



MEETING MINUTES

Planning Commission

Thursday, March 22, 2018 – Special Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 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, Mr. Mike Linder and Dr. John Dubos. Others present: Kyle Rauch, Development Director; Kim Shields, Community Development Manager; Kendra Spergel, Development Planner; Stephen Smith, Frost Brown Todd; Bill Vedra, Safety Director; Tami Kelly, Clerk of Council; Laura Scott, Planning and Zoning Coordinator; Jennifer Stachler, Public Service Superintendent; Lt. Jeff Lawless, GCPD; and Mary Havener, Development Assistant.

Chair Oyster noted a quorum was present.

ITEM #1 – Beulah Park – Development Plan

PID #201704270012

Ms. Shields presented the Development Department's findings. She stated that the applicant is proposing to rezone the 212 ± acre former Beulah Park thoroughbred racetrack, on the south side of Southwest Blvd., east of Demorest Road from SD-3, IND-2 and R-2 to PUD-C and PUD-R. The site is surrounded by a mix of competing land uses and zoning districts from large scale distribution to the north to some of the most historic and diverse housing to the South. This application creates an opportunity to effectively transition between the competing land uses to minimize negative impacts between the two.

Nine subareas are proposed as well as three open space areas. Proposed uses and standards for each subarea are contained in the submitted zoning text, as well as site-wide standards such as requiring public art and entrance features and standards for public roadways which include multiple traffic calming techniques.

The site is designed to be a mixed-use development, with non-residential uses including office and research and development proposed in Subarea A along Southwest Blvd. and specialty retail and restaurants similar to other uses in the CBD in Subarea B in the southeast corner of the site; north of Cleveland Avenue.

A mix of residential is also proposed with Subarea C featuring homes with enhanced architecture and rear-loaded garages when across from a public green space, Subareas D & E offering 60' wide lots for single-family homes, and Subarea E2 with 90' wide lots and minimum homes size of 2400 sq. ft.

Multi-family residential options are proposed in Subareas F, G and H with subarea F featuring attached and detached condominiums, Subarea G featuring multi-family townhomes and Subarea H for multi-family apartments. Subarea I allows for three (3) general categories of land use: institutional (for assisted living, independent living

and memory care), multi-family condominiums and office uses. Each of these general categories have specific standards depending on the use category.

In reviewing the standards and proposed uses, staff compared the application to the principles of the Beulah Park Conceptual Framework and GroveCity2050. While the application generally conforms with these principles, there are a number of outstanding concerns, primarily in terms of roadway standards, architectural standards and diversity and appropriate open space dedication and access to open space in the development.

Therefore, after review and consideration, Staff recommends Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to City Council for the rezoning with the seven (7) stipulations as noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Don Plank, attorney for the applicant, was present to speak to the item. Mr. Plank stated that the focus today is on the subarea plan and the 20-page zoning text and their goal is to bring in a final development before the rezoning gets voted on by Council. He continued to state that this project is 212 acres; roadways that connect to eight (8) existing roads; and ten (10) subareas. He added that the zoning text was created by the applicant, but has gone back and forth with the City for a collaborative effort. Mr. Plank proceeded to give a brief description of how the zoning text was laid out. He feels that the main focus of the text was the layout of the roadways.

Mr. Gary Smith, G2 Planning, presented a detailed presentation of the rezoning application. He stated that they have a very unique opportunity to create an urban, mixed-use development that will connect with all of the developments surrounding it, not only by vehicles but also with sidewalks and trails, making it a very walkable community. He stressed that the streetscape is a very important aspect of this development including tree-lined streets.

Mr. Leasure asked if Columbus Street was going to be put on the property. Mr. Smith said they're trying to incorporate the extension of Columbus Street by the library across the railroad track to Southwest Blvd. and up to the roundabout. They are also extending Park Street throughout the Development over to the existing park on Demorest. Their goal is to create multiple points of connection and multiple modes of travel. Mr. Leasure stated that he was concerned about the width of the roadway up by Cleveland Avenue. Mr. Smith stated that they are connecting through the Beulah property, so it should be fine. He continued to describe the roadways and how they will vary depending on where they are located within the development.

