



MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 3, 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. Jim Rauck and Dr. John Dubos. Mr. Mike Linder was absent. Others present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Kendra Spergel, Development Planner; Jennifer Readler, Frost Brown Todd; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; Jennifer Stachler, Public Service Superintendent; Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council; Jeff Lawless, Grove City Police; Tammy Green, JTFD; Terrence Barr, Zoning Intern; and Mary Havener, Development Assistant.

Chair Oyster noted a quorum was present and asked for approval of the March 6, 2018 Planning Commission minutes. Mr. Leasure moved that the minutes be approved. Dr. Dubos seconded the motion and the minutes were approved 4-0. Mr. Leasure also moved that the March 22, 2018 Special Meeting minutes be approved. Dr. Dubos seconded the motion and the minutes were approved 4-0.

ITEM #1 – K9 Ohio – Special Use Permit

PID #201801310005

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting a special use permit for a dog training/ dog daycare facility with kenneling at 4446 Broadway, part of a multi-tenant building located at the northeast corner of Broadway and Ventura Boulevard.

Per the applicant, the focus of the business is on dog training. Multiple training programs are offered ranging from five (5) to 15 days in duration. Dog day care will be available for customers not entering the training program but want their dogs to have a place to play during the day. The facility can accommodate a maximum of 10 dogs for daycare during the day at a time. The facility will also offer boarding for up to six (6) dogs overnight. The applicant has indicated that the boarding aspect of the business has room to be expanded, however, they want to keep the number of boarded dogs limited to ensure the dogs receive proper attention.

Because the business is located in a multi-tenant building, special care needs to be taken to ensure that noise and messes are managed. The applicant has indicated that a garage door has been installed within the building to separate the dogs from the other portions of the business and keep noise down; additionally, the applicant has indicated that the trainer will be onsite with the dogs throughout the day and into the evening hours and will work to keep them quiet. There is a fenced area for the dogs outdoors in the rear/east portion of the building. Dogs will also be walked in nearby parks throughout the day.

Staff believes that the proposed dog kenneling, daycare and training businesses can be in harmony with the intended character of the district as long as noise and messes are managed to minimize the impact of the business on the property and adjacent tenants. Therefore, staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Special Use Permit with the two stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Luke Smurthwaite and Mr. Elijah Smurthwaite were present to speak to the item. Mr. Luke Smurthwaite added that they will only be offering daycare to the dogs that they have trained in the past. It won't be open to the general public, which will keep down the number of dogs. Their main focus will be on the training aspect of the business.

Mr. Leasure asked if these would be police dogs. Mr. Smurthwaite responded that they would not. Mr. Leasure asked if they had any problems with the stipulations. They responded that they did not.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit to City Council with the two stipulations as noted in the Staff Report:

1. Noise from the dog kenneling and training business shall be minimized to not negatively impact surrounding tenants.
2. Dog waste, both on and off the site, shall be cleaned up immediately and placed in an appropriate trash receptacle and/or dumpster.

Dr. Dubos seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0.

ITEM #2 – 1519 Borrer Road – Rezoning

PID #201803020009

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is proposing to rezone a 2.035-acre parcel at 1519 Borrer Road, located on the south side of Borrer Road, approximately 1,500 feet east of Buckeye Parkway from PUD-R to SF-1 in order to construct a single-family home on the site.

The property was zoned as PUD-R in 1976 without a zoning text upon its annexation into the City, and per Table 1135.14 III, standards for single-family PUD-R developments are "as approved by Council as shown on the development plan." Staff does not believe it is appropriate or the intent of this to review development plans for individual homes and recommended the property owner pursue an SF-1 zoning to allow for the construction of their desired single-family home, and the potential to split the lot to develop an additional home on the site while keeping the large-lot rural character intended for the area on future land use plans.

After review and consideration, staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Rezoning as submitted.

Mr. Jeff Glavan, representative for the applicant, was present to speak to the item and answer any questions.

Having no discussion, Dr. Dubos moved to recommend approval of the Rezoning to City Council as submitted. Mr. Leasure seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0.

ITEM #3 – The Ashford of Grove City – Development Plan

PID #201802210006

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a development plan for a new 160-unit senior living facility on the south side of Southwest Blvd, west of the CVS site and east of the railroad tracks. City Council approved the preliminary development plan for the project in February 2018 and Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning application to rezone the property PUD-R with zoning text at the March 6 meeting.

