezoning, another three have been suggested during this discussion. The number of conditions give him pause. He agrees that there are certain communities where a certain buyer is targeted, and the homes are designed accordingly, but that does not necessarily restrict buyers. However, the City has a couple of communities with small lots and quality, high price-point homes. If that can be achieved here, as well, he has no objection.

Ms. Fox stated that the use of single-family homes here is good. However, she has concerns about Subarea A. Determining the density based on the entire acreage can be misleading. There are two separate parcels involved. In Subarea B, per the Low Density requirements, the density should be 2.0 du/acre, not 2.5, which would reduce the number of lots by 18. With past residential developments, the City has required varying lot widths. With this proposal, each lot is 53 feet along the roadway. There is the same lot width and same rear yard setback, which creates a homogenous, "cookie cutter" look down the roadway. She appreciates that the applicant indicates a willingness to offer more than four architectural designs. With The Hamlet application, the applicant provided well-articulated architectural styles, which provided assurance of the particular product that would be provided. The Commission does not see that here. She does not understand the reason Post Preserve's access must be changed to be through another neighborhood. That concerns her, but she understands that is a Council issue, not a Commission issue. She believes the developer would have to agree to that access. She is concerned about the level of density in Subarea A and the vagueness of what can develop there. Approving 70% lot coverage immediately next to a residential neighborhood is concerning. She would reduce the size of that lot coverage and tighten up the language on the expectations. It is currently zoned R1, which is the most open, least dense residential zoning. The proposal is to change that to the greatest lot coverage and density. She does not believe that is fair to the neighboring residents. They have no understanding of what will be provided in regard to lighting and buffering along their perimeter. Those are her primary concerns, but she also has concerns about the landscape layout. As stormwater ponds are developed, they should be attractively designed landscape features. Often, a stormwater pond can be just a dry pond. Stormwater ponds should not be recognizable as such. Next to this site will be one of the largest roundabouts and busiest intersections in the area, flowing into a rural corridor. The manner in which that area is planned is very important. In summary, her main concerns are the amount of density, the vagueness of Subarea A, and the proposed access points.

Ms. Call inquired fellow Commissioners' thoughts about the proposed 5,300 sq. ft. minimum lot size within the single-family subarea.

Mr. Supelak responded that he could be agreeable to it, but previously, applicants have demonstrated the high quality architecture of the proposed homes. Without having that assurance here, it is difficult to be comfortable with it.

Mr. Hunter stated that the road system has been imposed by the City and ODOT. An interstate off ramp dumps onto this property. Would the Commission be supportive of a 120-unit empty-nester product without an age restriction here? If so, they could attempt to come up with such a plan. Without an understanding of the seven-year history of this property, Commissioners may be unaware of the hurdles they have attempted to jump through to develop it. At this point, they need specific direction to be able to continue that effort. They cannot spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on architectural plans without direction. The proposed plan is the result of direction they were given previously. They have satisfied all of staff's previous conditions. They are attempting to meet the needs of the community, yet be fair to the property owner, with whom they have been in contract since 2012. The difficulty is due to the different interests that need to be satisfied. He requests that the Commission tell them if they will support an assisted-living type of development here, where the interstate ramp empties, and if not, if they would be supportive of 121 single-family homes here. It is important to point out that the development cost includes extending the road extension through the site. The proposed plan has been vetted thoroughly, and it is a good plan, but if the Commission does not support it, he requests clear direction on what can be pursued here.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is looking at a land development plan against what has been envisioned here. Low Density and Mid-density Residential were envisioned, which would be 121 units. His question is if the Commission would support 121 high-quality single-family units here. That is what the Future Land Use map indicates should be entertained, and if the Commission were viewing an application with 121 units that met Code requirements for open space, setbacks, roadway buffer, etc. – the discussion would be quite different. Conditions are typically placed on an application because either the text requires additional clarity, or the first choice was not the optimal choice for some reason.

Mr. Hunter stated that they could put 31 of the same type of units that are in Subarea B in Subarea A. Would that be an acceptable plan to bring back to the Commission? He needs clear direction. He noted that Community Plans are established to provide guidance, and there are significant mitigating circumstances here, including the road system that cuts through the site. They need to have a development that works; otherwise, the property owner is being deprived of his land value.

Mr. Hunter requested the Commission to table the application. They will return with a revised plan.

Mr. Fishman stated that he likes the assisted living concept, although perhaps not 200 units. He also likes the single-family units, but there is a need to be much more creative there. Previously, these types of applications were not stacked lots; they were more creative with courtyards and common space. It may be necessary to eliminate a few lots to achieve more creativity within the residential component and make the homes a more expensive product. The concept makes sense, but it is important to achieve the best plan for the residents and the City.

Mr. Newell stated that the purpose of a PUD is to give better control over the architecture within a project. Sometimes tighter lot lines are permitted in a PUD because, in return, the City will be getting some back. However, the proposed development text does not indicate that approving the rezoning would result in anything better than leaving the zoning as is. That said, she is supportive of rezoning this property, and ultimately, perhaps the smaller lot sizes, but only if we can be assured of the product. Currently, the text is too open. She is supportive of the proposed assisted living facility. She could be supportive of the plan, but at this time, the text has not been developed sufficiently.

Laura Comek, Comek Law LLC, 5693 Strathmore Lane, Dublin, stated that she is representing the Schottenstein Real Estate Group. She requested clarity of the Commission's guidance.

