



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2021 at 6:30 PM in Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL – Mr. Adler called the meeting to order at 6:33pm.

Mr. Lafayette swore in Mr. Harriman

Present- Adler, Jaskiewicz, Swank, Carney, Harriman

Absent – None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning and Zoning Commission-Regular Meeting- November 17, 2021

Mr. Jaskiewicz motioned to approve the November 17, 2021 meeting minutes, seconded by Mayor Carney. 4 yeas, Mr. Harriman abstained.

Mr. Jaskiewicz asked the commissioners if they would be willing to modify the agenda to move PZ-21-26 as the first item of business. Commissioners were in agreement. Mr. Adler motioned to amend the agenda, seconded by Mr. Jaskiewicz. All yeas

COMMUNICATION

Zoning (Ms. Brill)

Our Zoning Code re-write is coming along nicely. We are working through the comments and making revisions now. Sections detailing the residential guidelines were included in the packet and are on the agenda for discussion.

BZA (Mr. Jaskiewicz)

No meeting in December. At the last meeting the board held the findings of fact for the, three applications. A request for a conditional use at the corner of Alcott and US 42 for Operation Restoration was tabled. Along with that was an application and variance for an accessory dwelling unit, were all approved.

Mayor Carney

Council decided to create Administrator Search Committee. They plan is for the committee to meet regularly to help facilitate the search for a new Village Administrator along with the consulting firm. Some Village staff, elected officials, and community members took a trip to

Troy, Ohio to explore a few of their community center facilities. The trip was organized by Mr. Rayce Robinson.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

PZ-21-26: Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan for the 7800 Rickard Rd.

Mr. Adler noted that the applicant had sent a formal letter requesting the item be tabled until next month's meeting. Ms. Brill had stated there was a resident here to speak on the item. Mr. Adler opened the public hearing.

Janice Bailey of 7800 Rickard Rd. provided comment about the application. She stated that they are the only house on the road. Concerned about it being zoned that way because of dirt and dust and the preservation of the Darby. Concerned about the dirt mound that existing near her property currently. Talked about property value concerns and how this proposal going in would impact that.

The commission clarified that some of these items was discussed at the last meeting during the initial discussion. Commission asked for more information about what portion of the parcel is in the village and what is in the township. Ms. Brill explained the boundaries.

Hearing no more comments for the evening, Mr. Adler motioned to table PZ-21-26, seconded by Mr. Jaskiewicz. All yeas

PZ-21-25: Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan for the Madison Meadows II Residential Development

Mr. Adler opened the public hearing and asked Ms. Brill for the overview.

Ms. Brill stated the applicant is requesting approval of a rezoning and preliminary development plan for a new residential development, Madison Meadows II at 0 Lafayette Plain City Rd. The site is located east of Lafayette Plain City Rd, just south of Madison Meadows. A mix of detached, single-family homes and patio homes are proposed for the project, with a total of 225 units proposed. The site is currently in the process of being annexed into the Village. The resolution will be in front of Council in January 2022, for a formal decision. To accommodate this development, the applicant has asked the Commission to consider a rezoning of the parcel. A zoning text for the property was included as part of the rezoning application. The proposed development plan has been designated within the parameters of this zoning text.

The proposed site is 79 acres, with a proposed density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre. The development will have one access point from Lafayette Plain City Rd and provide connection via

Madison Way to Madison Meadows. Road within subarea A will be 30' wide with on-street parking permitted. In subarea B these, private roads will be 24' in width.

Per section 1178.06, the development is required to dedicate 25% open space. For these 79 acres, 20.2 acres has been dedicated for open space, for a total of 31.66%. The applicant has provided a plan sheet indicating the various open spaces throughout the development, to include a 10 acre community park. The developer has indicated this will be dedicated to the Village after rezoning, if we elect. Staff will be discussing this with Village Council, in later phases. A 10' multi use path is proposed, along the Lafayette Plain City Rd frontage, which will connect the original Madison Meadows. In addition to the multi-use path, a network of internal sidewalks will line both sides of the public streets and will weave through the open space areas.

There is an existing ditch that runs along the northern portion of the property. No structures are proposed within the EPA Stream Protected Zone. Wet retention ponds are being integrated into the development from stormwater management purposes. Specific subarea architectural requirements have been outlined. The developer has included a listing of divergences on page 8 of the zoning text. After review and consideration, the Planning and Zoning Department recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to Village Council for the Rezoning and the Preliminary Development Plan with the following stipulations:

1. The Village shall be granted an access easement, for the multi-use path, that falls outside of the right-of-way, if applicable;
2. The applicant shall evaluate traffic calming measures on the main road off of Lafayette Plain City Rd.;
3. A Traffic Impact Study response from the Madison County Engineer is provided to the Village;
4. A Final Development Plan shall be presented to the Commission for approval, prior and/or in conjunction to platting.

