

**VILLAGE OF PLAIN CITY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
AUGUST 19, 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, Dustin Adler, Tom Jaskiewicz, Darren Lee, (Amy Rucker- not present)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 17, 2020 Meeting:

-Mr. Lee; any comments or concern for the June 17, 2020 minutes? Mr. Jaskiewicz no changes. Mr. Adler no changes. Motion to Approve Mr. Jaskiewicz, Second the motion Mr. Adler. 4 votes yes

COMMUNICATIONS:

-Mr. Lee to Zoning (Taylor Brill).

Zoning (Ms. Brill)- Purchased zoning software from OpenGov. Hopes to have up and running before end of year.

BZA (Mr. Jaskiewicz)- Meeting last week on application for sign at Shell Station with modifications. Was given conditional approval and Ms. Brill was going to communicate the changes that BZA required.

Council (Mr. Lee)-Nothing to report

General (Mayor)-Nothing to report

VISITORS: Mr. Barkin (MI Homes), Mr. Gunnen (Evergreen Land Company), Gary Smith (G2 Planning) speaker for Madison Meadows; Stew Walker, Fred Yoder, Kelly

Ms. Brill asked to amend agenda to move Rockford Home Discussion before new business.

Mr. Lee anyone have opposition, Mr. Jaskiewicz did not, Mr. Adler did not. Moved to discuss Rockford Homes. Asked Ms. Brill who representative was. Mr. Gary Smith. Mr. Lee introduced Mr. Gary Smith.

Mr. Gary Smith showed a map of proposed site 50.59 acres, wants to move it forward to more a formal application process. The property is at the corner of Noteman and Chillicothe Street and encompasses several different properties. Part of the plan is to split off 3.9-4 acres near the existing house/business on Chillicothe and keep them as is, as zoned and then come back and

provide a development plan for remainder of property. Property is up against the Big Darby Creek with flood plain that bisects property, working with ImageT doing investigation on flood plain and how that flood plain should actually be defined in that process. When you look at City's recently adopted Comprehensive Plan for the site, it calls for when you get closer to the 42 area it classifies what the expected land use is more in the employment center, closer to Noteman assuming is a mixed use residential (medium density) 6 – 20 units per acre/ open space park which is assuming is geared to preservation of flood plain. Our perspective, the medium density residential category seems to be a little out of character of single-family homes, we moved towards single family direction to be more compatible with homes on Noteman and a buffer along Chillicothe and preservation of flood plain area and the protection zone, which governs this area. It's 101 lots, as proposed, relatively simple layout, providing stubs connection to north and broken down into 2 different lot sizes. Lots in yellow (perimeter) are 60'x130' lot and the lots in orange are cluster lots 52'x125'. Geared for couple different products. Also has Cory Tarkoff (sp) and Robert Yocum (Rockford Homes) available to answer questions. Provided images of type of product that they invasion marketing with mix of 2 story and 1.5 story products with 1st floor master crowd, creates diversity in craftsman, architecture and elevations. Working thru amenities in regards to the greenspace. Highlight any big picture issues.

Darren asked Taylor about any thoughts. Ms. Brill, no thoughts at this time.

Darren asked Mr. Adler and Mr. Jaskiewicz about any thoughts. Mr. Adler discussed sewer capacity 750k gallons/day, using 625k with another 75k planned and other proposed properties would take 50k, puts us at 100% capacity on sewer. Nathan something that we are looking at right now, verifying and trying to calculate what Madison Meadows and Jefferson Village project is going to bring. Discussions with developer in their application packet does not have a letter from Mr. Cahall saying that Village is able to provide water/sewer service in its entirety. At best for MI, based on refinement, the only thing the Village is able to commit to at this time is sewerage maybe the first 2 phases for their project plan. This one looks like we do have capacity in the village, also in light of I&I projects, confident that we can handle this size of development. Expansion Sewer Plant is on track to submit to EPA the constructions drawings but those expansion efforts are not expected to be completed and online until probably 4th quarter of 21 or 1st quarter of 22. Mr. Adler hears that we might have capacity but we aren't entirely confident that we do. Mr. Cahall, yes, we are verifying and taking into account and measurements at the plant, looking at I&I efforts are resulting in and net difference is. . We do have our eye on this and that is why there is no service letter included with MI because we do not feel comfortable with sewerage the entire site, we are looking at a partial interim basis. Mr. Adler feels this is a very serious concerns about the 1300 new units and also concerned about school capacity. Mr. Cahall, I think the other thing for planning commission and give some direction on, is how the plan in front of you meshes with the villages comp plan. The majority of this area is transitional use either open space and natural land preservation or transition mix use or suburban residential then moving up N. Chillicothe to commercial uses. The breakpoint on the land use map is along