Ms. Newell provided clarity on the building materials, specifically the vinyl trim. In the past, where there was no assurance of the actual product that would be used, the Commission requested the product be eliminated from the text. The applicant can provide a sample of the actual product later and request that the text be amended to include the material. The issue is that, currently, the materials portion of this text limits nothing.

Ms. Comek responded that they would add the additional clarity to the text.

Mr. Boggs stated that the Chair has suggested that the vinyl material be removed from the Preliminary Development Plan phase. Later, if the applicant discovers an excellent grade of vinyl that they would like to use, they can bring back a sample and request that the text be amended, and include it in the Final Development Plan. The applicant has the ability to provide a sample of the material later.

Mr. Fishman stated that Mr. Hunter has requested that the application be tabled. Several Commission members are in favor of the proposed plan, but believe the residential lots need to be more creative.

Ms. Comek stated the Community Plan provides opportunity for Residential Low Density or for Residential Medium Density, which can be multifamily. The Community Plan recognized that this is not only the last piece of property in this corridor, it is a transition piece between the residents and the interstate highway. Typically, that last piece is different as it tries to accommodate that transition.

Ms. Newell stated that she is a proponent of Concept Plans, and the Commission has not seen a Concept Plan for this particular plan.

Ms. Comek stated that the Commission reviewed earlier plans for the site in 2012 and 2015. This application was re-filed and reviewed by the Commission in 2017. Perhaps if there is no clear policy stated, it is a policy issue for City Council.

Mr. Fishman stated that this is a PUD application, and the Commission has a good amount of flexibility with a PUD. He likes the concept, but much more creativity with the lots is necessary. He would suggest that they discuss the plan with the residents in the neighborhood and address their concerns.

Ms. Comek indicated that they would do so.

Ms. Fox stated that this site will be developed, and the Commissioners believe that a good use here is single family. Putting 200 units in Subarea A is a different land use, which creates a need for other items, such as lighting and parking. The existing residential community would be

bumping up against a different land use. There will be higher density here because of that land use. Mr. Hunter has inquired about the possibility of placing 121 units across the entire site. She would be in favor of allowing more density here if the development was something more consistent with the existing residential environment. She also understands the difficulty in selling units close to that roundabout and highway. Perhaps the lots in Subarea A could be the smaller, 55+ lots, and make the lots in Subarea A larger, single-family lots – as that subarea is the front door to the Post Preserve neighborhood. That could be a better option for Subarea A. It would be much more difficult for the neighbors to live next to a 2-story building with parking lot, lights and staff coming and going all hours of the day and night. That would be a different use in this area.

Ms. Comek stated the Community Plan acknowledges that this is a transition property and permits mixed uses. A senior-living facility would be a good neighbor to the residential community. Perhaps this application should be kicked up to Council and let them decide if there is a tolerance for a buffering use with low traffic impact here.

Ms. Call requested that for this application, and any future applications, if there are items, such as the ACLF, that are not defined in the Code, could there be an accompanying request to amend Code to include that definition. This would mediate the vagueness upfront.

Ms. Boggs stated that in the Development Text that he viewed, there was a definition for an ACLF. It is not codified Citywide, but it would be the codified definition of that use for Subarea A. Ms. Call inquired if it would be location-specific or zone-specific.

Mr. Boggs stated that it would be PUD-specific. For Subarea A of the Gateway PUD, ACLF is defined to mean, “one or more buildings providing assisted living accommodations for senior citizens and the elderly with one or more levels of care....”

Ms. Call stated that in an application it is possible to define things differently. For instance, they can define a hospital as senior care facility. She would like to have the parallel in the Code.

Mr. Supelak stated that this would apply to multiple cases. There were multiple building types in the Bright Road development. In both cases, we were asking for density comparables. With this plan, the 200-unit building and 70% lot coverage is a concern. That does not mean there is no appreciation for the project. At this point, perhaps the need is to fine-tune the plan and eliminate the vagueness of what will be on Subarea A and the vagueness of the architecture in Subarea B. There is a need for additional references to be provided for the architecture and for comparable uses.

Mr. Boggs stated that the Zoning Code generally does not define an analogous use. It does mention the type of use without defining it in the context of parking requirements. If this definition were to be codified for the entire City, it might not work in another PUD.

Ms. Call stated that what she is looking for is definitions in the Land Development Code. She sees a definition for a townhouse. If an applicant comes forward with an application for a townhouse, we have a definition that applies. If they were proposing a six-unit townhouse, but a townhouse is defined in Code as a two-unit building, staff could indicate the application does not meet Code. In the Code, that number of units would be a multi-family dwelling.

Mr. Boggs stated that in the context of a PUD, a flexibility in the definition might be desirable for those items that are not the basic building blocks -- for those items that are not analogous.

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to table the Dublin Gateway Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan and Dublin Gateway Preliminary Plat.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.


[Motion approved 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that staff is attempting to schedule a joint meeting with City Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board, potentially in February. That group is anticipated to meet quarterly.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.


Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission


Deputy Clerk of Council

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

[Motion passed 6-0]

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the four conditions.
Mr. McCauley confirmed the applicant was in agreement.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat to City Council with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments and updates to the plat in accordance with the accompanying Preliminary Development Plan are made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure that the street names are approved and indicated appropriately on the plat; and
- 3) That the applicant revise the Preliminary Plat prior to Council review to reflect a typical chamfer at the corner of Hyland-Croy Road and McKittrick Road, as required by Code.
- 4) That the applicant revise the plat to accurately display the planned 100-foot right-of-way for Hyland-Croy Road.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion passed 6-0]

6. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road, 17-061, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

A request to rezone ±45.4 acres from Rural District to Planned Unit Development District to facilitate the future development of 91 single-family homes and up to 200 living units for seniors with varying levels of care in one or more buildings and approximately 12.7 acres of open space.

7. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road, 17-061, Preliminary Plat

A request to subdivide ±45.4 acres into one lot for a senior care facility and 91 single-family lots, rights-of-way for five public streets, and six open space reserves.

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to table Cases 6 and 7.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion passed 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that staff is attempting to schedule a joint meeting with City Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board shortly after the beginning



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.dublinohio.us

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

MAY 21, 2015

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

2. Hyland-Croy Gateway District 15-029CP

7150 and 7270 Hyland-Croy Road Concept Plan

Proposal:	A residential development including empty-nester four-unit buildings, and a retirement facility that includes independent and assisted living units on approximately 45 acres along Hyland-Croy Road.
Request:	Review and non-binding feedback for a Concept Plan application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicants:	Schottenstein Real Estate Group and The Roman Catholic Diocese of Columbus.
Representative:	Thomas L. Hart, Esq. Isaac Wiles Burkholder & Teetor, LLC.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: Adjacent residents voiced concerns regarding road connections through the site and requested the applicant include age restrictions on potential renters. The height of the independent living facility of three stories was also a concern. The Commission shared many of the concerns of the residents and encouraged the applicant to meet with residents and address their concerns prior to moving forward with a Rezoning application.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II

**2. Hyland-Croy Gateway District
15-029CP**

**7150 and 7270 Hyland-Croy Road
Concept Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for review and non-binding feedback for a residential development including empty-nester, four-unit buildings, and a retirement facility that includes independent and assisted living units on approximately 45 acres along Hyland-Croy Road.

Claudia Husak said this case is in a similar location, also on the east side of Hyland-Croy Road. She said it is slightly different than the previous one in terms of it being a Concept Plan application, which is the first step in the rezoning process. She said this site is also not annexed into the City of Dublin so the current jurisdiction is within Jerome Township.

Ms. Husak presented the site, which is 45 acres in two parcels. She noted Park Place subdivision to the north and Post Preserve to the east; both are zoned PLR, Planned Low-density Residential District. She said the site is very narrow with 3,300 feet of frontage along Hyland-Croy Road and the depth of the site is only about 500 feet. She said there is a stream tributary that has a Stream Corridor Protection Zone associated with it, which the applicant will be required to study to determine the width of that zone. She said there are tree rows along the stream. She indicated for the most part the site is farmland; there are some single-family homes on it with farm outbuildings.

Ms. Husak reported the applicant had a couple of meetings with adjacent neighborhoods, specifically with the HOA of Post Preserve and Park Place. She said in January there was a meeting where a few residents attended as well as members of the Catholic Diocese as part of the proposal has a senior living component. She said most recently, a meeting was held where about 15 – 20 people from the adjacent neighborhoods attended.

Ms. Husak said the Community Plan has two future land use designations for the site: north of the stream is the Suburban Residential Low Density District (1 – 2 dwelling units per acre) with the remainder as mixed-Residential Low Density (up to 3 dwelling units per acre). She explained that both of those are very similar to residential development patterns within the City of Dublin where the mixed category talks a little bit more about providing buffers to allow more leeway for the type of units provided in that district. She said there have been proposals for more commercial big box type of development on the land in Jerome Township on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Husak said Hyland-Croy Road has a rural character designation. She said there are major changes proposed by ODOT in conjunction with the City of Dublin to the interchange of SR 161/US 33. She said the limited access area extends towards Post Road from Hyland-Croy Road, which really is dictated by ODOT and access for Post Preserve Boulevard will be required to be eliminated. She said in 2005 – 2007, that project for the interchange was a lot more imminent than it is currently. She said there were numerous neighborhood meetings at that time on how the access would be handled in the future.

Ms. Husak presented what Council approved as the method for access management going into the future, which takes part on this particular property under consideration this evening. She said Springview Lane and Stillhouse Lane within Post Preserve are intended to be extended to current stub streets, through this property and out to Hyland-Croy Road to provide full access into the neighborhood. Upon urging of Staff, she said the applicant has incorporated this public street into their proposal. She reported the extensive update to the Community Plan also occurred in 2007 that included one of the street extensions but not both. She said the Northwest Area Plan is the same, which shows single-family development to the north of the stream at a 1 – 2 units to the acre for density with an extension of a street called Holbein Drive to provide access and distribution of traffic. She said a row of single-family houses adjacent to Post Preserve and multiple housing types to buffer the residential area to the west from whatever might happen west of Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Husak said there were also considerations for protecting the stream providing entry to the neighborhood and making sure to be sensitive to the existing trees on the site.

Ms. Husak said the Concept Plan proposed is divided into two subareas. She explained there are 50 assisted living (AL) units and 75 independent living (IL) units at the south end of the site. She said both facilities are connected at the entry porte-cochere but serve different residents. She said the southernmost building is the AL facility designed as a single-story building with four quadrants of care and the IL facility is a three-story building with an open courtyard in the center including parking areas to the north and east and detached garages along the east border with Post Preserve. She said the balance of the site has four-unit residential buildings, which, according to the applicant, are targeted for empty-nesters. She said there are 17 buildings consisting of 68 units shown in the center of the site, south of the stream. She said there is an additional 15 four-unit buildings consisting of 60 units north of the stream.