Mr. Adler asked the applicant if they had anything to add. Mr. Smith stated this development is an extension of Madison Meadows, with the same developer and builder. Envisioned this being a cohesive package from what was already required in the original Madison Meadows. This development will be just south of Madison Meadows. The original development had 4 subareas. There is a ditch that exists on the northern extent of the property. This will be preserved in an open space easement. The new development has 3 subareas to include single family, patio homes, and a community park.

The property owners who sold the land wanted to leave a portion for a park. The developer is willing to turn that over to the village for a public park. If the village is not interested, during the final development, they will detail the park and some amenities.

Mr. Smith stated that small community open spaces are throughout the development. A landscape plan was provided showing how street trees and landscape would be done. The landscaping and entry feature would be very similar to Madison Meadows.

The architecture will be very similar to Madison Meadows, the original development. There was a mix up in the document, where only a single story product for the single family home was shown. There will be both ranch and two-story product so, he provided a print out of the correct architecture for the commission.

Mr. Smith stated that the divergences are the same as what they requested for Madison Meadows and were approved. They also included a fire truck turning radius diagram, to ensure that the reduced radiuses would not cause an issue.

Mr. Adler asked Mr. Adams if he saw the turn radius diagrams. He stated no but if they used the same truck and diagrams for modeling in this development, it should be okay.

Mr. Swank asked about on-street parking. Mr. Smith stated it is on one side of the street, opposite of the fire hydrants.

Mr. Swank asked about on street trees and who provides those. Mr. Smith stated they are provided by the builder as they build out phases. Mr. Swank asked if these species listed would be required. The applicant stated they will label this when they come back for FDP and sensitive to not creating a monoculture by mixing tree species.

Mr. Swank clarified if the developer was DR Horton. Mr. Smith confirmed.

Mr. Swank asked about top-soil and if that will that be provided. He wants to make sure that the top soil is not being removed and to make sure that grass and plants will grow. He stated that he and the Village want to require this. Mr. Adler clarified that this was coming out of a discussion, where commonly developers will shave off a layer of topsoil and sell it off. This sometimes leaves front and back yards full of rocks and construction debris, and grass doesn't grow. Mr. Adler stated that this topsoil layer is not only for the aesthetics, but for the environmental piece.

Mr. Swank asked if the signs are wooden. The applicant clarified that they are a sign cabinet on a base, not wood.

Mr. Swank asked about the internal walking paths, stating he would like to see some benches. Mr. Smith stated the open spaces will be programed for residents. These more specific details will be in the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Swank asked if the general development standards, where it talked about dumpsters in the zoning text would apply. Mr. Smith stated that this was an oversight mistake and was just carry over from previous language.

Mr. Smith stated there will be an HOA and envision an extension of the Madison Meadows HOA. The open spaces will be maintained by HOA.

Mr. Swank talked about retention areas. Mr. Smith stated there is a desired by the developer to make those a feature for the development, by having some features. Mr. Swank asked if they

will be dry or hold water all the time. The applicant stated it will hold water all the time and have fountains.

Mayor Carney asked about the 10 acre park area and what it would look like if the developer kept the land. Mr. Smith stated the park discussion is ongoing. The developer is going to want to program that for the benefit of the development if the village does not want that area. If the developer is going to keep that area they will come back with more landscape detail in the final development plan.

Mr. Harriman asked if the developer help the village get that developed and come up with an image for the space. Mr. Smith stated that it depends on the timing and the interests of the village. This will need to be a discussion with the developer and the village moving forward. The motivation for including the park in the specific space was influenced by the landowner. This was part of the purchase contract, for a community space/amenity.

Mr. Harriman asked if there will be a bike path will be along Lafayette Plain City Road. Mr. Smith stated yes, this will connect to the path in the original Madison Meadows that ultimately wraps around and goes down Perry Pike as well. This space was ultimately the end of the boundaries, but as this new area is annexed, the developer would be willing to move the easement down to denote corporation limits.

A question was asked about the park area being used for retention. Mr. Smith clarified this was a copy paste from the original, stating everything drains in the other direction, so this area will not be used for retention purposes.

A question was asked about private roads, upkeep, and maintenance. The applicant provided that the home owner's association would plow the road. The patio homes work is they are like a condo community. They mow and do maintenance. This product is targeted for the empty nesters, who do not want this responsibility. With them being private roads, they would also maintain the pavement surface, as well.

Mr. Swank commented on the front setback divergence, asking if the 28' to 25' approved in the original development. The applicant confirmed. Mr. Swank also asked why there is a divergence from 200' to 60'. The applicant provided it was because of the layout and them being clustered. It limits a traditional neighborhood type. This was approved in the condo section, of Madison Meadows. Mr. Swank also commented on the side yard setback reduced the minimum to 5', stating he doesn't agree with this.

A question was asked about the green interior spaces and mailbox pods. Mr. Smith provided that pods are required for all new developments. Ms. Brill added that the locations of the mailbox pods were provided in the preliminary engineering submittals in the packet.

