



MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

Tuesday, July 24, 2018

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Julie Oyster began the meeting with a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was taken and the following members were present: Ms. Julie Oyster, Mr. Gary Leasure; Mr. Mike Linder. Dr. John Dubos was not in attendance. Mr. Jim Rauck was not in attendance at time of roll call; however, he arrived at 1:40. Others present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Kendra Spergel, Development Planner; Stephen Smith, Frost Brown Todd; Bill Vedra, Deputy City Administrator; Jennifer Stachler, Public Service Superintendent; Kim Conrad, Director of Parks and Recreation; Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council; Lt. Jeff Lawless, Grove City Police; Tammy Green, JTFD; Dalton Walker, Development Intern; and Mary Havener, Development Assistant.

Chair Oyster noted a quorum was present and asked for approval of the June 5, 2018 Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Leasure moved that the minutes be approved. Mr. Linder seconded the motion and the minutes were approved 2-0 with Mr. Linder abstaining.

ITEM #1 – Salon Lofts – Use Approval

PID #201806130022

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is proposing to offer microblading and permanent makeup at Salon Lofts located at 2179 Stringtown Road in the Derby Square shopping center. The proposed uses of microblading and permanent makeup are forms of cosmetic tattoos on eyebrows, eye lids, and other portions of a person's face.

The applicant is proposing to open a business within Salon Lofts, Beauty by Michelle B, to operate a microblading and permanent makeup business and will be located in a corner of the current Salon Lofts business. The proposed business owner will be the only employee and will operate with daytime hours planned through the week.

Staff believes the proposed use is appropriate given its proximity to other service and commercial uses in the area. Additionally, Franklin County Public Health requires a Body Art license to operate any tattooing or piercing business, including microblading and permanent makeup. Applicants must first obtain zoning approval prior to applying for the body art license.

After review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the use approval (rezoning) with the one (1) stipulation as noted in the Staff Report.

Ms. Michelle Bockbrader, Salon Lofts, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Leasure asked if she agreed with the stipulation. She stated that she did. There being no additional questions or discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend approval of the Use Approval (Rezoning) with the one (1) stipulation as noted in the Staff Report:

1. The use approval shall be limited to microblading and permanent makeup only.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

ITEM #2 – Trail View Run – Development Plan

PID #201712270046

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for a new residential subdivision that will include 77 single family home properties and 40 patio homes on 49.5 acres of land south of Borror Road, adjacent to the Grant Run Estates subdivision.

The site of the proposed development's future land use designation in the GroveCity2050 Community Plan is "Conservation Neighborhood" in which developments are to be designed to preserve large natural areas by clustering homes. While the proposed density of 2.34 dwelling units per acre is above the density recommended in the Southeast Area Study, part of the Community Plan, staff believes the proposed configuration will provide an appropriate transition between the existing adjacent development to the west (Grant Run Estates) and the rural character of Borror Road to the east. Much of the site is proposed to be preserved as green space with a large park space to be dedicated to the city in the southern portion of the site and a large reserve area located along the site's Borror Road frontage.

The 49.5-acre site is proposed to have three points of vehicular access – one off Borror Road, and two connections into Grant Run Estates through Coggan Drive and Hemetite Drive. A total of 117 housing units are proposed on the site, consisting of 77 single family lots (Subarea A) and 40 condominium units (Subarea B). The required amount of open space has been met per Section 1101.09(b), not counting the space in the electrical easement.

A landscape plan was provided showing items such as the 20' no-disturb zone, which is proposed behind lots along the site's frontage, and along lots along the site's western property line next to Grant Run Estates and the street trees relocated onto each property. Although some additional detail is needed on the Landscape Plan, Staff is overall supportive of the proposed landscaping.

Each subarea will feature a variety of home models each showing materials and architectural details required in the approved zoning text. The single-family homes of Subarea A will range in size from 1,833 to 3,020 square feet meeting the required minimum home size of 1,600 square feet for single floor and 1,800 square feet for two-story homes in the zoning text. Each of the renderings features a two-story home that utilizes a combination of horizontal siding, shake siding, and masonry (either stone or brick). Staff is overall supportive of the proposed elevations, however, some of the provided home types appear to feature less than 25% brick or stone as required in the zoning text. The zoning text allows for deviations to be sought from this requirement, provided that adequate additional architectural detail be provided.

