

**VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES  
JUNE 17, 2020 VIA ZOOM**

**MEMBERS**

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

Nathan Cahall- Administrator Paul La Fayette- Solicitor

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Lee call to order @ 6:35pm

**Roll Call:** Commission member present Mayor Lane, Darren Lee, Dustin Adler, Tom Jaskiewicz, (Amy Rucker- not present)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 20, 2020 Meeting:

-Mr. Lee; any comments or concern for the May 20,2020 minutes? Mr. Jaskiewicz motion to approve minutes for May 20,2020. Mr. Lee Second the motion. 4 votes Yes; 1 vote absent

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

-Mr. Lee introduces Ms. Brill as the new Zoning official for the Village of Plain City.

Zoning (Taylor)- Nothing to report. Defer to Mr. Cahall for addition comments. Mr. Cahall states only one item to note to the committee; talks with developers for some Village projects. South of the Villages on 42, they are planning to submit a PUD modification to council that the planning and Zoning commission was cc to as well. They have plans to adjust their 1,2,3-bedroom units therefore they would like to remove about 5 to 6 parking space.

BZA (Tom)- Mr. Jaskiewicz was not present at the BZA on 6/16/20, therefore cannot report on updated information regarding BZA. Mr. Jaskiewicz did report, according to meeting agenda the Board review case #CU-2020-002: Conditional Use Permit for Duplex Dwelling at 349 S. Chillicothe Street. Mr. Cahall elaborate more on the details of the BZA meeting. Mr. Cahall reports board review application for the Duplex Dwelling for 349 S. Chillicothe. BZA has previous denied application. Applicant took the board consideration and advise. Applicant revise his application and resubmitted to board for approval. BZA has determine that the application meets all Village requirements and plans to move forward with application. Board meets again on June 23, 2020 for Finding of Facts and to render their decision.

Council (Darren)-Nothing to report

General (Mayor)-Nothing report

**VISITORS:** Gary Smith (G2 Planning) speaker for Madison Meadows; Bryan Adams; Michele Troyer; Randy Loebig; Christy Hatcher; Terry Andrews; Erin Dunbar Kemp (UCDD); Jack Mautino; Matt Gerkan (Terrain Evolution); Terrer Andrews

**NEW BUSINESS:** Case # 2020-002 Madison Meadows Final Development Plan #2 (Sub-Areas A and C)

-Mr. Lee introduces Mr. Smith from G2 Planning for the applicant. Mr. Smith introduces Matt Gerkan from Terrain Evolution, Terrer Andrew Randy Loebig from Highland, and 2 representatives from Westford Home: Terrer Andrews and Jack Mautino. Mr. Lee: gives the floor to Mr. Smith to discuss Madison Meadows.

-Mr. Smith; Thanks, the commission for allowing him to present and looks forward in working with the Village of Plain City. Last month we discuss the entry features and the design for the entry way as well we discuss the up-coming submittal for Sub A and Sub C. Westford Homes will be taking over these two Sub area (Sub A and Sub C) and building two different products as highlighted in the submittal. Mr. Smith asks to if he could share screens. The different areas for the Madison Meadows development are as follows: SUB A is the single-family home; SUB B Multi-family homes(has not turned in for final development view/ will turn it in at a later date); and SUB C duplexes/condo. Agreement was to come back once the final - end users are established and re-present the final development plan in detail. One thing you will notice with this layout is pretty much the same and street network from the last layout that was present to the commission. The product changed just a little bit and the architectural of the houses and age-targeting. Because we have different footprint final- end user. It is a beautiful product and beautiful as you can see from the pictures submitted to the commission. The single-family portions with a few expectations' minor changes from an engineering standpoint regarding the storm water is very similar to what was submit before. This package contains the finer details, product, and the landscape. The landscape maintains street tree planting incorporated the buffer treatment, and the entry features fit into the landscape. Mr. Cahall suggests to Mr. Smith in the last meeting, that they should include the buffer in a certain area (please references landscaping map provide in final development package submit by G2 Planning) and to the east into the submittal. Staff pointed out to G2 Planning (Mr. Smith) miss out on certain lots sizes from Merely drive to Harrington Drive, those lots supposed to be 70 ft; we fix the sizes and resubmitted to Mr. Cahall on June 16,2020. We still have the same number of lots as before. On the duplex side, we incorporated a larger open space in the center and beautiful landscape to give it a nice open court-yard ambience. We place two locations for the mailboxes one located where there is 3 parking space, sidewalk and second mailboxes on the south end. Both mailboxes are surround with beautiful landscape. Image of mailboxes is including in package. The style of the duplexes are Ranch style products. They are meant to attract your "empty nesters" or older generation that does not want to walk up and downstairs. Duplexes floorplans are shown in the packages that was submitted. They are multiple floorplans and evaluations for the sub area. Mr. Smith mentions that the engineers for this development is present in today's meeting if committee has any question for them.