The layout of the site generally matches that on the approved Preliminary Development Plan with two points of access: a full access curb cut onto Southwest Boulevard and a secondary access drive connecting to the existing private drive on the adjacent CVS property. The preliminary development plan was approved with a stipulation that the reconfiguration of access points be considered with the final development plan. To address this stipulation, the applicant shifted the Southwest Boulevard access point to the west to align with a cut across the street and straightened the entrance drive off this cut. To address concerns related to the access point off the shared CVS drive, the applicant has indicated that a stop sign will be placed on the proposed drive and they will reach out to CVS about further traffic-calming on CVS's drive.

A stipulation was also set with the Preliminary Development Plan regarding building architecture. The stipulation stated that portions of the building facing either Southwest Blvd. or Broadway shall include at least 50% masonry, and the proposed elevations meet this requirement, with additional materials (vinyl board and batten, horizontal and shake siding) to create architectural interest around the building.

The proposed building will be 102,000 square feet in size and will have a pitched roof with asphalt shingles. The assisted living portion of the building will be three stories and the memory care and shared common area portions of the building will be one story.

The proposed use of assisted living and memory care does not cleanly fit into many of our Code's standards for residential or commercial development. Because of this, staff has worked with the applicant to strike a balance that will result in a quality development most appropriate for the site and reasonable for the proposed use. Deviations to typical residential requirements are outlined in the project's proposed zoning text and include parking and open space. Deviations to commercial requirements are requested for irrigation.

While there are a few outstanding issues regarding landscaping, staff believes the site has been designed to create a quality development, therefore staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the six stipulations and deviations as noted in the Staff Report.

Ms. Nicole Boyer, Wallick Asset Management, was present to speak to the item. Ms. Boyer asked to address both the fifth and sixth stipulation. #5 stipulates that a path should be provided around the proposed retention pond to meet the City's standards. Ms. Boyer stated that they are requesting a deviation from this request due to the fact that the pond is located on the backside of the property and is adjacent to the floodway. The pond is solely for retention and is not an amenity for the residents. Most of their residents will have ambulatory and mobility restrictions, so they would like to provide a pathway that goes around the building. In this way, there are opportunities for the residents to go outside without being too far from the building. There are also liability issues that are related to having the path too far from the building and having non-residents on the back of site, where they might pose a threat to the residents. Ms. Shields responded that the path requirement is an example where this project doesn't fit cleanly into our Code standards and staff has gone back and forth with the applicant on this issue. Because they have required paths around retention ponds on other commercial properties, they do not want to deviate too much because they are appropriate in most developments. Ultimately, they requested that the path be placed around the retention pond.

Ms. Boyer responded to stipulation #6, the evergreen hedge along the Southwest Blvd. frontage shall be at least 36" in height at installation. She stated that 36" hedges are difficult to find and are somewhat cost prohibitive. She suggested as an alternative, they use 18" – 24" plantings instead that will grow and fill in over time. Mr. Leasure asked if they could provide mounding so that the smaller plantings would be higher and provide additional screening. Mr. Leasure asked if they were still intending to put mounding in that area. Ms. Boyer stated that they are.

Mr. Leasure asked the Fire Department if they had any issues with getting their equipment around the complex. Ms. Green stated that they did not.

Dr. Dubos asked if the 36" could include some type of mounding. Ms. Shields stated that the intent of the 36" is to provide screening from headlight glare onto the roadway and if they can show that by providing mounding and other grasses and plantings could provide the same amount of screening, staff believes that could be acceptable.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend Planning Commission recommend approval of the Development Plan to City Council with the following deviations and stipulations:

1. A deviation shall be granted from Section 1136.09(a)(3) to permit areas for irrigation as shown on the landscape plan, sheet L1.0, of the final development plan.
2. The applicant shall provide a monetary contribution for the installment of the Southwest Boulevard bike path.
3. All sidewalks on site shall be at least five (5) feet in width.
4. Additional landscaping shall be provided around the proposed retention pond that meets Grove City Standard Drawing C-GC-98.
5. The evergreen hedge along the Southwest Blvd frontage shall be at least 24" in height at installation on top of mounding.

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

ITEM #4 – The Residences at Brown's Farm – Preliminary Development Plan

PID #201712270045

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary development plan for a new housing development made up of two subareas, The Residences at Brown's Farm (Subarea A) and The Cottages at Brown's Farm (Subarea B). This application was previously heard by Planning Commission on February 20 and was postponed due to the number of outstanding issues and to give the applicant the opportunity to meet with area residents to discuss the project.