The patio homes of Subarea B will be one-story and will range in size from 1,683 to 1,935 square feet in size which meets the minimum requirement of 1,300 square feet required in the zoning text. A total of 20 different renderings have been provided for the patio homes that each feature brick or stone around the garage and home frontage, as well as horizontal, vertical, and shake siding. Staff is supportive of the proposed patio home facades, as they meet the intended character and requirements in the approved zoning text.

After review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the six (6) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Tom Hart, Harmony Development Group, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Hart stated that they are in agreement with the stipulations. He also stated that they have worked out an agreement with one homeowner on Hemetite and also the Driftmyers who own a property on Borrer Road.

Mr. Linder asked about the timing of the Borrer Road improvements. Ms. Shields stated that the plans are still being finalized; however, she anticipates that this would be a 2019 project. Mr. Stephen Smith continued to state that he has prepared contribution agreements for all respective parties in that area for contributing their share for the project. Mr. Linder asked if the Borrer Road improvements would be completed before the Trail View project begins. Mr. Rauch stated that by the time the developer has the sanitary in and begins selling lots, the Borrer Road project should be nearing completion. Mr. Hart added that with the final engineering and the development/construction phase will be at least a year for this project.

There being no additional questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the following six (6) stipulations:

1. Deciduous shrubs shall be planted around each proposed pond and wetland that encompasses at least 20% of the linear pond edge per Grove City Standard Drawing C-GC-98.
2. Irrigation and lighting shall be provided for the entry features into the site from Borrer Road.
3. No parking shall be permitted along the portion of Hemetite Drive with center medians.
4. An exhibit showing the typical planting for each type of residential lot including tree placement and type of tree shall be provided that meets the requirements of the zoning text and subject to approval by the Urban Forester.
5. The tree planting typical information shall be updated to state that the tree planting typical is for both deciduous and evergreen trees and the statement regarding wire baskets being cut in four places and folded down shall be removed as it does not meet requirements for planting.
6. The proposed entry sign into the condominium units shall be submitted for review to the Development Department.

Mr. Leasure seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

Mr. Jim Rauck arrived at the meeting at approximately 1:40 p.m.

ITEM #3 – The Courtyards at Beulah Park – Development Plan

PID #201806060021

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for Beulah Park Subarea F for 104 condominium homes, with 78 detached and 26 attached units, as well as a clubhouse. The site of the proposed development was defined as "Mixed Neighborhood" on the GroveCity2050 Community Plan Future Land Use and Character Map. This land use calls for a mix of housing types with the potential to incorporate small-scale, neighborhood-oriented retail or office uses. These districts are typically located within a walkable distance to a neighborhood activity center. The proposed development is in line with this future land use, as it offers a unique housing option within the Beulah Park development and for the larger community. The development will bring additional residents within walking distance of the historic Town Center, and contribute to the mixed-use environment designated for the area on the GroveCity2050 Development and Conservation Strategy.

The site is proposed to have two points of access; one off Street 'B' and the other off Street 'A', both part of the Beulah Park roadway network. Two-way private drives are proposed throughout the site, with no on-street parking permitted on the site. A total of 104 condominiums are proposed, with 78 detached/single-family units and 26 attached two-family units. Amenities on the site include a clubhouse and pool, as well as community gardens, a pickle ball court and a bocce ball court proposed in the center of the site.

Each home will be one-story in height, with the possibility of a small second story available, and will have a rear courtyard area. The homes will be finished primarily in vinyl siding in four (4) different color schemes with different brick or stone accents provided around the garage doors, front door and front window areas. Other accents on the homes include garage doors including windows along the tops and other vinyl trim with differing colors.

Vinyl fencing, six (6) feet in height, is proposed to screen the courtyard areas of the homes. Staff is not supportive of any privacy fencing that can be seen from public and private streets, therefore all privacy fencing should be decorative in nature and supplemental landscaping should be installed around any privacy fencing to break up the mass of the fencing.