that common property line between Lots 54 and 91, around that area, one of the larger policy decision is for Planning Commission to recommend to Council and rezoning proposal. A comprehensive plan's land use map is not set in stone, in general it is but in terms of exact boundaries, kind of blending and fading. The question is, from a policy standpoint, how does the commission feel about residential instead of reserving that for nonresidential usage. This iteration was looked at, in SR-42 area there is a considerable amount of land left over, as you move further away from 42, the opportunity to develop office, which is already an overburdened development type, the opportunities seem to become more and more unrealistic as you get away from SR-42. It was thought to be a good balance for area for employment along SR-42 and still preserving that flood plain and still incorporating some residential that seems to fit with that area, directly across from the park.

Mr. Lee asked where the current dividing line is.

Mr. Cahall showing where faint property line is.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Smith about concepts to keep in mind with that current property? Mr. Smith looked at concepts and left that property out, it makes more sense with critical mass and maybe some compromise with considerable amount of acreage, another 50-60 acres up against SR-42 if you're doing 10000 sq.ft. an acre is a considerable amount of office space left over. Extending down Chillicothe didn't make sense, 600,000 sq.ft. of office is a lot for the village to absorb.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Jaskiewicz if he had any comments, Mr. Jaskiewicz stated not really, did not have the comprehensive plan in front of him. Would like the roads to line up and the road on Noteman and Shepper Ave do not line up, they are confusing and dangerous. Would have liked to see walking trails back towards the back end of the property (east end) and also connectivity to Pastime Park. On the density and residential, the residential fit and meshed well. A ton of industrial / office space doesn't make sense unless it's on the SR-42 frontage side. Needed a transition area so industrial use land is not in front of Pastime Park.

Mr. Smith stated, we haven't gotten to that level of detail and certainly, but can look at aligning the streets and typically North Chillicothe would be primary entry. We will provide pedestrian connections and sidewalks that connect and also pathway connections and incorporate some of those amenities that you mentioned. Comprehensive plan perspective that's exactly what we were thinking, still a tremendous amount of square footage would remain there.

Mr. Lee said is try to keep alignment with Shepper with the access point. What was lot width of the orange section?

Mr. Smith stated, the orange are 52ft lot widths and is consistent with what is to the west, very similar lot sizes, fits in well with surroundings.

Mr. Lee wanted to incorporate some connectivity and greenspaces. Suggests a layout that would provide rear lot vehicular access versus the way it is shown now, where houses are closer to the street. Would fit in better with what's in the area.

Mr. Smith said it is an extremely difficult product to market and pushes the product past the purchase price that makes sense for most people. The applicant's preference would be not to do that but most of the places they've seen that type of product developed, the products sits longer due to cost to purchaser.

Mr. Lee asked for more consideration to that or a blend of both.

Mr. Lee was not sure about stub headed to the west and not sure about transition.

Mr. Jaskiewicz had a thought, talked about the realignment at entrance off of Noteman, viewed the main entrance off of Chillicothe, more suited to handling the traffic. Are there methods to encourage traffic to go out on Chillicothe vs Noteman, thru road narrowing, or something different with parking being permitted?