Ms. Husak said stormwater management is shown throughout the site with retention ponds. She stated the plan includes an eight-foot asphalt multi-use path along Hyland-Croy Road with connections from the site to the path.

Ms. Husak read the discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed land use appropriate?
2. Is the proposed greater density warranted relative to the quality of the proposal?

Bob Miller asked what has been proposed in the past on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road all the way up to Post Road.

Ms. Husak indicated she knew of two proposals for retail development south of Weldon Road. She said the most recent proposal, which Jerome Township requested the City to weigh in on, had larger store-type of development without parcels on Hyland-Croy Road with a potential hotel or some sort of multi-family units north of Weldon for the future.

Steve Langworthy said there has only been one major proposal that the township had approved. He said it was originally called Hall's Corner that had a pretty intense retail development, a couple of big box retail developments along with restaurants and the other outlots. He said there were some concerns expressed by the City to the Township about the relative density and intensity of that product at the time. He said there were discussions about sewer systems, traffic, road improvements, and the like. He said that proposal has since gone away and a new company has come in from Indianapolis that has proposed an application that has not been submitted for anything by that company but the concept plans we have seen recently are much less intense than the original plan.

Mr. Miller asked if an auto dealership had been proposed.

Ms. Husak said there is a site approved for an auto dealership in the township as a conditional use and Costco has received a lot of press.

Mr. Miller asked what has been proposed on this existing Gordon Farm site. Ms. Husak answered no applications have come forward.

Amy Salay asked if the roundabout at Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road is the anticipated solution.

Tina Wawszkiewicz said Ms. Salay was seeing the long-term picture idea. She said if this were to become annexed and became the City's intersection the City could evaluate stepping to this level and could be a discussion with City Council during the CIP process. She noted the ultimate build with the ramp.

Ms. Husak clarified that at this point, this area of Hyland-Croy Road is not under the jurisdiction of the City.

Don Hunter, Schottenstein Real Estate Group, said he resides in Dublin. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to share information and receive feedback. He explained there are two applicants today: the Roman Catholic Diocese of Columbus; and the Diocesan Retirement Community Corporation and mentioned all the team members in attendance to answer questions.

Mr. Hunter said he has a great respect for the process. He explained he reached a land purchase agreement in August 2012. He said they met with Marsha Grigsby in October 2012. He said they met with Land Use and Long Range Planning in February and started meeting with HOA leadership of Park Place/Post Preserve in May 2013 and have continued that dialogue. He said this particular plan is a result of three to four reiterations in receiving feedback from the leadership of the HOA group. He said the first neighborhood meeting took place in January and most recently, this week. He presented the plan with the senior retirement community to the south that the Diocese will own and the northern two-thirds of the site is the empty-nester community.

Mike Cuddy said they have been in the senior housing business since 1977. He said they have 16 facilities in 10 counties. He said they are open to residents of all faiths and they are replicating their Villas of St. Therese concept. He said this is a high-quality architecturally compatible with the neighborhood. He said this is a mission-based goal of serving seniors providing safe well-appointed housing for seniors in a continuum of care that runs from independent living to assisted living and building a retirement community where people have the ability to move from one level to the next. He said they have done this very successfully out on the east side of Columbus at the Villas at St. Therese and the goal is to do the same thing here in Dublin, Ohio.

Mr. Cuddy said they have done a study to ensure that there is market demand for this type of facility and had a great deal of interest as expressed by Dublin residents. He said prior to the Villas of St. Therese facility, there were people on the east side of Columbus who were really looking to maintain residence in their own community. He said part of the mission is to provide a facility where they could retire, have independent living as long as that was possible for them, and transition in the same community to a higher level of care to assisted living. He reported they are a non-for-profit corporation and able to deliver a higher quality product at a lower price. He presented the 75 units of IL facility and 50 units of AL in the lower portion of the graphic.

James Michael Milligan, JMM Architects, 4685 Larwell Drive, Columbus, Ohio, 43220, said his firm is a senior living design specialty firm and have designed over 1000 retirement communities around the nation. He said this is not subsidized housing. He said the Roman Catholic Diocese of Columbus provide a niche that is compatible with the highest quality facility but in a much lower cost. He said these facilities will be 1 or 2 bedroom apartments with washers/dryers in the IL areas and garages for their cars, brick/stone cement fiber siding and use residential style materials with pitched roofs. He said between the AL and IL, there will be a main street facility/common area where folks can have dining opportunities, library, etc. an indoor/outdoor space with a lot of light. He said the AL is all private rooms and operated by the diocese. He said the Villas at St. Therese are 15 years old and have held up quite well. He said the apartments are a three-floor concept and on the site plan, garages are a buffer with four-sided design. He said there is a wet pond on the south side for stormwater management and site amenities and controlled parking.

Brian Schottenstein, Schottenstein Real Estate Group, 600 W. Goodale, Columbus, Ohio said Dublin has the highest standards of any community around. He said they believe their attached homes will be the nicest in the state of Ohio. He said they have been voted the BIA Developer of the year three times.