The proposed clubhouse will be one-story in height and will utilize the same materials that are proposed around the homes, utilizing stone, vinyl siding and roofing. The pool adjacent to the clubhouse is proposed to have a decorative, aluminum fence, 4.5' in height around it. Materials indicate that the fence will either be black or white in color. Staff would be supportive of a black fence, which will match other decorative metal fencing utilized in the city.

The locations of mail pavilions are noted on sheet C1.0; however, details for these facilities have not been submitted. All individual mailboxes or mail kiosks should be decorative in nature, utilizing colors and materials in character with other structures and fixtures on the site.

Street lights are proposed throughout the site, primarily located next to mail pavilions, and while staff is supportive of the design of the proposed street lights, there are concerns that not enough have been proposed to adequately light the site.

Entry pier signs are proposed at each of the subarea's main entrances with a sign provided on each side of the road. Each of the signs will be plaques stating the subarea's name and placed on a stone veneer column that matches the stone utilized throughout the Beulah Park development with a green metal cap. The Beulah Park zoning text states that signage for each subarea is to be approved through the Development Plan process. Staff is supportive of all of the proposed signage, as it utilizes colors and materials in character with other signage and structures in the Beulah Park development.

After review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the four (4) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Joel Rhoades, Epcon Communities, was present to speak to the item. He stated that on page 3 of the Staff Report where it states that the applicant has indicated that the entry features will be irrigated, it was their intent to irrigate the main entry – but not the secondary entry. Also, on the same page, where it discusses buildings, there will be some vinyl accents on some of the homes, but the siding will be wood – not vinyl. In that same paragraph, there is a reference to a rear courtyard, many of the courtyards are on the sides of the homes. The courtyard is an integral part of the living space of each house and every home will have a courtyard – most of which will be on the side-yard as opposed to the rear. Finally, on page 6, Mr. Rhoades stated that where it talks about the proposed development being constructed in one phase, it is their intent that there will be two phases of development.

In relation to the four (4) stipulations, Mr. Rhoades stated that they do not disagree with any of them; however, the key will be to continue to work with Staff when it comes to determining what “decorative” means so they achieve a mutual goal.

Mr. Leasure asked for clarification on the irrigation around the entrances. Mr. Rhoades stated that typically, they do not irrigate throughout the neighborhoods, but they would be willing to do it around the entryway. Ms. Shields stated that typically irrigation is required for all entrance features, so according to code, they would be required to irrigate both entrances. There is a stipulation in the zoning text, however, that allows deviations through the

development plan. After discussions with the applicant, Staff agreed that we would be comfortable with irrigation at the southern entrance only. Mr. Linder asked what the plan showed. Mr. Phil Morehead, G2 Planning and Design, stated that the plan reflects irrigation at the southern entrance only, which is the main entry. Since the Staff Report refers to irrigation at both entrances, Ms. Shields stated that a stipulation could be added that reflects that irrigation would be at the southern entrance only.

There being no additional questions or discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the four (4) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report and adding a fifth stipulation:

1. Additional post top street lights shall be provided along the subarea's private streets.
2. The fencing around the pool shall be black to match other fencing utilized on other recent projects in the city.
3. Any fencing visible from a public right-of-way and/or private street shall be decorative in nature with supplemental landscaping planted to break up the mass of the fencing.
4. Any proposed mailboxes or mail structures shall utilize decorative materials in character with other site fixtures or structures in the development.
5. Irrigation shall be provided at the southern entrance only.

Mr. Leasure seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0.

At this time, Mr. Don Plank, representative for the next two items, requested that the order be switched and Item #5 - Beulah Park Roadways (Phase I) be heard before Item #4 - The Apartments at Beulah Park.

ITEM #5 – Beulah Park Roadways – Phase I

PID #201806150024

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for the Beulah Park Phase I roadway network. This includes the majority of roadways shown on the approved subarea map and preliminary development plan for Beulah Park, aside from roadways in the southwest portion of the site, and includes connections to Southwest Boulevard, Demorest Road and a connection to the future extension of Columbus Street in the Town Center.

