

VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 20, 2020

6:30 PM Via Video conference

MEMBERS

Mayor Lane – Darren Lee – Dustin Adler – Tom Jaskiewicz – Amy Rucker

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Lee called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm

ROLL CALL:

✱ Mayor Lane - Joined at 6:41 pm ✱ Darren Lee ✱ Dustin Adler ✱ Tom Jaskiewicz ✱ Amy Rucker

STAFF PRESENT:

Nathan Cahall (Village Administrator), Paul LaFayette (Solicitor) - joined at 6:37 pm - and Karley Kidd (Council Clerk).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 15, 2020 Meeting

- Mr. Lee motioned to approve the April 15th meeting minutes. Mr. Jaskiewicz to second. Four yes votes. Mayor Lane absent.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Zoning (Nathan): Scheduled to have a 3rd reading on the Jefferson Village project.

BZA (Tom): At the last meeting, an applicant proposed a conditional use for a duplex development, and that was denied and sent back. Staff has received the applicant's revised application.

Council (Darren): Request that the packets get distributed at the adopted time.

VISITORS:

- Gary Smith
- Wade Dunham
- Randy Loebig
- Josh Barkan
- Aaron Underhill

VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 20, 2020

6:30 PM Via Video conference

NEW BUSINESS: Case # 2020-001 Madison Meadows Final Development Plan #1 – Entry Feature and Signage Design Plan

- Mr. Cahall addressed the commission regarding the Madison Meadows entry feature and design plan. This plan is focusing on (L)0.1, indicating the areas where the entrance features are being proposed. For this development and its zoning text, a two-stage development was created. This allows the applicant in the zoning and development stages to have time to further develop the plans and to come back through an administrative review process by the planning commission and council. This is to make sure each section or each component of the project is being proposed to move forward. There are general design guidelines put in place for architecture and alike. The same is true for fencing and the layout of the street. It was originally envisioned by staff that this project was generally divided into three different pods of housing types. Staff figured there would be three, maybe four portions that would come into the administrative review process. The applicant, in this case, is wanting to just provide a limited review packet that would consist of their perimeter and buffering landscaping plan along Perry Pike and Plain City-LaFayette, and also their major development signage. Through various sheets in the plan set, the development is looking to have three development identification signs and landscape features at the three primary access points - one being at Perry Pike and two different access points on Plain City-LaFayette Road. To reference this, look at sheets 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0. The signs, material utilization, and design are in keeping with what was proposed conceptually at the major concept plan stage. The associated landscape around the entry signage meets the requirements. The ground signs will be externally illuminated. The second component is the perimeter buffering area along both the frontages along the development's eastern boundary line. Staff recommendation is to punt until there is a better idea of drainage components and utility locations.
- Mr. Smith addressed the commission and expressed his gratitude to the village for their efforts in this challenging time. Mr. Lee expressed that he had a question regarding sheet 2, there is a call out for the entrances - G3, G4, and G5 - are those intended to reference the sheet numbers L2 and L3? Mr. Smith responded that it was intended for the L-sheet and was leftover from the zoning document. Mr. Lee stated that what was provided looks very good. Should probably evaluate the eastern buffer plan. If there could be more information regarding mounting and vegetation to go along with what is currently laid out, like the buffering of the trees.
- Mr. Jaskewicz motioned to approve the signage and associated landscape but to disregard the buffering area. Mr. Lee to second. Five yes votes.

VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 20, 2020

6:30 PM Via Video conference

OLD BUSINESS: Case # 2019-009 Oak Grove Final Development Plan. The Evergreen Land Company. 10522 U.S. 42 Plain City, Ohio 43064 Parcel # 04-00816.000

- Mr. Lee stated that case #2019-009 is still pending an updated revision from the applicant. This will be tabled until the next meeting. Mr. La Fayette stated that the tabling was at the applicants' request that the case is moved to the June meeting.
- Mr. Lee motioned to continue review on the application until the June meeting for case #2019-009. Mr. Jaskiewicz to second. Five yes votes.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