Both subareas are proposed to be age-targeted, designed for empty-nesters and seniors, and are in line with the recommended future land use for the area as outlined in GroveCity2050. 210 apartment homes are proposed in Subarea A, west of Haughn Road and 110 detached condominium homes are shown in Subarea B, east of Haughn Road.

Since the special Planning Commission meeting on February 20, the applicant has held a meeting for area residents and has worked with staff to resolve concerns with the project, primarily regarding access to and from the site. In response to access concerns, the applicant has submitted options for reconfigured access to Orders Road for both subarea A and B. Subarea A's would be through Fryer Park to Discovery Drive and Subarea B's is shown over the adjacent First Baptist Church property to the east. Both subareas will also have access points off Haughn Road.

Haughn Road is a two-lane rural road at the property's frontage, and the applicant will be expected to work with the City in terms of improvements around the site's access along Haughn Road. A traffic study has been

submitted, though not typically required until the rezoning application, and is currently under review. This study will help determine appropriate access and necessary improvements to the roadway network.

Other adjustments to plans have been made based on comments generated at the last Planning Commission meeting including shifting the proposed bike path away from existing residences and increasing the amount of open space on the site. While there are still a number of issues to resolve, primarily related to access, staff is generally supportive of the proposed application and is recommending that Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Preliminary Development Plan with the three (3) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Jonathon Wilcox, Wilcox Communities, and Mr. Jack Reynolds, attorney for the applicant, were present to speak to the item. Mr. Wilcox asked to present a couple of highlights on what has transpired since the last Planning Commission meeting. He stated that they have met with area residents to discuss concerns/questions that they might have and Mr. Hale has met with another resident and their attorney to discuss concerns. As a result, they have attempted to address some of the larger issues. The only significant change on the western portion of the project was to eliminate the curb cut onto Orders Road and to instead utilize Discovery Drive. This will allow them to move their clubhouse up to the front and the open space to the south would be a good area for the City to utilize.

There are three items on the Cottages (east) side of Haughn Road that they have addressed. One item was buffering along the south. Regarding, the single-family residences to the south of lots 1-8, there is now a 20' buffer that runs along the southern edge, which will give them an opportunity to add a 3 ft. mound with some spruce trees. The second item on that side is related to the bike path. They have reconfigured some of the lots around the access road which enables them to pull the bike path down a little bit away from the back yards. The final issue relates to the access road that goes out to Orders Road. Mr. Wilcox continued to state that they have looked at three scenarios related to this concern. One option would be to bring a secondary access point just north of the existing entrance off of Haughn Road. Another option they have considered is future connectivity to the east and potentially connecting through the church property up to Orders Road. The third option is to keep the access road where it is, which is what is currently shown on their plans. After considering all three options, the direction they were given was to keep the current access road where it is. They removed the sidewalk along the road and have shrunk the size down to 26 ft.

Mr. Leasure asked if the question by Mr. Mike Absten, a concerned resident that had previously reached out to Planning Commission members, related to leaving the trees that are currently on the property had been resolved. Mr. Wilcox stated that he has been in regular contact with Mr. Absten and he has demonstrated to Mr. Absten which trees would stay and which would be removed. Mr. Wilcox stated that he thinks Mr. Absten has a good understanding of the proposed intentions.

Mr. Rauck asked if the western portion of the development would require purchasing of additional acreage from the City. Mr. Wilcox stated that it would, however, the details have not been worked out and nothing yet has been finalized. Mr. Rauck asked if Staff has considered that option. Mr. Rauch, Development Director, stated that this is an issue which will require addition vetting and discussions with Administration.

Mr. Leasure asked what the status of improvements on Orders Road was. Mr. Wilcox stated that they have done a traffic impact study and discussions are ongoing. Mr. Reynolds stated that they have received the traffic letter and will be reacting to it and there are ongoing discussions between the City and the County related to the roadway. This is just the Preliminary Plan and they understand that there are still steps which will need to be addressed. Mr. Rauch stated that the City engineers have been involved and have drafted a Memo of Understanding for a traffic study, which will be agreed upon by the City as well as the applicant and the Franklin County Engineer, to totally define what is to be studied and any impacts. All of this can take place during the Rezoning process.

Dr. Dubos asked the timeframe for beginning this project. Mr. Wilcox stated that they anticipate beginning around the first quarter of 2019.

Chair Oyster asked for comments from the public.