As noted in the GroveCity2050 Community Plan's transportation chapter, the intent of transportation planning in Grove City is a balance of function and character. The proposed roadway network for Beulah Park is designed to calm vehicular traffic, with features such as bump-outs to designate on-street parking to narrow the roadway and create safer pedestrian crossings. Sidewalks and trails are proposed throughout the development in association with the roadway network, with tree lawns and on-street parking proposed to create a desirable pedestrian zone separated from vehicles. Multiple connections to the existing road network are proposed to deter cut-through traffic on any one thoroughfare by disseminating traffic onto a variety of area roadways. Streets A-G will utilize different roadway designs based on location, with wider roadways near the northern gateways off Southwest Blvd., on-street parking utilized near proposed park space and thinner roadways used in residential areas to slow down traffic. Each street meets the design requirements and intended character laid out in the Beulah Park zoning text.

Existing entrance features at existing entrance to the site off Southwest Boulevard will be preserved including stone walls and a stone building. Each entrance from Southwest Boulevard and Street "G" will feature stone veneer columns and cross buck white vinyl fencing that will match those existing features, with some additional stone veneer walls provided at Street "A". An archway is proposed on the east side of the railroad tracks leading into Street "A" and is proposed to be constructed as part of the Columbus Street extension. Staff is not supportive of the arch being located off the site, and recommends this feature be constructed on the Beulah Park site, west of the railroad tracks, with supplemental landscaping.

Entrance signs are proposed at the entrances to the site from Southwest Boulevard that will have a stone veneer base matching the character of the existing stone walls at the entrance to the site. Staff is supportive of the proposed monument sign as it meets the design and style intended for the Beulah Park development.

After review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the five (5) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Don Plank, attorney for the applicant, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Plank discussed the approximately seven access points to the site and that they plan on having two entry features on the entrances off of Southwest Blvd. and a lesser entry feature on the entrance off of Demorest Road, since that is a neighborhood street. There will also be an entrance feature on the Columbus Street entrance into the site. For this entrance feature, Mr. Plank stated that the City is requesting an arch on the west side of the railroad tracks. The applicant would prefer to have the archway located on the east side of the railroad tracks. At this time, Mr. Plank stated he would like to withdraw the archway entrance feature until they have had time to work with the City to determine what will be on the east side of the railroad tracks because he is concerned that the arch might interfere with the railroad crossing.

Mr. Leasure asked the status of the railroad crossing. Mr. Smith stated that there is an agreement that will go before City Council sometime in the near future which will finalize the crossing with the Railroad. Mr. Plank stated that without the railroad crossing, they really won't have a project.

Mr. Plank asked to address the irrigation (stipulation #3). He stated that currently, their plans do not show irrigation on entrance 'B', off of Southwest Blvd. and they will commit to irrigation on both entrance 'A' and 'B'. There will be no irrigation at the entrance onto Demorest or Lincoln. The Columbus Street entrance is unknown at this time.

Finally, Mr. Plank addressed the brick crosswalks (stipulation #2). He stated that it was their intention to extend the brick crosswalks only to a certain depth within their site. They do plan on significant brick around the roundabouts with interior landscaping. They do not want to take the brick throughout the entire site.

Mr. Rauck asked Mr. Plank if the entrance onto Demorest has a turn lane. Mr. Plank responded that the Traffic Study has not yet been completed and they will know more when that has been done.

Mr. Phil Morehead, G2 Planning and Design, asked to speak to the brick stipulation. He stated that they are attempting with the brick crosswalks to only pick up the cue they are getting from Broadway and carry it into their site for a brief bit. There is a substantial brick apron around the roundabout. He continued that if they were to add brick crosswalks spanning the lanes for the back path, he doesn't think that be conducive to bike-riding. Mr. Plank asked Mr. Morehead to demonstrate where the brick sidewalks were planned.

Mr. Plank proceeded to discuss the stipulations. He stated that they are in agreement with #1. For #2, they would prefer to keep the brick crossings just as they are currently on their site plan. For #3, they will irrigate both entrances off Southwest Blvd. ('A' and 'B'). For #4, regarding the archway, they would like to hold off until they have a better understanding of what's coming into the site from Columbus Street and they are in agreement with #5.