Mr. Smith understood where that's coming from, can talk about the options and what the village engineer is willing to accept in the future. The plan is organized where the bulk of residents would be exiting off of Chillicothe but the suggestion will be discussed and find a way to direct or incentivize people to exit Chillicothe first. From a density perspective, 2.5 units per acre, the comprehensive plan suggests a little more. Mr. Smith asked the commission if they were relatively comfortable with what was presented, understanding these details that we discussed that are important.

Mr. Jaskiewicz would like to read the text and the mixed residential may suggest a higher density versus the typical residential that was proposed. Makes more sense to have that lower density versus the higher density. He could also see apartments in that general vicinity but more towards the purple area because of its proximity to Big Darby. He also needed to put a little more thought and effort in how it looks into the comprehensive plan. The Comprehensive plan is a guideline but the exact width / depth of the areas is not defined. Still leaving a great deal of space to the north, I don't think there is a substantial variance between what's shaded, it's pretty close.

Mr. Smith stated, we are not taking a lot out of the market place in that employment center area, in reality about 11 acres, leaving about 60 acres in play just on that side of SR-42 and to the east of Chillicothe. Considerable amount of property left. Mr. Lee thanked Mr. Smith for his time. Mr. Smith thanked for time and feedback.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 7991 Physical Fitness Facilities as a Permitted Use in the B3 Central Business District

Mr. Lee asked if this was a public hearing for this consideration. Mr. Cahall said yes, it's a public hearing. Mr. Lee will open the public hearing for considering 7991 as a permitted use in

the B3 Central Business District. Any comments from public? No public comments. Mr. Jaskiewicz felt it makes sense, and fit in with character with other types of permitted uses in that area. No objections. Mr. Lane supports it as well. Mr. Adler agreed that physical fitness center fit as permitted use. Mr. Lee closed the public hearing for 7991 physical fitness as a permitted use in the B3 Central Business District.

Motioned to recommend code change to Village Council by Mr. Lane, Mr. Jaskiewicz seconded. 4 votes yes

- Case 2020-003 Darby Station Preliminary Development Plan. MI Homes of Central Ohio. State Route 161 Madison and Union County Parcel # 1800021700000, 1800021710000, 1500210250000, 0400776000 and 0400818000

Darby Station preliminary development plans from MI Homes of Central Ohio Mr. Lee asked Ms. Brill if there was anything to relay. Ms. Brill stated before you is the rezoning and predevelopment plan for Darby Station. It's the rezoning of the old McKittrick Farm, which is east of the Uptown and north of SR 161. We're looking at about 335.83 acres of development, consisting of about 5 parcels: 3 in Union County and 2 in Madison County. Current zoning is RS2A, B2, rural and I1 and proposed zoning is PRD. The development calls for single family resident with opportunity for multifamily and/or school site, also designated for open space and parkland. Staff reviewed the proposed zoning text, subareas A, B and C are reserved for the single family houses and sub area D is for the detached cluster homes and sub area E is that flex space which could be potential school site or multi area development and then sub area F is dedicated for public entity. Sub area A is the largest proposed with 314 homes built. Staff raised concerns to the developer about minimum lot width of 50ft but given the provisions requiring half of the homes to be over this minimum at 54ft and 60ft. only 100 of those homes are going to be at that 50' minimum width. In comparison to the Darby Field product the average lot size at Darby Station is going to be larger. Developer is requesting potential building heights of 37 sq.ft. in sub area C, which is taller than our 35' minimum in section 1178.06 of our code. We had some discussions that this might no longer be a request. There is also a potential deviation from our code from a 10' to 8' bike leisure path but after staff's review seems substantial. We had some preliminary engineering work done, our engineer reviewed it as well EMH&T, the developers engineering team, comments are attached to the staff report. Staff has been working with ODOT and Madison County we are continuing to work with all parties to ensure changes and refinement for engineering work are reflected in following submittals. In conclusion we recommend tabling the application due to further discussions on sewer capacity and given the size of the development we need to evaluate whether it needs to be a phased approach or approve as is.