Mr. Schottenstein presented images on the screen and on boards. He said there are four units in each building and each unit has 2-car garages, a screened in porch, and two first floor bedrooms geared towards empty-nesters. He said there will not be a clubhouse, bar, or trash cans outside. He said trash pick-up service will be provided to go into a central compactor including a mail center in that building as well. He said there are 128 units and density is 3.9 units per acre. He indicated the average age of someone moving into AL facility is 84 years old. He said they want to capture the market of people in their 50s, 60s, and 70s before they would go into the community right next to us. He said we would even provide opportunities for them to get into the community sooner if they live in ours first because they believe there will be a waiting list. He pointed out that on two-thirds of the plan, on the north side is their four-unit empty-nester homes. He noted the nice buffering of trees. He said they plan to respect the Stream Corridor Protection Zone.

Mr. Hunter summarized there are two fundamental but related uses: senior retirement community and empty-nesters. He said 30 years ago, the average age of entry into IL was 65 years of age. He reiterated that now the age is 83, more and more services have to be provided (meals, transportation). He recited statistics about population growth in Ohio to demonstrate the need for this type of housing. He said there is a "silver tsunami" coming. He presented 17 objectives from the Community Plan and stated how his plan addresses some of these. After spending a lot of time in this community analyzing economic development issues, he suggested we are at a crossroads and asked if Dublin was a generational community. He indicated they are going to enhance the Park Place/Post Preserve neighborhoods with the transitional use. He said Hyland Croy Road will become five lanes. He said his plan will insulate the community from that noise as a quiet, compatible neighbor. He noted the 360 degree architecture they will provide and how this site is a challenging property and not appropriate for single-family homes. He concluded they are proposing high-quality, low-density development.

Bob Miller asked what the square footage is for the empty-nester units.

Mr. Schottenstein responded there are four different floor plans, going up to 1,900 square feet.

Mr. Miller asked what the rent range is. Mr. Schottenstein answered high teens would be the amount for rent.

Ms. Salay asked if the empty-nester products were all for rent. Mr. Schottenstein said they could be for sale; it is market driven.

Mr. Hunter said they are trying to meet the needs of the community by offering flexibility.

Ms. Salay asked if some of the units were two-stories. Mr. Schottenstein said all have two bedrooms on the first floor and some have loft above, which make those a story and a half.

The Chair invited public comment.

Jeffrey Smith, 7226 Springview Lane, said the concept of putting the empty-nester community along that track of land makes a lot of sense and would be supportive with some exceptions. He said it meets the demand within the City and provides a nice buffer to whatever goes in on the west side. However, he said it does not appear to be any mechanisms in place to enforce the stated objectives of empty-nester housing. In his research, he said there is federal legislation known as the Housing for Older Persons Act in 1995, that would allow the developer to designate a community as housing for residents that are 55 years and older. He said that stipulation requires 80% of the units are occupied by at least one person who is 55 years old. He asked if that was considered and if it was, why that designation is not going to be in place.

The Chair said she would entertain those Commission questions as they proceed.

Mr. Smith said 3.9 units per acre for density is higher than what is shown in the Community Plan. To make that exception on the density he said, for supposed improvement in quality to address an unforeseen demographic shift back when the Community Plan was completed, is unjust. He indicated there are no assurances that given the higher density space that those needs are going to be met. He said without some designation through the Bylaws or in the deed restriction, potentially, those units are occupied by non-empty-nesters, which would bring in over-crowding of schools. He said then there is the issue of rent vs own. He asked if the City is going to be responsible for maintaining the landscaping of that Post Preserve entrance once it is closed off. As a founding board member of the HOA, he said it is costly to maintain that entrance. He said once it is closed off, it is no longer the enjoyment specific to just the HOA but rather open to the public.

The Chair announced over 13 people have signed up to speak and asked that the comments be brief and not repetitive.

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, said he has lived in this Post Preserve neighborhood since it was built. He indicated the applicant is proposing an apartment complex and trying to put an empty-nester label on it. He said the developer is not willing to put any stipulations on who may live there. He said if \$1,700 a month is the rent, they will attract families that want to get into Jerome High School. He said the key thing the Schottenstein folks said was this was a Concept Plan and a lot of these issues are going to be market driven. He indicated he suspects that if the market is not going to be there for the empty-nesters then the market will be filled with whoever will pay the rent and we will not end up with a quiet community. He said that is further complicated as City Council had previously ruled that our entrance will go through this neighborhood. Currently, according to the plan he said, it appears we will drive past the trash compactor on the way to our house. He said when Council originally ruled on the entrance closing, they specified that the intention of the new entrance would be along the same lines as our existing entrance and would have the same character. He said he believes the City made a mistake with the planning in that area and feels strongly that the community is owed more than just having our neighborhood go through an apartment complex.

Mr. Razor said he did not receive any notice that any meetings were taking place until the one that occurred last Tuesday and at that meeting, he was told that the purpose was not for the developer to hear the thoughts of the residents but to answer questions about what they planned to build on this site. He asked if these people are going to manage an apartment complex next to my house, how cooperative of a neighbor are they going to be. He concluded maybe they are not the right developer for that land.