Mr. Leasure asked Mr. Plank if his understanding was correct, that if the railroad crossing doesn't occur, they might not be able to complete their project. Mr. Plank responded that it would. The whole idea of this project is to be an extension of the Town Center. Mr. Leasure asked if the project would proceed if the railroad crossing doesn't happen. Mr. Plank stated that they would more than likely be back with a different development plan because the main entrance would then be off of Southwest Blvd. instead of from the downtown area. Mr. Leasure asked if this should be part of the motion – pending the opening of the railroad crossing. Mr. Smith responded that he didn't think so because it shouldn't be too far in the distant future before the issue of the railroad crossing goes in front of City Council.

Mr. Linder asked if there should be irrigation at the main entrance. Mr. Plank stated that he believed that under code it would be required to be irrigated. They just don't know what it will look like at this point.

Ms. Shields asked to speak to the brick crosswalks. She stated that in the Subarea for the previous Courtyards project and the upcoming Apartments project, they made a request that there are stamped brick crosswalks across the entrance drives which will add to traffic-calming and the general character. While the stipulation does say brick, Staff would at least request that it be stamped brick, because it makes it much more of a cohesive development. Mr. Plank responded that the difference between putting stamped brick in a private development as opposed to a public right-of-way, is that in a private development, the developer can maintain it. In a public right-of-way, the City will be required to maintain it. They could do the brick stamping, but they would prefer not to. Mr. Rauch stated that over the last couple of years, the City has done a number of brick crosswalks across public roads. This project is going to involve public financing to a certain extent with a TIF, and a major part of that financing package involves paying attention to the public realm. Mr. Rauch continued to state that he would like to see the use of full brick within the crosswalks to help delineate the pedestrian paths from the vehicular traffic. It is a maintenance cost to the City; however, the City is willing to take on that cost for the aesthetics of the community. Mr. Plank stated that he would still prefer to not be obligated to provide the brick other than what has been shown on the site plan. It could, however, come back under the Development Agreement with the City. Mr. Smith stated that he would suggest that there be a stipulation that states "unless otherwise agreed to".

Mr. Rauck asked to again speak on the archway. He stated he understands the location is based on what's best for the project; however, by leaving it off, he doesn't want them to possibly not have an archway. He would like to make sure that there will be an entrance with an archway in downtown Grove City. Mr. Plank stated that they are not trying to get away from having an archway. They're just trying to determine the best location and the further away from the railroad tracks, the safer it will be. Mr. Smith added that the text requires an entry feature must be there, it's just a question as to what it will be.

There being no additional questions or discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the following five (5) stipulations, noting the changes to stipulation #3 and #4:

1. Pavement and right-of-way widths shall be dictated by the approved Beulah Park Zoning Text (C-24-18). The Standard Drawings on sheet C0.3 (C-GC-61, C-GC-62, C-GC-63 and C-GC-64) shall be referenced only in terms of pavement composition for public roadways in the development.
2. Brick crosswalks shall be provided at pedestrian crossings at all roundabouts and across Street "A" and Street "E" at Southwest Boulevard.
3. Irrigation shall be provided for all entry features into the Beulah Park site excluding the entrance to Demorest and Lincoln.
4. The proposed archway shall be determined at a later time.
5. Autumn Blaze Maples and Pin Oaks shall not be used as street trees. Replacements for these trees shall be subject to approval by the Urban Forester.

Mr. Linder seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0.

ITEM #4 – The Apartments at Beulah Park – Development Plan

PID #201806150023

Ms. Spergel presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for Subarea H. Plans indicate that 376 units are proposed; however, after discussions with the applicant, 384 units are proposed, which still meet the requirements of the Beulah Park zoning text for Subarea H.

The site of the proposed development was identified as “Mixed Neighborhood” on the GroveCity2050 Community Plan Future Land Use and Character Map. This land use calls for a mix of housing types with the potential to incorporate small-scale, neighborhood-oriented retail or office uses. These districts are typically located within a walkable distance to a neighborhood activity center. The proposed development is in line with this future land use, as it offers a unique housing option within the Beulah Park development and for the larger community. The development will bring additional residents within walking distance of the historic Town Center, and contribute to the mixed-use environment designated for the area on the GroveCity2050 Development and Conservation Strategy.