A question was asked about the drainage requirements in the ditch area. The applicant stated they are going to be required to manage flows before draining into ditch, as part of stormwater regulations.

The commission asked about the stub street and connectivity. The applicant commented they are required in Plain City code, for connectivity in the future.

The commission discussed the traffic study and would like to see the impact at Perry Pike and US42. They would like to see this evaluated at the light. The applicant noted no improvements were required in the original development. The commission stated they would like this to be studied, when the final development plan comes back.

Concerns were expressed about water and sewer from the commission, stating that we don't have capacity currently. The applicant stated they are aware of the current conditions of the sewer capacity and understand they would be in the queue with others. The applicant guessed they would not be building in there until 2024. Mr. Adler stated there is not a guarantee this capacity will be there. Mr. Lafayette stated the village has been in close communication with the EPA on those details for the expansion and are hoping to have approval soon. The design and build out would be staged, and the idea would be that the EPA would give capacity as it is built. This has been discussed but is not a certainty. It would not be unreasonable to think that we couldn't serve this development, in the coming years. The applicant concluded with the comment that there is a lot of developers who want to located in Plain City and are willing to wait until the Village is ready.

Mr. Swank asked if the applicant has been in contact with the schools. The applicant stated they were for the original Madison Meadows, but not specifically for this new development. Mr. Jaskiewicz stated staff keeps in communication with the superintendent. Mr. Lafayette stated the schools are planning for this and there is existing capacity.

Mr. Jaskiewicz asked if there was a deadline once they come in with the final development plan that they have to start the project. Ms. Brill and Mr. Lafayette agreed that there is three years to go from final development plan approval to platting. The applicant acknowledged that they were aware of this timing.

Mr. Adler asked if the applicant had a timeline in mind for where they are looking to obtain approval or denial for the rezoning and preliminary development plan. Mr. Loebig stated they need to make the rezoning and annexation match up and asked Ms. Brill when the annexation resolution was to go back to Council. Ms. Brill stated in January. Mr. Smith stated that ideally you do not want to get the rezoning and annexation approved too far apart. Mr. Adler asked if the rezoning asked would be subject to the two readings at council. Mr. Lafayette confirmed.

After some discussion about procedures and conditions of approval. The topic came up about adding a top soil requirement as discussed previously. Mr. Lafayette concluded that his recommendation would be for the Village not to require anything that is ambiguous and not enforceable.

Mr. Jaskiewicz asked Mr. Swank if all his questions we addressed in the expressed conditions of approval. Mr. Swank stated that he sees developments going up in town that are way to dense.

Mr. Smith added that the applicant's preference would be to be to keep a product similar to Madison Meadows. He provided that the Commission to explore the studies MORPC has published on housing and buying trends, stating that the preference is moving towards larger homes, smaller yards, with more emphasis on community open space. Mr. Swank and Mayor Carney stated that they don't know if this is the vision for Plain City. The community wants to see a rural community so when you put in smaller lots, bigger house, there is opposition. Mr. Smith stated there is not a lot of developers that are supporting that right now, because people are not buying it. They are buying the product that is proposed. The applicant understands that Plain City has a vision but would like to keep the product consistent with what was approved in the original development. Mr. Jaskiewicz stated his takeaway was that the commission wants to see more uniqueness in developments, not the copy and paste all over plain city. This could be in the layout or shape of retention ponds. He understands that there is a catch 22 in what the market will bear and what the vision of Plain City is to make it feel unique. Mr. Alder summarized stated that Plain City is a desirable area and feels that because of this Plain City has the opportunity to evaluate what the Village can do better. Trying to find a balance between unique character, without pricing people out of the market. Believes there is a mutual benefit between the developers and Village to do this.

Mr. Jaskiewicz made a motion of approval with the following conditions, seconded by Mayor Carney. 3 yeas, 1 no, 1 abstention.

1. The applicant will expand the traffic study to explore the Perry Pike and US 42 intersection and abide by those recommendations;
2. A Traffic Impact Study response from the Madison County Engineer is provided to the Village;
3. The applicant will revise the zoning text so that the side yard setbacks match the development exhibits;
4. The applicant will update the architectural exhibits to reflect the new single-family two-story concepts;
5. The Village shall be granted an access easement, for the multi-use path, that falls outside of the right-of-way, if applicable;
6. The applicant shall evaluate traffic calming measures on the main road, off of Lafayette Plain City Rd.;
7. A Final Development Plan shall be presented to the Commission for approval, prior and/or in conjunction to platting.

Public hearing closed was closed by Mr. Adler.

DISCUSSION

Residential Design Guidelines

Ms. Brill discussed what was presented in the packet. The board asked for more time to look through the documents. Ms. Brill stated that the commission can email her any comments or

questions. Stated they can also set up a work session to discuss. Mr. Alder stated he would be in touch with Ms. Brill about coordinating something soon.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.