Alycia Cassini, 7545 Marston Lane, said she appreciated the Commission's comments earlier about getting the HOA more involved in these meetings with the notifications. She said the applicant said they met with HOA leadership from May 2013 – May 2015. She said meeting with one individual who did not share any information with the community does not constitute neighborhood feedback. She said once we were made aware of this situation this past Tuesday, the neighborhood has responded with how they feel about this development. She said this is really two separate concepts: the retirement home and 128 rentals that will be in our backyard. She said there are no restrictions on who can rent these units regardless of age and family size. She said the rentals will be designated as Suburban Residential low density, outside the design concept and the Post Preserve entrance will be closed. She said this is unacceptable for Post Preserve and for the rental agency or renters because there will be a high volume of traffic coming through their neighborhood. She said the Conservation Design Principals and support of the rural feel of this neighborhood has not been applied to this concept. She indicated it is interesting that Schottenstein is taking these two very separate concepts and bundle into one proposal; these should be two separate independent plans. She said Schottenstein is trying to say what the market is through charts, quotes, and the emotional heartstrings to get approval for their highly profitable business of rentals. She encouraged the Commission to do their own independent research and not rely on the carefully crafted information presented by Schottenstein.

Eileen Corson, 6717 Monticello Lane, reiterated the stress that could be put upon the school district if we have this many rentals this close to our homes; there is no elementary in our area but good access to Jerome and Karrer. She said if the apartments are not age restricted, there will be the potential for a lot of school bus traffic. She said HOA representation had no communication with them. She indicated there were three members: one is leaving, the other said during the meeting with the developer yesterday that she has been shopping for these homes. She said there are two new members on the board and has serious ethical issues with their board. She requested additional time for review of this proposal for the residents.

Kumar Vemuri, 7021 Post Preserve Blvd, said he has been a resident of Post Preserve since February 2006 and was never told there was an entry issue by the builder. He said as soon as he entered his new home, he started getting letters about this proposed entry closure and he attended meetings that were well organized in those days (2006 & 2007). He said they were given five or six options and finally narrowed it down to one or two. He said during that time they were promised there would be a layer of single-family homes just to their backyards of Post Preserve and that there would be a similar entrance on the other side. He said with this proposal, we do not see any of that happening. He asked what will be the size of the entry roads if there will be any coming into Post Preserve. He asked what would happen to backyard fences or if there would be any fences between these two properties.

Marian Vordermark, 6834 Stilhouse Lane, said she is the president of Park Place/Post Preserve HOA. She referenced the timeline presented by Mr. Hunter. She confirmed the three previous board members did have a couple of meetings in 2013 and they were told they had contingency contract with Mr. Gordon, which was going to expire in November 2013, which it did. She indicated they were told it was not going to be extended so the HOA members did not publicize their meeting. She said she was not given any further information until much later on. She said we do not correspond with our community on a regular basis because it costs our HOA a lot of money and they have not seen an extreme amount of interest from their residents. She said apparently there are interested people in the community. She presented several pictures: the Post Preserve entry, the ponds, the street that will be closed off, and Post Perimeter Road. She said she is concerned about the replacement entrances surrounding their community. She said the quality of the Gateway project significantly impacts their neighborhood and the valuation of 145 residences of Post Preserve and potentially, Park Place because they are viewed by realtors as a joint M/I neighborhood. She said the residents are requesting an engineering study be completed to determine if a right in/right out entry into Post Preserve could be allowed by ODOT. She said other exceptions to that rule within the state have been made. She said there are a total of 292 home sites in the Park Place/Post Preserve are affected by this decision. She said there will be a high interest in getting to Costco and OU development that will contribute to additional traffic.

Keith Hammond, 6965 Post Preserve Blvd, said his biggest concern is his master bedroom and back windows face west so immediately out his backyard he will see a three-story apartment complex. He said he agrees the retirement facility at one story is a good idea but the third-story building will be right in their faces and the garages will back up to their property line.

Parminder Rooprai, 7035 Blakemore Lane, said that he strongly opposes this plan. He said the builders already indicated this is going to be offered at a low cost around 1,900 square feet as the biggest unit. He said the average home in Post Preserve is 3,000 square feet. He asked why they are trying to integrate a low cost product with high cost homes. He indicated the builder has probably already figured the appreciation they would gain as well as the depreciation the current homeowners are going to see. He asked who would compensate the current homeowners for that depreciation. He said Hyland-Croy Road already has high traffic congestion and asked what the plan is to address that.

Carmine Spada, 7012 Post Preserve Blvd., said he has resided there since 2006. He said the word "rentals" was not presented by the developers at the meeting. He said 20 - 25 residents took a vote on Tuesday and all but one stated they did not want rentals in their community. He said they were told they

were rentals because it is not feasible otherwise but this evening they said they could be for sale at some time.

Lora Boukheir, 6957 Post Preserve Blvd., said they moved there to raise their children and are looking to the Commission to represent them. She said she lives in the fourth house and when she walks out her front door to sit on her porch, she already looks at a parking lot and a church that is at least three stories high and an apartment complex. She said less than a mile away is a healthcare facility and now she is to expect another three-story building in her backyard. She said she is looking to the Commission to protect her home so it does not depreciate in value. She said the moment she received the letter she asked why she should stay in this community and asked how she could sell it with no backyard. She said this proposal does not represent family or the Dublin she committed to for her children. She pleaded with the Commission to put themselves in her position as this is not good planning and zoning.

Jerry Merrell, 8742 Craigston, said he is a member of St. Brigid of Kildare and wanted to share the view from the seniors of that church. He said there are over 100 members and they are all looking for a "St. Therese of the north". He said he is very familiar with the Villas of St. Therese on the east side and to duplicate that in Dublin would be a plus for the community. He said he is not certain about the Schottenstein part of this proposal. He said a lot of people in his age group who are not ready to commit to moving into an assisted living or independent living facility and need something that they can step into short-term and then eventually move over to the St. Therese north area. He said he has been in the Columbus area since 1970 and has watched this city grow as well as the population of seniors increase. He said the age of people speaking against this appear to be younger than those with gray hair. He said he may be the only person speaking for the gray-haired group. He said they would like to stay in Dublin and the only way they can do that is if they have these kinds of facilities.