The site is proposed to have two 32' curb cuts off of Street “A” of the Beulah Park public roadway network. Access drives throughout the site will be two-way. Most of the provided parking will be pull-in spaces along the access drives or in garages located off of the access drives, with some parallel spaces also provided off private access drives.

A total of 384 apartments are proposed with 304 traditional apartments and 80 townhomes. A total of 12 multi-story apartment and townhouse buildings are proposed throughout the site and will vary in size with the larger buildings proposed to have 32 to 48 units each and the smaller buildings proposed to have 16 to 24 units each. There are 10 proposed garage structures located throughout the site, ranging from six (6) to nine (9) spaces available within them. The proposed clubhouse will be located on the west side of the site near the southern entrance and will also have a pool and a mail kiosk located nearby. In addition to the clubhouse and pool, other site amenities include a variety of open space, tot lot, and dog park.

Five (5) different building types have been submitted for the proposed apartments and townhouses, with each containing different unit types. The largest buildings will have 48 units containing all apartments. The smallest buildings will contain 16 units with a combination of apartments and townhouses. Some unit types including the townhouse buildings are proposed to utilize pitched roofs and be located further east on the site away from the streets with attached garages on the sides. The all apartment buildings are proposed to utilize flat roofs and be closer to or along Street “A” to provide a more urban look to the Subarea. Each building is proposed to utilize brick veneer along the first and portions of the second story with vertical board and batten vinyl siding and horizontal vinyl lap siding used on the upper portions and around any proposed attached garages. Each building will provide balconies.

Two (2) different designs for detached garages have been submitted, but both are proposed to utilize the same materials and colors found on the proposed apartment buildings. The proposed clubhouse, as with the other buildings, will be finished in the same materials utilizing brick veneer around the northern portion of the building with horizontal vinyl lap siding around the remainder of the building. A stone wall is proposed around the building as well.

A six (6) foot white vinyl fence is proposed along the east and south property line of parcel 040-004268 and along the eastern property line to buffer the site from the railroad tracks. While staff is supportive of the fencing, the proposed fencing along the eastern property line is on the outside of the proposed landscaping, and staff is not supportive of this layout and believes that the fence should be located on the east side of the plantings. Additionally, the zoning text requires decorative fencing along the development's frontage on Street ‘A’ and only portions of fencing are proposed. This fencing should be extended along the entire project's frontage to conform with the zoning text.

One (1) sign is proposed in front of the clubhouse along Street “A”. The proposed monument sign will have a manufactured stone veneer base matching and connecting to the proposed stone veneer wall around the clubhouse. The Beulah Park zoning text states that entry/monument signage is to be approved as part of the final development plan, and staff is supportive of the proposed sign.

After review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the eight (8) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report and one additional stipulation:

9. Decorative fencing shall be installed along the entire project's frontage of Street 'A'.

Mr. Don Plank, attorney for the applicant, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Plank stated that in regards to the stipulations, they are in agreement with #1. Not only will the entrance features be irrigated, but the entire frontage of the property will be irrigated.

Mr. Plank continued to state that what they are trying to create with this project is an urban development and he feels that City code deals with a "less than urban development" and more towards "clean sites". This is more of an infill site – not typical for Grove City.

Mr. Craig Murdick, Craig Murdick Architects, Ltd., asked to speak to the item. Mr. Murdick expressed that in the 25+ years of working with this development group, he has seen that they are interested in quality projects. To that end, in regards to the stipulation related to fencing along the frontage of the property, he feels that this will serve to create a separation, contrary to the intent of a more walkable, open community. Mr. Phil Morehead added that in trying to create a more urban feel, the structure itself is the edge in lieu of the fence along the frontage.