Mr. Smith gave a brief description of each sub-area in the development (which is detailed in the zoning text). Basically, they attempted to create commercial to the north which will then transition from the distribution centers on the north side of Southwest through the commercial/office on their side down into the residential. By doing this, it will provide employment opportunities and bring tax dollars into the City. It also provides an opportunity for people who live in the development to have access to goods and services or even employment without having to travel far.

From a residential standpoint, they have tried to create a wide variety of residential options that will serve a wide range.

Mr. Smith presented illustrative plans depicting the type of development they envision and the various types of residential styles that will fit within each subarea, as well as the streetscapes and open space areas.

Mr. Leasure asked if they had plans to have ball fields within the park areas. Mr. Plank stated that this would be up to the City. They are giving the City 29 acres in the middle of the development and it will be up to them to decide what they will do with it. They will also be creating bike paths around the entire development as well as a memorial garden, applying grading to the park and creating a pond. Mr. Leasure asked if there was going to be a recreation center. Mr. Smith stated that if one were to be developed, it would most likely be over near the entrance from Southwest Blvd.

Mr. Leasure asked if the railroad company would be covering the cost of putting in a crossing. Mr. Plank stated that there are ongoing discussions with the City, but the City has passed legislation to appropriate funds and they are negotiating with the railroad to create a crossing over the tracks.

Mr. Leasure asked about restaurants. Mr. Plank stated that subarea B, is the area where you might see a small shop. There might be more opportunity if someone were to acquire the land to the east.

Mr. Leasure asked if they were in agreement with the seven (7) stipulations. Mr. Plank responded by stating that they are in full agreement with the first three (3) which deal with the roadway system. In regards to #4 – All homes built in Subareas C and E2 shall be reviewed and approved by an Architectural Review Board. He stated that Subarea C is divided into two sections and the lots along the parkland and the main thoroughfare will be treated differently. The internal lots in C all have rear alleys which will make them more expensive and will be pushed up to the front. They will all be two-story homes. Subarea E2 will all have 90 ft. lots. In lieu of having an individual Architectural Review for each, Mr. Plank proposed that they come in with models that are approved by the City and they will then be permitted to put those models anywhere along those lots. They would not do that for the rest of Subarea C, as that would be up to the developer. Mr. Smith continued to state that it is important to note that there are diversity standards built into the text which dictates that the same elevations cannot be built across the street from another one. Their goal is to make sure the community does not look like tract housing.

Mr. Plank addressed stipulation #7- A minimum of 180 feet of park frontage shall be provided through the interior of Subarea E2 to provide better connectivity to the central open space. He stated that they would like to propose the it be 120 ft. instead of 180 ft., and instead of the 90 ft. wide lots, it would 80 ft. By doing this, Mr. Plank addressed stipulation #6 – All homes within Subarea E2 shall have side-loaded garages. He stated they would be able to accomplish this on an 80 ft. lot. Finally, stipulation #5 – Within Subarea E, all homes fronting public open space (P1) shall be accessed from rear alleys with no direct access or curb cuts permitted from public (non-alley) roadways. Mr. Plank stated that of all the stipulations, this is the one they are unable to do. By placing alley's behind those homes, it will increase the cost and this was one of the areas that they considered to be more affordable. Mr. Smith stated that they would like to have driveways, but no street parking. They would still treat the park-side as they would in Subarea C; parallel parking with stripes and a bump-out. They will restrict parking to the side towards Subarea E.

Mr. Leasure asked Staff if these items need to be addressed now before they vote on the proposal. Ms. Shields stated that if the Commission is not in line with what the recommended stipulations are, then they will need to be amended.

Mr. Rauck asked if the alleyways that have garages to the rear of the properties allow for apartments above the garages and if they would be controlled by the homeowner. Mr. Plank stated that they would. Mr. Rauck asked which Subarea would permit this. Mr. Plank stated that it would be applicable for any of the rear-entry homes. Mr. Rauck asked if it would be possible to reduce this to limited areas. Mr. Plank stated that they could limit it to those with alley access. Mr. Smith asked staff if someone wanted to add a garage apartment in the future and zoning wasn't permitted up front, would they be able to petition the City to allow for it. Ms. Shields stated that there is flexibility in the zoning text where Council can approve deviations, however, the applicant would be required to go through the steps for an amendment. Mr. Plank responded to Mr. Rauck by stating that this is restricted to Subarea C and only to those with alley access. Ms. Shields stated that it would also be permitted in Subarea E with those homes along the park frontage.