Mr. David Hellard, resident at 3151 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. Mr. Hellard expressed many concerns and his opposition related to these apartments being placed behind his single-family home. He is requesting that the rezoning not be rushed into without due diligence. He is also concerned that the land around the nearby church, which currently is open for soccer and flag football, as well as other public events, will be affected if the drive is moved to that property. He reiterated that he is opposed to the zoning being changed. He believes that the single-family zoning has been put into place for a reason and to change this, there should be a compelling reason to do so, not based on the desire of a developer who wishes to change the character of the neighborhood. He feels that Fryer Park and Century Village are two of the gems of the City, so placing high-density apartments does not seem to make sense to him. Traffic is also a big concern for him. He asked that the developer come back with a project that respects the current neighborhood settings.

Mr. Tom Reed, resident at 3564 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. He stated that is he concerned about the drainage concerns related to this development. Ms. Shields stated that there is a storm line that runs between Mr. Reed's property and his neighbor, however, when a property is developed, they are required to demonstrate "zero" impact to existing developments. As far as the current system, Ms. Shields stated that staff could review his concerns with our Service Department to determine if anything could be done.

Mr. Tad Kuhn, resident at 5278 Haughn Road, asked to speak to the item. He stated that he met with Mr. Wilcox and they have agreed to a 20 ft. no-build area and an additional 24 ft. no-build setback area on lots 1-8. He stated that Mr. Wilcox also agreed to a three-foot mound with some spruce trees on the first 20 ft. area for buffering. He would like to request that these items be represented in the plans so that he knows it will occur. He also asked about the possibility of working out a deal to annex into the City more feasibly. Ms. Shields responded that a stipulation could be added stating that the applicant must agree to mounding and landscaping within the 20 ft. southern setback. Doing so will place it on the record that the applicant is committed to those improvements.

Mr. Rauch reiterated that this is a preliminary review and the applicant will be back before the Commission two additional times, once with a Rezoning and once with a Final Development Plan. At this time, the applicant will be required to present detailed development sheets that will address stormwater, landscaping, traffic movements, etc. The current plan is basically to determine if the use makes sense.

Ms. Suzie Widner, resident at 2557 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. She expressed her concerns related to flooding in the area, the pathways around the retention ponds and the amount of traffic as a result of this development. Mr. Leasure asked if someone with the City would follow up with her. Ms. Jen Stachler, Public Service Superintendent said she would get with Ms. Wagner and follow up on her flooding concerns.

Mr. Rob Ringhiser, resident at 3535 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. He stated that his biggest concern is the access point from the Cottages to Orders Road and if there are any alternatives. Ms. Shields stated that it has not been determined that this is the location of the access point. This was the initial direction because the Brown property includes the 60 ft. strip that went out to Orders Road, so it seemed appropriate that they be able to utilize it. However, there are other options which Mr. Wilcox has mentioned. From a safety aspect, the City would like to see another access point. Where that access may be is still under discussion, which is the reason behind staff's recommended stipulation regarding access points to Orders Road.

Mr. Leasure asked the City who participates in the improvements of Haughn and Orders Roads. Ms. Shields stated that it depends, as it goes between the jurisdiction of the roadway. This is where the traffic study becomes such an important part.

Mr. Richard Wirtz, resident at 3786 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. He expressed his concerns related to the dust and dirt that will result from the construction of this development and the risk of fire if one of these condominiums were to catch on fire.

Mr. Wilcox asked to respond to the comments made by Mr. Hellard. He explained that they are also developing the Mews at Pinnacle. In regards to the comments about these units being high-density apartments, he stated that these are ranch-style, age-focused luxury apartments and when you see them on paper, they appear as if there are a lot of buildings, however, this might be the least dense multi-family project that has come to Grove City. In regards to the comment related to single-family zoning, this property is not currently in the City; it is agricultural property within the Township. They are being guided by the GroveCity2050 plan which recommends this level of density at this location.

Ms. Chris Carney, resident at 3545 Orders Road, asked to speak to the item. She stated that there has been no resolution in regards to her driveway and the access point to Orders Road from the Cottages.

Mr. Rauck asked the City if the boundaries of this development include any of the potential land in Fryer Park. Ms. Shields stated that it does not. For this application, Planning Commission is only approving what is legally within the project boundaries of this development. However, the plan sheet showing the potential road connection to Discovery Drive is included in the materials to show the applicant's willingness to consider modifications to their access points.