In regards to the fence screening along the railroad tracks. Mr. Morehead asked for further clarification on this item. Ms. Shields stated that in regards to the eastern side along the railroad tracks, right now the plans show a fence, trees and the railroad. Typically, when they are requesting a fence and trees, it's so the trees will break up the visual mass of the fence. They feel that the trees should be on the resident's side. Mr. Morehead stated that they do have staggered trees and the majority are on the east side of the fence and he doesn't see a reason to destroy an existing tree just to install a fence and they be put in the center due to stormwater going through. Ms. Shields stated that there was no tree-stand marked on this area and they were showing some trees within that area. It appears that there is a good five feet between the parking lot and where the fence is going so perhaps the fence could be shifted over approximately three feet so there's more room for landscaping. Mr. Murdick stated that he feels the proper solution would be to allow the tree stand to exist to stand and a fence could be installed just to the west of that area and then inside the project some plantings could be installed to break up the fence. Ms. Shields stated this was what they were trying to achieve. Staff does not want to remove an existing tree stand to simply put up a fence.

Mr. Murdick stated that he was unsure about the landscaping around the buildings. Related to this is the condenser screenings. The front buildings with the flat roofs all have the condensers on the roof and will not be visible. The back buildings with the pitched roofs do have condensers on the ground around all sides since it is four-sided architecture. With the stoops/porches, there is a limited amount of space and the intent is to provide nearly a 100% constructed screen with removable panels, supplemented with landscaping around it. Ms. Shields stated that would meet code. She continued to state that there were a couple items – the service structures being landscaped – basically just a note on the plan sheets stating that you'll comply with the requirement. If there isn't a final design for it at this point, as long as the Urban Forester has something to point to and say that you have agreed that it will be landscaped per code, the city might not need to see all the details right now. In terms of the other landscaping around the buildings, that's why we added the "and/or the approval of the Urban Forester", recognizing that some of the requirements of 1136.09(a)(1) don't really mesh with an urban development, especially in terms of trees per unit. The City doesn't, however, want to compromise in terms of the shrubs and more of the decorative landscaping. Basically, the City would just like to work together with the applicant to make sure we're both happy with the end product.

Mr. Murdick added a comment about the trees in the parking lot peninsulas. He stated that from an architectural standpoint, peninsulas are not always the best place for trees and wanted to know if this is something he can work

through with the Urban Forester. Ms. Shields stated that this is a code requirement, so it would need to have a specific deviation which can be requested. She added that this isn't something she supports, but if it can be proved that it is warranted, then it might be approved. She would prefer for them to attempt to work with it because it is a standard across the City.

Regarding the trash compactor screening, Mr. Murdick stated that his understanding from the zoning text is that the concern of the City is the street views of the structures and the amount of brick that is seen from the street. They have accommodated with the percentages required. The compactor is tucked away and will be landscaped and screened with a vinyl fence. He continued to state that they don't feel it's necessary to brick a structure that isn't very visible. Ms. Shields responded that this is a typical City-wide requirement. Even if something isn't visible from the right-of-way, doesn't mean it doesn't need to be a high quality development. It will be highly visible from the residents within the development. Mr. Plank stated that they went to great lengths to bring the buildings up to the front and put the frontage so that they become the screening to the rest of the property. They have committed to landscaping in the front to be compliant with code, but once you get past that first row of houses, everywhere else is a marketing issue. How he deals with the rest of his site, should be his problem. Mr. Plank continued to discuss his argument on the screening and that he doesn't want to be in violation with the City if they choose to screen differently.

Mr. Pat Kelley, GC Beulah, asked to comment on the brick. He stated that they have challenged their architect to create a dynamic apartment community that he feel's is going to be one of the best in central Ohio. The complex ties in with the whole theme of Beulah. They are going to be very nice buildings with beautiful interiors and will look especially nice along the roadway. He stated that he is concerned that adding additional brick is going to price potential renters, mostly millennials, out of the market. Mr. Murdick added that, based on his experience, vinyl enclosures are not a detriment to a project, especially considering the high quality of the project throughout. In response to that, Ms. Shields stated that requiring the enclosure to be entirely brick might be extreme; however, currently, the developer is requesting it to be entirely vinyl, and the City does not allow that. The goal is to have the enclosure match the theme of the corresponding structure. Mr. Murdick stated that they could work to see how they could incorporate some brick. Mr. Kelley asked if they could provide examples of where they have done this in other communities. Ms. Shields stated that at this point the stipulation is recommended and it's up to the Commission to make a determination. If we approve the plans right now, it will include a white vinyl fencing screening enclosure. Mr. Morehead added that there will be significant landscaping around the enclosure, mostly shrubs which will be a minimum of 6 ft. tall to 15+, ornamental grasses and ornamental trees. In regards to the enclosures matching the buildings, Mr. Murdick stated that the adjacent garage is a horizontal lap-sided building and they could create an enclosure that also has horizontal lap-siding. Ms. Shields stated that doing that would be much easier for Staff to consider. She continued that perhaps they amend the stipulation # 6 to state that the developer shall work with Staff to determine an appropriate enclosure.