Eileen Martin, 5509 Villas Drive, Dublin, 43017, said she wanted to speak on behalf of the seniors in the community. She said she believes she is the oldest person in attendance but having a retirement community in Dublin is definitely needed. She said she moved here five years ago because she had to downsize and had children who lived here. She said most people her age, when widowed or with a spouse but is up in years, that is where you go, particularly if there are grandkids. She said you want to be close to them so they can visit you. She said she had considered Erikson when it was time for her to move but they were in Hilliard, and then the recession hit. She said she took a condominium because there was nothing else available. She asked that this proposal be considered. She said to the young folks, this may be someplace they will want to go in 30 years so they do not have to leave the community.

Jeffrey Smith, who spoke earlier, said he did not get a sense from anyone from the Post Preserve/Park Place that they do not want a retirement community there. However, he said they are looking for restrictions on the development to ensure that the older people have access to that community. He clarified that this land is not owned by Dublin but rather Jerome Township to ask Dublin to annex this land. He said if that does not happen, because we are not pragmatic about this, we could end up with something far worse. He said there are certain issues that need to be addressed like the three-story building, density, and rent vs owned.

The Chair closed the public portion of the meeting.

Amy Salay said the presentation by the developer was compelling in terms of the need for empty-nester housing as well as the apartments and assisted living. She said there is a lot of work to be done between the developers and the neighbors. She stated there is no way she could support this application in its present form. She indicated she assumed this was a 55 and older community and asked why that is not a part of it by placing restrictions on it. She said character based planning is important – creating a sense of place. She said the seniors and the current single-family neighbors will need to be well integrated so they can feel like this will be an enhancement to their community and not a detriment.

Ms. Salay said she was looking at the entryways and improvements need to be made. She said this neighborhood is losing their very attractive front door, essentially, because of the ODOT restrictions. She said the City made concrete expectations for the entrance. She said traffic calming is also important.

Ms. Salay asked if there is a way to reduce the height of the St. Therese portion, possibly spreading it out and taking away some from the apartment portion as this is very jarring for the neighbors that back up to it. She indicated she is generally ok with the architecture with the primary materials being brick and stone. She said she likes the idea of the connection with the atrium.

Ms. Salay said the apartments are not conducive to people living together as the way they are structured, turning their backs on each other. She said she would prefer to see where folks can be interactive and front porches are important. She said there is a lot of time between 55 and 80. She said there is no central park and asked where people are supposed to gather. She suggested moving this across the street and adding a mixed-use environment as opposed to big-box retail that is offensive.

Bob Miller said he is in agreement with Ms. Salay as the analytics are solid. He said this is really good land use. He indicated he was uncertain that single-family homes on a five-lane road would be appropriate. He looks at this as a buffer and could be an enhancement for the existing subdivisions. He suggested that the Schottenstein folks go the condominium route to solve the big problem with the neighbors or the 55-year old designation is worthwhile. He said he struggled with the height proposed as he views this as a gateway project. He indicated from the Hyland-Croy side, a lot could be done to make this property pop for people entering from the SR161/US 33 interchange. On the other hand, he said he is sympathetic or empathetic with the residents. He said he does not have a northern elevation so he is not certain what he is looking at. He said he appreciates the protection of the stream but would like to see a little more diversity in terms of how the empty-nester housing is aligned to create that connectivity. He understands this is not easy to do on this very thin piece of land but would like to see more connectivity, which would be appreciated by the neighborhood as well. He said he would like to see pictures of the existing properties at the Villas at St. Therese as they are 15 years old.

Cathy De Rosa said she agreed with her two colleagues that if it is going to be a retirement community, it should be designated as such. She said she does not see evidence that a person that starts in one end would actually move to the other end, speaking from her personal experience and the resident that stated they would want to stay near their children/grandchildren. She said the Villas at St. Therese appear to be one or two-stories on the website but the applicant confirmed they are three stories. She asked if consideration could be made for the height. She said she is concerned that if it is going to be a 55-year old designation if there would be some mobility. She said there is a need for this but for active seniors. She said this is an opportunity for families to be next to seniors and this needs to be figured out as a community but there is a lot of work to be done for this one to fit that bill. She said this works on this piece of property but there is a ways to go with the application.

Chris Brown said he is supportive of the retirement community overall. He said three separate neighborhoods should be designed: the Villas; the new entry to Post Preserve/Park Place; and then the northern section. He said it is crucial that the new entry to Post Preserve respects the community nature of Post Preserve as a whole. He said he agrees with Ms. Salay's comment that the units tend to turn their backs to each other; he likes a front porch presence if appealing to empty-nesters. He said he looked at Friendship Village, Villas at St. Therese, and First Community Village, which are all very low impact on the areas with very little traffic and few people walking about. However, he said there should be the opportunity to walk about as Ms. De Rosa just said; there is still a lot of vitality in these seniors. He noted there is no interconnectivity other than that bike path along Hyland-Croy Road and the community within needs to be engaged. He said the stream green space was respected but it disconnects the central portion to the north section. He said he understands we do not control Hyland-Croy Road but by living in a community east of Dublin Road, taking a left in the morning is brutal. He asked if there may be a roundabout opportunity, how to get people actually turning south on Hyland-Croy Road with 292 homes

in that community plus this particular community. He said the height on the north, west, and south portions do not terribly bother him but the part that engages Post Preserve are really looming over those properties and needs to be addressed. He said the eastern wing has the most impact. He stated anything this high of density has to be designated as 55 plus and could not support something that did not have that definition. He said everything we have learned through current market trends through what we are doing with the Bridge Street District and everything else, it does not bother him tremendously if they are rentals vs condominiums; he said there is incentive to keep standards up if there is one singular owner as opposed to elderly people that are wearing down and might not maintain the property as well.