Mr. Wilcox stated that they would be agreeable to adding a stipulation that the developer install approximately 3 ft. mounds within the 20 ft. setback, with a designated number of spruce trees for lots 1-8.

Ms. Jennifer Readler, attorney for the City, stated that since this is the preliminary plan, a stipulation that specific would be more appropriate for the final development plan. Ms. Shields stated that a more general stipulation could state that appropriate screening shall be installed when adjacent to existing single-family residences.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Leasure moved to recommend approval of the Preliminary Development Plan to City Council with the following four (4) stipulations:

1. The annexation items shall be filed with Franklin County.
2. The applicant shall work with the City regarding roadway improvements around the site's access points along Haughn Road south of Orders Road.
3. The applicant shall investigate the feasibility of reconfiguring access points to Orders Road.
4. Appropriate screening shall be installed when adjacent to existing single-family residences.

Dr. Dubos seconded the motion and it was approved with the following votes: Mr. Leasure, yes; Chair Oyster, yes; Dr. Dubos, no; and Mr. Rauck, yes.

NOTE: At this time, (2:50 p.m.), Chair Oyster recognized that Dr. Dubos would be leaving the meeting; however, a quorum would remain with the other three members.

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is proposing to rezone three (3) parcels on the south side of Borror Road, approximately 0.5 miles east of Buckeye Parkway from SF-1 to PUD-R in order to develop the Trail View Run subdivision. The applicant is proposing to develop 79 single-family homes and 42 detached condominium/patio homes.

Density remains the primary outstanding concern with the proposed zoning text allowing a maximum density of 2.5 dwelling units/acre. The Grant Run Estates development adjacent to the west has a density of approximately 2.3 dwelling units/acre. While staff is supportive of the proposed lot sizes and type of dwellings, staff is not supportive of having a density higher than the density found in the adjacent development given the desired "step down" in density along Borror Road outlined on future land use plans. A number of clarifications in the text are also requested and amendments to align the standards with potential code amendments regarding street trees.

There are other outstanding issues with the proposed development, which are outlined in the Staff Report for the Development Plan. In terms of the zoning application, staff is recommending Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Rezoning with the six (6) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Karl Billisits, Harmony Development Group, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Billisits stated that they are struggling with the requested density. Grant Run, which is adjacent to their development, has a substantial amount of open space, which was the flood plain for Grant Run. He stated that they have about 35% open space for their project, which contains some flood plain, but is also open space based on the City's Park's Plan to grant the park in the back, which is about 12 acres in size. They made a large commitment of about \$300,000 to Grove City to support the Borror Road improvement plan with OPWC to fix Borror Road. From a traffic standpoint, they have a group of about 45 homes that are patio homes geared for active adults. Within them, they have so much square footage on the first floor with a limited amount of square footage on the second floor. They equate to about 75% of a traditional single-family residential home. They have made several adjustments in the front to make it more rural in character.

He continued to state that the first stipulation related to the density, they cannot meet. The next stipulation that they are struggling with is the street tree requirements. He is unsure what is being asked of them. He could agree to the current code requirements, and if there is a new ordinance that is coming, they could look at it and see if it is something they can accommodate.

Mr. Leasure asked if they are sharing in the costs of improvement for the roadway with the City, Township and the County. Mr. Billisits stated that this is correct. He stated that it was a group effort between three developers, Rockford Homes, Beazer and Harmony Development Group, as well as the Township, the County Engineer's office and the City. Ms. Oyster asked the City if they had further details regarding the street tree issue. Ms. Shields confirmed that the recommendations listed are not the current code requirements, other than paying into the community environmental fund. She continued to state that the direction of the potential code amendment is to shift street trees so that the responsibility of their installation and maintenance is off the City. It would be the responsibility of the developer or private property owner to install, purchase and maintain them. It is not codified at this point, but it is the direction we are going. This would be the first development to go along with what we intend for all future developments to follow.

Mr. Rauck asked for clarification for the record of where street trees are located. Ms. Shields stated that street trees are typically located in the right-of-way between the street and public sidewalk.

Chair Oyster asked if anyone from the public would like to speak to the item.

Mr. Brian Driftmyer, resident at 1421 Borror Road, asked to speak. He stated $\frac{3}{4}$ of his property will be affected by this development. Since so much is affected, he detailed his major concerns which include traffic, the density of the development, line marks on his driveway and divots in his yard from people going up and down his driveway, and the lack of submitted detailed building elevations and his concern that lesser quality building elevations will be allowed after the fact. He also noted that he has made requests to the developer which have not been addressed related to potential fences/gates around the development to keep his children safe.