Mr. Lee hands to Mr. Barkan (MI Homes) and Aaron Underhill (Underhill and Hodges) Mr. Barkan gave a high-level overview of the proposal. The site is zoned multifamily and industrial and commercial warehouse. Unique zoning for 15-20 years. The comprehensive plan however goes to more different housing uses. Believed it proposes 2-8 units per acre, our proposal, if does

not have the multifamily, is 1.55 units per acre gross and with the multiple family its even at 2.24 units to the acre. It also has 50% open space. Thinks it will have great community amenities and will be a tremendous place to live. Walking through, the access to proposed off of SR-161, one of the things that is not in text but discussed with Ms. Brill and Mr. Cahall, at the very least there will be emergency access to Butler Ave. There are a handful of reasons that the applicant does not want to do permanent access just yet, this turn is rough but not knowing what the use is for sure, didn't want to commit but will build and provide emergency access here. Land south of SR-161 is proposed park land, had initial conversation with Metro Parks, who are interested land that abuts the Darby Creek and are also very interested in finding a way to connect their path (Heritage Trail), going to continue that conversation, to have Metro Parks be a part of this project and will figure out how to get Metro Park that land. On the north there are 19.3 acres, which is defined as flex area. Big difference you don't see, from the last time is an apartment complex or multifamily on the plan, as of right now. Trying to find a way to do all single family and keep this as a school site. Not positive but need to work with engineering, cost and expenses. Met with Gary Chatman, Superintendent and school board members and have had very good discussions. Mr. Barkan thinks it's safe to say that they are very interested in project, interested in potentially having a school site here and committed to working with the school/village to work collectively and it doesn't overrun the schools. It's currently set up as schools have right of first refusal, has 5-year trigger where they have the ability to purchase the ground. After 5 years, if school doesn't exercise that right, MI would be able to sell to a multifamily user and develop it that way. More to come on that as the best path is determined with the schools. Without having the apartments, another way to monetize it is needed and that's been kind of the discussion. Gives flexibility to get schools involved. The next part, in the middle and up along north part, is considered the Smart Product, same as Darby Fields. Total at Darby Fields was 260 lots, total 314 here. At Darby Fields we have 50 ft and 60 ft. lots. The minimum lot area was 6000 sq.ft. Here the applicant is proposing 50 ft, 54 ft and 60 ft. lots, with a minimum lot area of 6250 sq.ft., 35% will be 54 ft and another 30% will be 60 ft. Price point pushed at Darby Fields. Thinks there is a continued huge demand for this particular product. Sub area B is the Signature product. Proposed to be 65', more house, higher housing things and a nice move up option. The 3rd is sub area C, 70' lots Signature Plus product. A wider housing product up to 48' wide and up to 4000 sq.ft., and a further step up and big houses. The last one is sub area D Condo product, detached units, built on quads on a shared drive. \$400-425,000 empty nester product, slab and parking and garage behind home. Sub area C, asked for variance to 37' for bigger house. After some discussion and understanding the village concerns, we no longer need that variance, so it takes us down to 3 variances that we are requesting. Up in top right, additional greenspace; some discussion for the need of a water tower sight and also be 10-15 acres for ball fields.

Mr. Lee asked the number of lots in sub areas.

Mr. Barken, Sub A is 314 units, Sub B is 66 unites, Sub C is 54 units, and Sub D is 88 units.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Jaskiewicz if he had any comments. Mr. Jaskiewicz liked changes that have been made from initial proposal. Likes 2nd entrance off 161, realigns with quarry, better intersections, walking paths have changed, Metro Park is in discussions, liked how walking trails have been extended on south side of SR-161, if Metro is not involved would like to see more access or use there. Liked finding a way to get to the west side of the creek to access the green space. Ball fields in upper quadrant and water tower, can't see ballfields going in there in terms of organized sports, more neighborhood use.

Mr. Adler asked is it a public hearing, does it need to be opened. Mr. Lee will open to the public.

Mr. Adler voiced concerns about water / sewer. Schools also big concern, this could push their capacity issue. Mr. Jaskiewicz questioned capacity issues on schools or water/sewer. Mr. Adler was discussing capacity for schools. Mr. Jaskiewicz hasn't heard anything from school district about capacity issues, he is glad they are being involved.

