



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 18, 2022 at 6:30 PM in Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL- Mr. Swank called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

Present- Jaskiewicz, Swank, Harriman

Absent- Adler and Carney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Harriman motioned to approve the Planning and Zoning Commission- Meeting Minutes from April 20, 2022, seconded by Mr. Jaskiewicz. All yeas.

COMMUNICATION

Zoning (Ms. Brill)

She updated the commission on where the Hamlet on the Darby project was in its review. She also stated that developer of Oak Grove has asked for a time extension and that request is in front of Council for approval. Ms. Brill told the commission they should expect to meet next month to review some site plans. She finished by stating that the Village is exploring some new ODOT grant opportunities as they relate to community connectivity.

BZA (Mr. Jaskiewicz)

Mr. Jaskiewicz stated the board met to review a variance for a lot split. The variance was ultimately approved.

NEW BUSINESS

PUD-22-1: Development Plan/Zoning Text Amendment, Darby Station Residential Development

Ms. Brill stated the applicant is requesting a modification to the zoning text for Subarea D of the development. Subarea D is 30.6 acres located on the eastern most portion of the development, north of SR 161. This subarea will contain single-family detached cluster homes as a permitted use. The text calls for a maximum of 88 detached cluster homes.

The first amendment requested is in VIII(c) Setbacks, with the revision stating “there shall be a minimum building and pavement setback of 10 feet from all perimeter boundaries of this subarea...”

The second amendment is to section VIII(d) Building Height, with the text now stating, "home heights shall not exceed 35 ft in height. The revision strikes out the 1 or 1 ½ stories previous and set a maximum height for all structures in feet. This 35ft restriction is consistent with all other subareas where single-family buildings as permitted and/or primary uses. The developer has made some changes to the product type for Subarea D since the preliminary submittal.

Section VIII(f) is being amended to remove the installation of a privacy fence for each unit and section VIII(h) now state, "each home shall be required to have a minimum of two off-street parking spaces on its driveway, in addition to those parking spaces in its garage. This parking requirement is consistent with Subareas A-C.

Those 4 zoning text amendments sum up the requests for the applicant. All other sections of the text will remain as approved in the preliminary plan and furthermore ordinance 19-20.

The applicant is proposing a modification to the layout of Subarea D. The unit count will remain the same. The previous site plan called for a clustering of homes in a more block style pattern. Each unit shared a service drive and the garages were rear-loaded. The new site plan would keep the community as part of a condominium ownership.

Mr. Josh Barkan, representing M/I Home, explained the intent of the modification and showed the board the new site plan. He stated that some of the text modifications were cleaning up redundancies. He believed the new proposal is more in keeping with the suburban nature of the rest of the development and will be an attractive product.

Mr. Harriman asked if the common space and the streets will remain under the HOA. The applicant confirmed the streets to be private and the common space to be maintained by the HOA for the development. When asked about any age restrictions, Mr. Barkan confirmed there to be none. He stated it was rather age targeted, with some of the ranch plans being attractive to empty nesters, but those of any age could purchase one of the homes in the Subarea. He stated along with the ranch plans there will be 2 story homes.

The commission asked about the street widths. The applicant confirmed the private streets to be 27ft wide with parking not included along the street. Ms. Brill noted that the parking concern was the only one raised by the fire department, but no on street parking would resolve the issue. The applicant confirmed that in addition to the spaces provided to each home in the garage and driveway, some common parking spaces have been added and are denoted on the site plan.

The commission asked Ms. Brill about staff's comments on the development. Ms. Brill stated that the comment was more specific to the landscaping of the development, but the plans shown this evening show more of the street trees and landscaping than what was provided in the packet. Mr. Swank asked the applicant about the bike trail and sidewalk connectivity. The applicant displayed the sidewalk network and where the multi-use trail would be accessible from. The new layout created more common open space than the previous one, which adds to the overall open space allotment. The commission liked the addition of the greenspace. The commission also asked the applicant about somehow connecting the two cul-de-sacs and the

developers stated there was no real good way to do this and provide each unit what felt like a private backyard space. The commission acknowledged this and stated they understood.

After review and consideration, Mr. Jaskiewicz motioned to recommend approval of the application, as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Harriman. All yeas.

DISCUSSION

Rezoning of 8620 SR 161

Ms. Brill informed the Commission of a request to rezoning the parcel to accommodate office use. Mr. Craft, whom present, wanted to renovate the existing structure to accommodate his office space. The current home on the property would still remain but instead of a residential use would become an office use. The zoning code does not allow office type uses in a Rural District, which is the current zoning classification on the property.

Mr. Craft approached the commission and explained his future intent of moving his office space to this location to free up commercial tenant space off of US 42 for another medical office provider. He stated he had been in communication with Ms. Brill about the property and how to handle the matter, hoping the new code would be passed at this time. Since he is hoping to do this soon, and not able to wait for a date in the future for the new code to be passed.

Ms. Brill clarified the purpose of the discussion was to garner initial thoughts of the planning commission about the intended use and zoning classification into the future. There would not need to be a vote or a decision. Ms. Brill also provided the new zoning map in the zoning code revision has the parcel zoned agricultural, but professional services being among the uses. A small administrative office use falls under the definition of professional service.

The Commission asked about the current zoning designation and its uses. Ms. Brill provided those. The Commission asked what the new zoning classification was being proposed as. Ms. Brill stated one of the business districts, being B1 or B2. The commission asked about other properties zoned in the business district and those permitted uses. They referred to the comprehensive plan and the future land use map. The property in the comp plan has it as agricultural, and it was the desire of the commission to remain within the guidelines of the plan.

Ms. Brill also provided an alternative solution, as to add a use into the Rural District to accommodate office type uses. This would not require the parcel to need to be rezoned. The Commission asked about other properties zoned Rural and what the addition of the use could be for those properties. Ms. Brill stated there were only a handful of parcels in the Village zoned as Rural. The Commission after consideration, stated the addition of the use might fall in line with the comprehensive plan's planned land use map for the area.

Ms. Brill thanked the Commission for their feedback and stated she would work with the applicant of official next steps.

Zoning Code Update

Ms. Brill informed the commission that the consultant is at work with making the suggested changes based on the joint work session with Council. The Commission also filled Mr. Jaskiewicz in on items discussed with the Suburban Residential District, setbacks and lot size. This was the primary focus of the discussion. Ms. Brill stated that based on the feedback a more form-based treatment of the district has been proposed, which would take a closer look at massing, orientation and form of the structure, rather than just simply setbacks and lot size. It seemed to be the consensus from Council this is what they wanted to explore. The Commission asked about other sections of the code and when those would be discussed. Ms. Brill asked them to please review on their own time and send her specific questions, this would make it easier to cover the lengthy document most efferently. Mr. Harriman asked about the sign code section. Ms. Brill stated she would take a closer look.

The goal is to have something in front of the Commission again informally next month.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:16pm