Mr. Driftmyer implored Planning Commission to not change the zoning and if it is changed, he would suggest that elevations would be required so that the nature of what is requested to be put in is what is actually put in.

Mr. Driftmyer also expressed his concern about the fact that originally, the barn was going to remain to preserve the rural character of the area and now they are removing it and putting a house in its place.

Mr. Rauck asked Mr. Driftmyer to point out his lot for clarification purposes.

Mr. Billisits stated that he has had communications with both Mr. and Mrs. Driftmyer.

Mr. Billisits proceeded to pass out pictures of the frontage of the property and explain the configuration and why they chose to make the changes they did in relation to the driveway on Mr. Driftmyer's property. As far as the elevations, Mr. Billisits explained that they submitted elevations as part of the application. In meeting with the residents of Grant Run, they were choosing to have homes with more square footage, which they accommodated. In terms of the sizes of the homes, he stated that they are much larger than the ones in Grant Run. The architectural detail in the front may not be what is desired, but they are larger square footage. They have also added some additional houses into the mix and oriented some houses along Borror Road a little differently. In regards to access to Mr. Driftmyer's driveway, Mr. Billisits stated that he can't speak to who is driving in it.

Mr. Leasure asked if Mr. Billisits had a problem with any of the stipulations. Mr. Billisits stated that they aren't really understanding the tree requirements. They are committed to putting trees in, but don't know how it's going to be affected by the proposed ordinance. In order to commit, they need additional details. They also have a problem with the density requirements. They looked at doing an R-1B layout but ended up going the PUD route to incorporate a lot of amenities, open space, bike paths and also the commitment with widening Borror Road.

Mr. Rauck asked the count on the patio homes. Mr. Billisits stated that there will be 42 patio homes and 79 single-family homes. Mr. Rauck also asked if the Fire Department was good with the swing radius of all the streets and stated that this would be something that the applicant would be required to comply with. Mr. Billisits stated that they would.

Kayla Spellman, resident at 1461 Borror Road, asked to speak to the item. She stated that she had a couple items related to the zoning, one being the density, which is her number one concern and the dwelling size. She proceeded to explain these concerns. She would like the area to remain SF-1 to retain the rural feel. She continued to talk about her concerns related to the prospect of this development. Mr. Rauck requested that Ms. Spellman point out where her home was located on the map, which she did.

Mr. Tom Hart, from Isaac Wiles, asked to speak to the item. Mr. Hart stated that they have done market research and density is one measure, but more important than density is value. Per their study, the average home sale around their site is approximately \$235,000. The Grant Run sales have been approximately \$240,000. In comparison, the starting price for both the empty nester and the single-family homes is between \$250,000-\$300,000. They are bringing new home building with value that is greater than the existing community is. The empty-nester homes are significantly higher per square foot.

Mr. Rauck asked if the garage configuration on the single family homes was front loading. Mr. Billisits responded that depending on the configuration, there could be both. He continued to state that the lots in Grant Run are

zoned R-1B and are required to be 8,400 sq. ft. The Grant Run lots backing to the proposed Trail View lots are 80 ft. wide, but only 105 ft. deep, which is why they're trying to contact residents along Platinum Drive to be able to grant an additional 20 ft. Mr. Billisits then proceeded to pass out some pictures of housing styles.

Mr. Rauch stated that all materials staff has received show front loaded garages. They have requested other pictures but haven't received them. Mr. Billisits stated that each home style will have 4-5 facades which get updated on an annual basis. Mr. Rauch stated that this wasn't a requirement for this application, but on the next application there is a stipulation where additional information will be required.

Brian Driftmyer asked to again speak to the item. He reiterated that 75% of his land is being affected and that no one from the development group has attempted to contact him. He again stated that the boundary lines of his property have not been addressed in terms of gates or fences. He also stated that he does not think the improvements of Berror Road should be a factor in the determination of this project.

Greg Comfort, Harmony Development Group, asked to speak to the item. He stated that their organization merely stepped up to assist with the Berror Road project and has nothing to do with getting this project approved. Mr. Leasure asked if the Berror Road improvements will continue to happen if this project is denied. Mr. Rauch stated that the road project is a \$6,000,000 project. The developer will be providing contributions that will equate to what would be required as part of the development. Regardless of the development occurring or not, the road project will happen. It is a collaborative project with the Township. They have received contributions from other developers along that stretch as part of other development agreements.