Mr. Rauck asked if the structure behind the vinyl siding was masonry. Mr. Murdick stated that it would have wood posts and the vinyl has a sleeve that slides over the wood. At the gate, there would be steel tube bollards that are in concrete, with welded hinges and a galvanized tube-steel frame. The handrails for the tenant pedestrian passage to drop off the trash would be same high-quality handrail that will be used on the balconies of the apartments. It will ADA compliant and landscaped.

There being no additional questions or discussion, Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the following eight (8) stipulations, noting the change to stipulation #6 regarding the enclosure:

1. All entry features shall be irrigated per Section 1136.09(a)(1).
2. The southern property line of parcel 040-004268 shall be fully screened with the line of evergreen trees going along the entire property line.

3. Landscaping around each residential building shall meet the requirements of Section 1136.09(a)(1) and/or the approval of the Urban Forester.
4. All parking lot peninsulas shall have one (1) two-inch caliper tree, unless restricted by underground utilities.
5. All service structures on site shall be landscaped per Section 1136.08, including the trash compactor, a/c units, and other service structures.
6. The developer shall work with the City to determine the appropriate screening materials for the trash compactors.
7. A path and additional landscaping shall be provided around the detention pond just east from the clubhouse and meet standard drawing C-GC-98.
8. The proposed 6' white vinyl fencing shall be placed to the east of the proposed landscaping along the eastern property line to buffer the site from the railroad tracks.

Mr. Leasure seconded the motion. At this point it was brought to the attention of the Commission that there were actually nine (9) stipulations recommended by staff, as one was added during the reading of the Staff Report.

9. The decorative fencing shall be installed along the entire project's frontage of street 'A'.

Mr. Morehead stated that it isn't that they don't have decorative fencing, it just runs between the buildings. So it alternates, building – fence, building – fence. Mr. Murdick continued that the fencing that they have shown is at entry elements and as part of their screening for the parking. They would prefer to not have it as a requirement for a continuous fence along the entire length.

At this point, Mr. Smith stated that there was a motion and a second with the 8 stipulations. If Mr. Leasure withdraws his second, then Mr. Linder can withdraw the motion and they can move to make a second motion.

Mr. Leasure withdrew his second and Mr. Linder then withdrew his motion.

Mr. Linder moved to recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the following nine (9) stipulations:

1. All entry features shall be irrigated per Section 1136.09(a)(1).
2. The southern property line of parcel 040-004268 shall be fully screened with the line of evergreen trees going along the entire property line.
3. Landscaping around each residential building shall meet the requirements of Section 1136.09(a)(1) and/or the approval of the Urban Forester.
4. All parking lot peninsulas shall have one (1) two-inch caliper tree, unless restricted by underground utilities.
5. All service structures on site shall be landscaped per Section 1136.08, including the trash compactor, a/c units, and other service structures.
6. The developer shall work with the City to determine the appropriate screening materials for the trash compactors.
7. A path and additional landscaping shall be provided around the detention pond just east from the clubhouse and meet standard drawing C-GC-98.
8. The proposed 6' white vinyl fencing shall be placed to the east of the proposed landscaping along the eastern property line to buffer the site from the railroad tracks.

9. The decorative fencing shall be installed along the entire project's frontage of street 'A'.

Mr. Leasure seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0.

Having no additional items, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.



Mary Havener, Secretary



Julie Oyster, Chair