Mr. Adler with over 400 units, that is potentially putting more children in the district. Mr. Jaskiewicz asked has the school expressed concern about capacity, and whether they build on this property or not, sounds that they are aware of this. Mr. Barkan, did not want to talk on behalf of the school district, just state high level, there is currently capacity today, has been growth but does think the schools see the project and has them thinking about capacity. Jonathan Alder school is very big district and most is west and south of this project. This site makes a lot of sense for a school because the population density is here in the village and likely to grow around this project. Believed the schools use a .46 students per combined unit, whether house or apartment. Looking through the life of this, possibly another 200 students that could come in. The school, thru site or small impact fee, they are going to looking at us to help and we are on board with that. Try to get a school site as reasonable as possible. Working hard on that and will find a way to help their needs. Does not think it's a capacity issue but didn't want to speak on their behalf.

Mr. Adler voiced his primary concerns, loves the idea of Metro Park along Darby, and concerns about development time project will take.

Mr. Barkan for sake of discussion, Darby Fields was open for sale about 2.5 years ago and are almost out, which exceeded expectation by 10-fold. As the bigger product is introduced the pace slows down. Doing 80-100 homes per years, perfect conditions you go 5 to 6 year build out, realistically it will slow to 6-8-year buildout. Single family will continue to be huge hit, move-up house in will be huge hit, 5-7 years to work through project.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Lane if he had anything? Mr. Lane, did not.

Mr. Lee stated, Darby Fields sold out in half the expected time. Mr. Barkan said it was tremendous for us. The community just really bought-in and worked great. Mr. Lee likes the

proposed layout. We have some utility service issues to work through and planned phasing. Asked what the current set-back for Signature product line, 600' set back around curve? Mr. Barkan said it is not 600', was in comprehensive plan, 600' was substantial and to keep the greenspace, the houses at the end are 400', did not know answer on bottom will confirm calculations at next meeting. Mr. Lee thinks it will be a small percentage. Thinks what is presented is reasonable. Mr. Lee asked if he had any planning information from Metro Parks to the north

Mr. Barkan, is part of it up in the Village. Mr. Lee, the Heritage path ends at Amity Rd and transitions up around West Ave and ends at railroad tracks, would have to cross thru gravel quarry and parcel to the south to get over to this area. Curious if they had preliminary alignments to bring through this area to conserve some space for that in the future. Mr. Barkan believed they have space for path on other side of river and to take to connect into Heritage Trail to the south. Mr. Barkan reached out to quarry owners to see what can be negotiated. Mr. Barkan stated, Mr. Jaskiewicz recognized that we have changed to align with that and hope to have a traffic signal to be the traffic solution, so trying to get ahold of the quarry to negotiate with them on this to buy easements rights to have that. It is a 3rd party land owner and still operating the quarry. Mr. Lee mentioned the primary intersection, have you evaluated a potential roundabout? Mr Barkan stated they evaluated but traffic light was best for few reasons Still finishing speed study and distances and breadth of what improvement needs to be. Can provide update at next meeting.

Mr. Lee voiced concerns about traffic signal at approach of the Village. Mr. Barkan hopes to slow people down coming into community. Mr. Lee questioned the variance of 10' to 8' path? Is path supposed to be 10' wide? Mr. Barkan is happy to do that, it just gets big, too much path.

Mr. Lee opened to a public meeting for case # 2020-003 Darby Station.

Mr. Walker as an adjacent land owner, directly to the east, with connectively and no stub street. We do fall within the shaded area of the comprehensive plan; this doesn't allow for connectivity to Plain City. Certain consideration for stub street or very least future capacity to their property, not annexed into city but does fall in comp plan.

Mr. Barkan stated one thing is engineering products, one change made, no cul-de-sac will be curved into his property and no cul-de-sac. Mr. Walker would be amenable to that, doesn't want to be shut out of potential future planning or the design. The city had comments about the capacity concerns. This project to the east would not eat up all the capacity improvements that the city would make to the east and consider other land owners for future development.