Mr. Rauck asked if the developer would be agreeable to a fence that would delineate the Driftmyer property. Mr. Billisits stated that they would be agreeable to putting in the same type of fence that's on the north side of the road along the perimeter.

Mr. Rauck stated that he would like to add a stipulation that a character fence be added around the adjacent property. Ms. Shields stated that since this is the zoning application, Mr. Rauck could add a stipulation to change the zoning text requiring a fence along the perimeter.

Mr. Rauck asked if they could also add a stipulation that homes on corner lots have models with side-loading garages. Ms. Shields stated that currently there is a stipulation in the development plan about new elevations being submitted that show more of the architectural interest that they're looking for that would probably address side-loaded garages. They also added that all of the approved home models would be required to go through the Development Department to make sure they are in line with the requirements of the zoning text. Right now the zoning text outlines architectural standards, but does not call out anything about home models. A stipulation could be added recommending the zoning text be amended to require that corner lots have side-loaded garages.

Mr. Rauck moved to recommend Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Rezoning application with the following stipulations:

1. The maximum permitted density on the site shall be 2.2 dwelling units per acre.
2. General Site Development Standard V(d) (Open Space) shall be amended to remove the sentence "Subject to Council granting a variance to allow all open space being dedicated to the City as depicted on the City's Master Parks Plan) to be counted towards the open space requirement."
3. General Site Development Standard V(i)(1) shall be removed from the proposed zoning text.

4. General Site Development Standard V(i)(3) shall be amended as follows: "~~Three~~ **Four** trees shall be provided per residential unit ~~that meet the requirements of Section 1136.09.~~ One shade tree **(2-inch caliper minimum)** shall be provided between the **sidewalk (or street if a sidewalk is not present)** and the front of each residential home ~~to function as the street tree.~~ **All other trees and plantings shall be arranged within the front, side or rear yard areas with emphasis on the front facades.** ~~One ornamental tree shall be provided in an area around the dwelling selected by the developer and a third tree may be located in the extra space at the front or rear of the home."~~
5. A new standard should be added to General Site Development Standard V(i) stating that "The owner, builder or developer shall be required to pay to the City's Community Environment Fund a fee in the sum of six (6) dollars per lineal foot of curb/street pavement frontage for the purpose of purchasing, planting and maintaining trees on public properties.
6. General Site Development Standard V(k)(2) (Signage) shall be amended to state "Any additional signage not included on the final development plan shall be reviewed and, if deemed appropriate for the site, approved by the Development Department.
7. The zoning text shall state that character fencing shall be installed along the project's property lines where adjacent to parcel 040-015527.
8. The zoning text shall state that homes on corner lots shall utilize side-loading garages.

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

ITEM #6 – Trail View Run – Development Plan

PID #201712270046

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan. This application is for a new residential subdivision that will include 79 single-family home properties and 42 patio homes on 49.5 acres of land south of Borrer Road. Like the Rezoning application, the development plan was originally heard by Planning Commission at the February 20 Planning Commission meeting and was postponed due to the number of outstanding issues to be resolved with the development. The preliminary development plan for the project was approved by City Council on August 7, 2017 after receiving a recommendation for disapproval from Planning Commission at the June 6, 2017 meeting.

Since the February 20 Planning Commission meeting, the applicant did submit revised plans showing reconfigured lots along Borrer Road, and while staff believes proposed lots #1 and #2 could match the character of existing homes along Borrer Road, staff does not feel that Lot #48, west of the proposed entrance drive, is appropriate. While this reconfiguration brought the open space into compliance with code requirements, a number of items discussed at the February Planning Commission meeting remain unresolved, including the overall density of the development and the quality and architectural interest of individual homes in the development.

After review and consideration, staff is recommending Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Development Plan with the 14 stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Karl Billisits, Harmony Development Group, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Billisits again addressed the property delineation along the Driftmyer's property. In lieu of the fencing, they might be able to eliminate lot #48. However, if the fence is more important, they could do the fence. If lot #48 is empty, a fence might not be necessary. In regards to the elevations for lots #1 and #2, he stated that he is looking at houses with front porches to add a bit more of the rural character. There will be some adjustments to the elevations that they have already submitted. Of the other stipulations, they are still struggling with the density and are not in complete understanding of the street tree stipulation.