-Mr. Lee (Question) regarding SUB C- duplexes the development shows 110 lots, is the duplex on its own lot with adjoining wall like a zero-lot line? Mr. Smith: typically, we do not show lot lines. Each part of the duplex will have their own lot. Also, in speaking of property maintenance and other things associated with maintaining the property and the home, the developer will have a strong HOA fee. This is the intent of the developer on how they will package the product. Therefore 110 lots = 110 units? Mr. Smith confirms (110 unit=110lots)

-Mr. Lee; I understand there are some concerns of the depth of lot #84 & 85(the depth of the lots and how they were representative.) (Mr. Lee pulls up the engineer sheet that representative these lots) Mr. Cahall; describe the engineering map., which is the south-eastern end area; right around Madison way (probably need to rename) One of the concerns is the where these two lots will have a smaller property line due to the stormwater Dutch back there. Both lots will have limiting characters to the property. This may create confusion with property owner and/or the Village. Mr. Smith: the builders are confident that those two lots are every markable even being smaller to then the others. One of the ways we thought about is having a smaller floorplan therefore creating equal amount of backyard. They would like to keep those lots.

-Mr. Lee; what are the depths of the property in question (Lot# 84 &85)? Mr. Smith stated that the depth is about 115. Mr. Lee: what are the depths of the other property? Mr. Smith; is about 130. Average on the other lots is about 120-125.

-Mr. Cahall; just want to reminder discussion item, public park space would have to come in to obtain approval. Talking to applicant and staff the best time parallel time path as plan starts getting finalize. Mr. Smith discusses the shelter/panic area and share photo with the committee (Photo is enclosed in the packet)

-Mr. Lee; Any comments or concern from the commission? The committee was very pleased with the presentation. Mr. Lee did have a question regarding the HOA text. Mr. Smith stated the his legal would create the HOA text and will send it forward to the Village to review. Mr. Lee: Can we list this as another condition 8 on the memo. G2 must submit a HOA text for the review/approval/legal. Mr. Smith: in regarding the 7 conditions, would like the commission to review condition 5 with regards of lot 84 & 85. Mr. Lee: Do you see anyway revise or improve the layout to fix the backyard? stormwater control? Mr. Smith stated that he will investigate it.

-Mr. Lane motion to approve Case #2020-02 Madison Meadows Final Development Plan #2 (Sub-Areas A and C) with the revision of condition 5 and adding Condition 8 (HOA text). Mr. Jaskiewicz second the motion. 4 Vote Yes and 1 Vote absent (Amy Rucker)

**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

- Applicant requested to postpone until July meeting.
- Mr. Lee motion to continue case#2019-009 to our July meeting per applicant request with an update application. Mr. Jaskiewicz second the motion. 4 Vote Yes and 1 Vote absent (Amy Rucker)

**DISCUSSION:** B3 Central Business District – 7991 Physical Fitness Facilities as a Permitted Use for conditional use

-Mr. Lee was contact by a person who would like to open a physical facility within the district. Currently is listed as a B2 district and not a B3. Concern to have a physical fitness facility as a use in the B2 district. Mr. Lee confirms with Mr. La Fayette adding a conditional use to a district for recommendation to council. Then Council would put into ordinance form then have a public hearing on topic. Discussion among committee in regards how the structure of recommendation process goes. Mr. Cahall mention and briefly describe 1136.03A. Mr. La Fayette ask Mr. Lee if he was asking to be a conditional use or a permitted use? Mr. Lee states he would propose as

permitted but we can recommend neither way. Mr. La Fayette opinion that it would be better to list as a conditional use. If is listed as a conditional use, then it would go to BZA for further approval. Mr. Adler agrees that conditional use would be the best choice. Mr. Jaskiewicz feels that because this would a physical fitness center that may attract a high volume of people then it should go in front of the BZA for further approval. Mr. Lee states should the commission motion for a public hearing on the above topic. Mr. Jaskiewicz agrees to go forward with the motion. Mr. Cahall verifies that next meeting is within 28 days and need at 15 days prior to public hearing to send out a notice to the community. Mr. La Fayette would like to clarify what is the motion for, is it for both recommendations to use as either or? Mr. Lee states the motion is for concentration to adding the 7991 Physical Fitness Facilities as a Permitted Use for Permitted or Conditional Use in the B3 Central Business District. Mr. La Fayette states that the commission would have to send a recommendation for an amendment. Mr. Cahall, states then the commission should state the motion as a recommendation as use of the B3 Central Business district for the 7991 Physical Fitness Facilities. Mr. Lee states the motion will be the recommendation of 7991 Physical Fitness Facilities as a permitted use in the B3 Central Business District and after the hearing if the commission feels it should be list as a conditional use then we can amended.

- Mr. Lee motion the B3 Central Business District- 7991 Physical Fitness as a Permitted Use. Mr. Jaskiewicz second the motion. 4 Vote Yes and 1 Absent Vote (Amy Rucker)

**ADJOURN:** Mr. Lee closes out meeting @ 7:32pm.