Chair Oyster asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to speak to the item.

Mr. Steve Von Jasinski, resident at 3542 Grant Avenue, asked to speak to the item. He stated that he would suggest to the Commission that they not be afraid to require conditional uses. For these apartments, a conditional

use would still be required to come through Planning Commission. They should also question where the parking would be for the apartment. He then asked what the width of the alleys would be and if they would allow for trash trucks to safely use them. Mr. Smith responded that there is a 20 ft. right-of-way and a 16 ft. wide alley which will be enough to accommodate trash trucks. Mr. Rauck asked the setback from the back of the garage to the right-of-way. Ms. Shields responded that for Subarea C, there is a minimum rear setback of 10 ft.

Mr. Stuart Koble, resident at 3755 Broadway, asked to speak to the item. He stated that he is not part of the development, but has a couple of concerns. He is opposed to the number of cars that will result from having a development of this size as he feels this will impact our community in a negative way. He also stated that there is a drainage problem on his property due to the way the dirt has been moved around. This has resulted in flooding on his property. He has attempted to resolve this with the City's engineer and the City itself, to no avail. He stated that the railroad company has been removing and replacing railroad ties which are then simply thrown in a ditch causing water to back up. He is concerned that consideration is not being taken for the current residents that live nearby. He asked the Commission for their due diligence related to this community so that it benefits everyone.

Mr. Rauck asked Mr. Koble for clarification on where his property was located so that he could come out and look at it. Mr. Koble demonstrated the location of his property.

Mr. Leasure asked Staff if they have any jurisdiction over the railroad company related to the ties that are being dumped. Mr. Koble stated that the railroad ties are only a part of his concern. He's more concerned that the water has been rerouted and is flowing across his yard and driveway.

Mr. Rauch, Development Director, responded that they would contact the City Engineer (EMH & T). This project that Mr. Koble is referring to is a City project that was part of the State's grant to the City for improving the property to prepare for redevelopment. He stated that they will see that someone goes out to the property to review the problems. Mr. Koble stated that Mr. Boso has already done this. He was told the issue would be resolved and this was in December 2017. Mr. Rauch stated that he would contact Mr. Boso and have him at the meeting with himself and EMH&T related to the property in question. In regards to the railroad questions, Mr. Rauch stated that this is railroad property. It is not right-of-way. Consequently, they have to go through enforcement with a property owner who is not present in the community, which results in a challenge. They do have ongoing conversations with the lessee of the property, but they are not the owners. They will attempt to correspond with the property owners and do whatever possible to resolve Mr. Koble's concerns.

Mr. Linder asked Mr. Pat Kelley if he would work with the property owner, as well, to resolve his concerns. Mr. Plank stated that this was still a City project but when they develop this project, they won't put any water on his property. They want the water to go towards the pond because that's how they keep it filled. As far as Mr. Koble's concerns related to traffic, they are having a traffic study done, however, due to the number of access points on the site, they do not believe traffic will be a concern.

Discussion was held on whether to add a stipulation requiring apartment homes only being permitted in Subarea C and not in any other areas. Mr. Linder stated that he would like to see alleys in Subarea E, which would then allow apartments over garages. Mr. Linder asked the City's attorney, Mr. Smith, his opinion. Mr. Smith stated that if it's in the zoning text, there will be a way to allow for it. Mr. Linder added that he is not in agreement of taking away the alleys in Subarea E.

Mr. Roger Burkett, interested party, asked to speak to the item. He stated that he agrees that the Beulah Park area should be developed, however, he is opposed to part of it. He continued to state that Council voted 3-2 to spend 6 million dollars to extend Columbus Street, including tearing down whatever houses/buildings that are necessary. The railroad has said that to add another crossing over the railroad track will require that one of the other crossings be closed. They have decided that Grant Avenue is the one that will be closed. Mr. Burkett explained that a business that is owned by his son, is right next to the Grant Avenue railroad crossing. He stated

that they use that crossing every day. The City has stated that they would provide an alternate route for the trucks to take.