M/I Homes Concept Plan Discussion – McKitrick Farm Along SR 161

- Mr. Cahall addressed the commission that representatives from the development interest that currently have the property under contract. They have been in communication with staff for a few months concerning the land, and they are at a point where they are contemplating the concept of rezoning packets to formally submit and also figure out infrastructure. They wanted to hold an informal type of work session discussion and to share with the commission their concept and get feedback and comments.
- Josh Barkan and Aaron Underhill with MI Homes.
- Mr. Barkan addressed the commission regarding the concept plan. The thought, given the scale of the development, is a land plan with lots of open space and amenities. The property is currently zoned as commercial and industrial. The comp plan developed calls for conservation development, so with some research, the developers wanted to stick with the conservation development principles as much as possible. The goal is to have a proposal formally in front of the commission in July.
- One of the things the developer tried to do was keep a nice green conservation corridor along SR 161. The closest home to 161 is approximately 200 feet away, with most being over 400 feet away. In the center where the pool is, there is a clubhouse amenity. The homes around that are 50, 54, and 60 feet wide. This would fit similar to Darby Fields, a 40 ft box with a storage bump or third car garage. The lots to the East of the pool that is 65 Feet are referred to as the 'signature product.' The yellow lots along 161 are 70ft lots to support 'signature plus product' - 44 to 48 ft wide. The concept that falls off of that is called the 'retrete concept,' which will house an empty nester concept. Four units share a common drive facing a driveway or green. The pink area is set as 27 acres for potential multi-family development with another partner. Land south of 161 is 41 acres of green space that is planned as a park. The dedication to that land is unknown at this time. On the plan, 48.9% open space, and when submitted, will be at 50%. The goal is to deliver as much open space. A path system is included. The product standard is shown in the Darby Fields development.

VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 20, 2020

6:30 PM Via Video conference

- Mr. Jaskiewicz stated his concern with the limited entrance or exits throughout the development. Initially, there is a lot of good and room for tweaking things, but like all the different products available. There are a lot of desirable features. Mr. Barkan stated that regarding the entrances, the developers would dive deeper with the village and ODOT to get a better understanding. There should also be an access point off Butler.
- Ms. Rucker expressed her concern about the green space and that the comprehensive plan does not have this included. She stated that she is very opposed to going against the plan. Mr. Barkan responded that south of 161 there is 41 acres of open space and it will still have over 120 acres on the north side of open space mixed in. Mr. Barkan asked for further explanation on how this does not fit into the called for a conservation development plan. Ms. Rucker stated that when thinking of that kind of development, homes sitting on an acre or five. In this case, the green space is a walking distance to get to greenspace. Mr. Barkan stated that typically in this type of development, you see cluster type housing with smaller lots and greenspace throughout. It has been found that people want greenspace that they don't have to take care of.
- Mr. Adler stated that the large number, 772 units, will take a minute to digest. With this large development, there is a concern with the number of children and how it will affect the school system. The initial plan looks good. One thing that did stand out was the location of the multi-family. The first thing people see when coming into town would be apartment buildings. Mr. Barkan stated that his plan is to contact the school district regarding their handling of the new units.
- Mr. Lee addressed his concerns regarding the entry flow. Could there be a possible roundabout entry? Would widening the road to four lanes make the entry better? Could the multi-family area also be used as a park area for a possible community center? Mix multi-family to the back corner of the green space. Path layouts look nice initially. Setbacks regarding the comp plan for residential setbacks of 600ft. Some areas provide frontage for commercial areas as well. 2-8 units an acre regarding the comp plan looks good. A breakdown of open space and what is usable and what is retention pond would be nice. He also asked if the developer has thought of any possible greenspace clusters and where the mailboxes would be located? Mr. Barkan responded that what the developer has been doing, where the clubhouse is, there will be a big part of the mailboxes there.
- Mr. Cahall stated that the applicant has the opportunity to change the aesthetic. Centrally located retention features. There is an opportunity here to also create some differentiation throughout the development with the different types of housing.
- Mr. Lee asked how many phases are planned for this development? Mr. Barkan said a lot. Potentially a 5 or 6-year project. Mr. Lee inquired about the electric. There are some Ohio Edison easements through there, do you see those being problematic? Mr. Barkan responded that there's one on the north side of the property that will need to be relocated, but the one from 161 through the property, we've done the best to work around it.

VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

May 20, 2020

6:30 PM Via Video conference

- Mr. Jaskiewicz inquired about the development of the apartments and multi-family housing. If MI Homes were to bring the project to the commission in July, assuming approval is granted, if there was some reluctance in the apartments and multi-family houses, would that shut down the entire development? Mr. Barkan shared that what they envisioned, that the developer would bring it all in from a zoning standpoint and be zoned accordingly. Typically they would zone it to a plan and do a preliminary plan at the same time. Do a plan for the single-family, but not a plan for the multi-family. Not zone it to a plan and get final approval. There would be a secondary review process.

ADJOURN:

Mr. Lee motioned to adjourn at 7:38 pm. Mr. Jaskiewicz to second.