Ms. Shields explained that for the street tree stipulation, the \$6 fee is not for the installation and maintenance of street trees. It is for a community fund for the maintenance of trees in other public properties. The intent of the future regulations is that the street tree maintenance and installation would be shifted to the private owners, but you would still be required to pay the \$6 per lineal foot into the community environmental fund for the maintenance of trees on other city properties. Mr. Billisits asked Ms. Shields if the \$6 was per lineal foot of street or per lot frontage on each side of the street. Ms. Shields stated that the wording is \$6 per lineal foot of curb/street pavement frontage. In the past it's been done on a per lot basis. Mr. Billisits asked if there is an ordinance on the books for this now. Ms. Shields stated that is a current code requirement. The monetary requirement remains the same, however, the street tree location is shifting location onto private property. Mr. Billisits stated that they would be agreeable to that stipulation, however, he just wants to make sure he understands the details fully before they sign off.

Mr. Leasure asked Mr. Billisits if there is a possibility that this project would be withdrawn if the density requirements could not be met. Mr. Billisits stated that this could be a possibility.

Mr. Rauck discussed the stipulation of the character fence around Mr. Driftmyer's home and wanted to verify that Mr. Billisits is in agreement to add one. Mr. Billisits stated that he is in agreement with the fence where the residents are living, however, when you get down to the stream, due to the 100-year flood plain, it might be more problematic.

Mr. Brian Driftmyer, resident at 1421 Borrer Road, asked to speak to the item. He demonstrated a stream that runs along Reserve B. He stated that he is appreciative of the offer to put up a fence. They just need to determine where it would start and stop.

Ms. Shields noted that before the discussion moves forward on the Development Plan, the motion to recommend approval of the zoning change included a stipulation that a maximum density of 2.2 dwelling units per acre, would require quite a few changes to the Development Plan. Therefore, she asked if the developer would consider postponing the Development Plan application to the May 8, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. This would allow time to go back and reconfigure the site to comply with the new standards of a density of 2.2 that they will be held to if the zoning text is approved by Council. This will also give them more time to address other issues such as the building elevations.

Mr. Hart agreed that this would be an appropriate option. Mr. Rauck asked their current density. Ms. Shields stated that it was 2.44, which equates to them losing 10-15 lots. Mr. Rauck asked if the reserve parcel and open space are factored in when density is considered. Ms. Shields stated that the density includes the entire site, including open space.

Ms. Oyster asked Mr. Billisits if it would make sense to postpone this item to give them time to go back and look at how they could lower their density. Mr. Billisits stated that losing 10-15 lots would kill the project.

Mr. Rauch clarified that if they postpone, and allow the rezoning to go onto Council, it will give them time to work through the issues. If Council approves the Rezoning, there will be a 30-day waiting period, which will give staff time to work through the issues.

Mr. Rauck asked the density of the development directly to the west. Ms. Shields stated that it was 2.3 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Billisits stated that they are willing to let the Rezoning application go to Council with the recommended 2.2 dwelling units per acre and asking for consideration over and above what they would be willing to do between where they're at today and the 2.2 that is being requested. Mr. Rauck asked what a density of 2.3 would do to his lot count. Ms. Shields stated that at 2.3, they would need to have approximately 113 units. They're at 120 now.

Mr. Rauck asked what would give them the most flexibility to work this out. Mr. Rauch stated that Planning Commission has made a recommendation to Council of 2.2. At that time, we can look at what the implications are from 2.2 to 2.3 and 2.4. At this point, staff is willing to sit down with the developer and work out the remaining issues. Once we get the answer from Council, we can immediately follow up on processing their Development Plan request.

Mr. Roby Schottke, council member, asked to speak to the item. He stated that he believes we should hold to the standards that were in place when they started the project. He also stated that his opinion is that this should be decided based on the two separate properties; the patio homes should be one development and the single-family homes should be another. If it was reviewed in this respect, density would not be an issue.

Mr. Rauck asked what the stipulation on density was when this development originally started. Ms. Shields stated that a formal number had never been set. Mr. Rauch continued that if there was no GroveCity2050 plan and staff had reviewed this application, they would have had the developer match the density of the adjacent neighborhood. Further discussion was held regarding adjacent neighborhood density.

Ms. Kayla Spellman, resident at 1461 Borrer Road, again stated her concerns related to the density of the development.

Mr. Billisits stated that they would like to postpone the item to the May 8, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Leasure moved to postpone the Development Plan to the May 8, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0.

Having no additional items, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m.


Mary Havener, Secretary
Julie Oyster, Chair