Mr. Smith, the City's attorney, stated that he has been working with Mr. Burkett's attorney over the last several weeks. He stated that it is correct that City Council has allocated money, but they still need to vote on the Columbus Street extension. He continued that it is correct that if Council approves the Columbus Street extension, one crossing would be closed to get the Columbus Street crossing. If this happens, Mr. Burkett currently has an area next to his building that the City is working with the property owner to the north (Star Electric – Tony Haughn) to allow to lease part of his parking lot. This would allow trucks to enter Mr. Burkett's son's business up into the parking lot and back out onto Grant. This is still a work in progress, but the City is attempting to alleviate his concerns that will result with the closing of the Grant Avenue rail crossing.

Dr. Dubos asked how likely it would be that the Grant Avenue rail crossing would be closed. Mr. Smith stated that the City will be taking a packet to Council where they would approve the new rail crossing, which would necessitate the closing of the Grant Avenue rail crossing. There would be an agreement with the Haughn's to allow access onto their parking lot for the trucks that are going to Mr. Burkett's son's business. The only thing Council has approved at this point is a funding mechanism.

Mr. Leasure asked Mr. Burkett if this solution is finalized, would it be workable. Mr. Burkett stated that it would to a degree but wouldn't be as good as it is now. Mr. Burkett stated that he is also concerned about the possibility of devaluing the property.

Mr. Pat Kelley, Managing Partner, asked to speak to the item. He stated that one of the biggest advantages of this development is the green space. The entire development is based on intelligent urbanism. When looking at the recommendations from Staff, the Grove City conceptual framework and the GroveCity2050 Comprehensive Plan, they meet all of the requirements. This project was designed to create sustainability, walkability and connectivity. This development encompasses the whole area connecting subdivisions to the Town Center, with a beautiful walkway and park through Beulah. Mr. Kelley specifically asked to address the issue with the homes in Subarea E. He stated that the builders that he has talked to want to know that they can fit their homes on the property. With the alleys in Subarea E, their homes won't fit. The design all along, has been to have a certain product in D and E, and a different upscale product in Subarea C. He would like to work with the engineers to minimize curb cuts in Subarea E and come up with other ideas than rear alley's and apartments over the garages. Mr. Kelley stated that this will be an outstanding opportunity for the City of Grove City and respectfully asked for a recommendation of approval.

Mr. Smith, G2 Planning, asked to further address Mr. Kelley's comments related to Subarea E. He stated that the alley product is a specialty product, in most cases a custom home. They're trying to create an opportunity for a variety of types of homes. They want both custom and production homes. The problem with putting alley's behind the homes in Subarea E is that approximately 40% of the homes in Beulah Park, will be more of a custom-type home. Many of the custom builders do not have an alley product. This will possibly alienate potential builders from being able to build in this area which might result in more of a challenge in selling the lots.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Rauck motioned to add an additional stipulation that Subarea C shall be the only area where the potential addition of residences over garages be permitted if there is an alleyway. Mr. Leasure seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0.

Mr. Leasure proceeded to move that Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval of the Rezoning to City Council with the eight (8) stipulations:

1. Boulevard street types shall have a maximum lane width of 12 feet.

2. The right-of-way width for "North Gateway B" shall be 80 feet to accommodate a center median and landscaping.
3. The roadway cross section images within the proposed zoning text shall be for illustrative purposes only. The cross section design of all roadways shall be approved as part of the development plan process.
4. All homes built in Subareas C and E2 shall be reviewed and approved by an Architectural Review Board.
5. Within Subarea E, all homes fronting public open space ('P1') shall be accessed from rear alleys with no direct access or curb cuts permitted from public (non-alley) roadways.
6. All homes within Subarea E2 shall have side-loaded garages.
7. A minimum of 180 feet of park frontage shall be provided through the interior of Subarea E2 to provide better connectivity to the central open space.
8. Subarea C shall be on the only area where the potential addition of residences over garages be permitted if there is an alleyway.

Mr. Rauck seconded the motion and it was approved 4-1 with the following votes: Mr. Leasure – yes; Mr. Rauck – yes; Mr. Linder – yes; Chair Oyster – yes; and Dr. Dubos – no.

Having no additional discussion, Chair Oyster adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.



Mary Havener, Secretary



Julie Oyster, Chair