Mr. Lee, asked Mr. Van Tilburg for any highlights. Mr. Van Tilburg said they did respond to comments, sent new response to Ms. Brill but not in time for this package. Mentioned cul-de-sac was one of them. Mr. Jaskiewicz stated the list was substantially shorter. Did comment on bike path and sidewalk issue. Question about electric and gas easement and a couple of lots that might be impacted and are they working with utility companies. Mr. Barkan is hoping to keep at 100',

keeping center area a go with no problems. Working thru relocation lines feels pretty good with both easements.

Mr. Van Tilburg said main entrance per calculations warranted a full build out, interim period won't really be warranted. Can discuss with ODOT and village if they want a signal, can rule over ODOT but questions about whether a signal is warranted. Asked if the applicant had the ability to do right and left turns instead of single lane on traffic study.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Adams if he had further questions. Mr. Adams - nothing except fire water supply, limited to test drive, emergency access to potential school/multifamily, remoteness questions are not issues.

Mr. Lee asked Ms. Brill if any further comments. Ms. Brill said Mr. Yoder wants to give comments. Fred Yoder land owner to the north will have houses around 3 sides of him and wants to know what about utilities, 2 electric, 1 gas and 1 oil. Asked applicant if they you are going to build close to those utilities.

Mr. Barkan - the hard part about understanding the scale of large property, scale makes it look like there is no room. Unloaded thoroughfare with 1 electric line and another electric line across the border and here we've called out the gas easement. Working to build into plan and can't do anything to create issues for property owners that abut this land. Diligence shows that they are not going to have a problem with it. Mr. Yoder talked about gas line to the north. Mr. Barkan - no easement on the property and trying to trace the easement, nothing came up in title work, found out by fluke. Mr. Yoder said easement on his deed, it goes clear up to Butler Ave.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Yoder if he had anything else. Mr. Yoder asked which would be coming in 1st, closer to SR-161 or back in the corner. Mr. Barkan - the last piece would be up in NE corner of the site.

Ms. Brill has Kelly Spence for public comment. Ms. Spence wants to echo Mr. Adler comments regarding the school. Neighborhood will drastically change our community and influx. Concerned about the impact on school district. Concerned about redistricting. Can't control growth and children suffer. Lots of concern. Much prefer to see a third of this size development, more agricultural mix. Wanted the applicant to honor Plain City, not take away why people love living here. Monstrosities like this is going to make us what people are trying to get away from. Would love to see a proposal that's different. Doesn't want to lose the charm, doesn't want straight streets, wants more cul-de-sacs, doesn't want cookie cutter.. Mr. Lee thanked Ms. Spence.

Ms. Brill - no other public comments.

Mr. Lee - closed public hearing at 8:17pm.

Mr. Adler, Mr. Jaskiewicz, Mayor any final comments on preliminary plan. Mr. Jaskiewicz - no, asked Mr. Cahall to please reach out to school district for current projections. Mr. Cahall a development of this size will not have district burst at seams. The decision point is their next building. He will provide information as requested.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Barkan - any other info or questions you have for us at this point. Mr. Barken asked Mr. Cahall what do you think is the next best step. Mr. Cahall, my thought is to get revisions on height requirement and cul-de-sac turn with hope of being on agenda next month and meeting on books for engineering.

Mr. Lee motioned to table per staff's recommendation. Mr. Jaskiewicz motioned to table. Mr. Adler seconded. 4 votes yes

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.

The applicant has again requested tabled to meet in person. Mr. Jaskiewicz seconded to table, advised not planning on any in person meetings through 1st of year.

Mr. Lee asked Ms. Brill to ask applicant if they want to come back via zoom or want to continue to wait until in person meeting. Ms. Brill will reach out.

Motioned to adjourn at 8:24 pm: Seconded by Mr. Jaskiewicz. Meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

ADJOURN: Mr. Lee adjourned meeting @ 8:24 p.m.