Steve Stidhem said he agrees with almost everything that was said here. He said he appreciates the neighbors coming in and voicing their opinions. He indicated he is frustrated with the lack of leadership it seems in this neighborhood but that is another topic. He said it is way too dense, there is no community space, and the entrance to the neighborhood was not accommodated given the upcoming closure of Post Preserve. He said he visited the St. Therese AL website, which looked like a two-story building so he needs to physically visit the Villas. He said he hopes the community is maintained better than the website.

Victoria Newell said many of her comments mirror Mr. Brown's comments. She said she is not in favor of the three-story assisted living area next to the residents and suggested stair-stepping those elevations. She stated the overall land use is appropriate. She indicated the residents could end up with something substantially far worse so she hopes for willingness within this community to work with applicants that are considering developing this property. She said if it is developed within Jerome Township and outside Dublin's borders, the residents will have no control. She said with the closures, the residents are going to feel like they are driving through an apartment complex per the current layout. She said this really needs to be addressed better. She said the site is broken into three parts and maybe there could be a variety in the units for the center section to make this feel more like a community. She said the entry structure described, which houses the trash compactor kind of looks like a gatehouse and reminded the applicants this will be the first thing seen when arriving to this site and better served someplace else. She would like to see the SPCZ expanded upon. She noted a presentation was made very compassionately for senior citizen housing and yet there does not seem to be a limitation to restrict it to that. She asked the applicant is they were or were not going to place that age targeted restriction on this.

Mr. Hunter said the short answer is they had not contemplated doing that and it is not their intention to do that. He said they could go back and study it. He said sometimes you get unintended consequences when doing that such as restricting highly educated people in the age bracket of 45 – 53.

Mr. Schottenstein added the example of a person having a child in their 30's when the spouse passes away, in between creating a life for themselves, they have to come back and live with their 55 – 60 year old parent, they would not have the opportunity to be in here even for a short period of time.

Ms. Newell said there have been recent proposals in front of the Commission that were for elderly housing and could approach the limitations tonight's developer is looking at. She encouraged the applicant to research this further.

Mr. Hunter asked for clarity.

Ms. Newell said recent applicants were willing to put those restrictions upon those age limitations. She indicated there have been some conversations about a child that moves back home with you for a period of time so she thinks there are entities that are able to address that. She suggested there is something the applicant tonight could do in that instance.

Mr. Hunter said he would explore that before returning.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about a barrier or fencing between this and the housing on the behalf of the residents. Mr. Hunter responded there are no plans for a fence.

Mr. Schottenstein said the entry feature has not been designed yet and promised to work with the neighbors. He said they are considering a community garden, also where the residents can plant their own vegetables on individual plots.

For another resident, Mr. Stidhem asked what stage is this designed because it appears to have been presented to the residents as a final design and it is clearly not the case.

Mr. Hunter confirmed this is a Concept Plan.

Mr. Brown said the Commission is representing the residents but at the same time, it is an opportunity to create a nice buffer between you and what Hyland-Croy Road is going to be. He encouraged the residents to keep an open mind and work with the developers. He encouraged the developers to work with the residents particularly on the entrance and what it means to their neighborhood; it is not just their backyard, this is the entry because of the situation with ODOT.

Ms. Salay encouraged the developers to be sensitive to the neighbors considering your own home and what you would want to live next to.

The Chair called for a five minute recess.

**3. Ballantrae Woods
15-004Z/PDP/PP**

**Cosgray Road
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat**

~~The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development District for a single-family residential development on a 49-acre site, east of Cosgray Road and north of the Conrail railroad tracks. She said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat for the lots, reserves, and rights-of-way.~~

~~Devayani Puranik presented the site and said this development has been reviewed several times. She noted a Cosgray Rings Road connector is proposed along eastern property line - Churchman Road. She said east of Churchman Road is the Links at Ballantrae, a multi-family development and further east is the Woodlands at Ballantrae. She said parcels along southwest corner of the property are within Washington Township in the Village of Amlin, which is outside of the Dublin corporate boundary. She described the character of this area as village residential with limited commercial activity along Rings Road where a pizza shop is located. She said the existing tree cover is present within the northern section and mature tree rows are present along the railroad tracks.~~

~~Ms. Puranik stated this case was presented informally to the PZC on September 18, 2014. She said the Concept Plan was presented on April 2, 2015. She said today's stage is the first formal stage to establish a Planned Unit Development. She said depending on the Commission action this evening, it could move forward to City Council for final approval.~~

~~Ms. Puranik explained there are two zoning classifications for this site. She said the northern portion of the property is zoned PLR-Planned Low Density Residential and the southern portion of the site is zoned R-Rural.~~

~~Ms. Puranik presented the Future Land Use/Southwest Area Plan maps. She said the Community Plan recommends "Mixed residential- Medium Density" for this site, which is meant for walkable, pedestrian~~