

Canal Winchester

*Town Hall
10 North High Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 14, 2018

7:00 PM

Planning and Zoning Commission

*Bill Christensen - Chairman
Michael Vasko - Vice Chairman
Joe Donahue - Secretary
Brad Richey
June Konold
Joe Wildenthaler
Mark Caulk*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey that Mike Vasko, Joe Wildenthaler and Mark Caulk be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold and Richey

Excused: 2 – Wildenthaler, Vasko and Caulk

Approval of Minutes

April 9, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Donahue, that the April 9, 2018 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold and Richey

Public CommentPublic OathPublic Hearings**VA-18-005**

Property Owner: Jenny & James Slones

Applicant: Jenny & James Slones

Location: 147 West Waterloo Street

Request: Variance to Chapter 1161.02(c)(1)(D) to encroach the established front yard build-to line with a new front deck.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Jenny and James Slones for property located at 147 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a variance from Chapter 1161.02(c)(1)(D) to encroach the established front yard build-to line with a new front covered porch/deck.

Staff discussed that the current home sits approximately 13.5 feet from the right-of-way line, not including the front stoop and steps. Staff explained the stoop and steps are exempt from the build-to line because they are the egress into the home. With the proposed new front covered porch, the house would be approximately 5.5 feet away from the right-of-way line. When looking at the average of all of the adjacent properties on the same side of the street, as defined by the zoning code, the average build-to line is 9.4 feet which would allow a deviation between 6.4 feet from the right-of-way line to 12.4 feet away. The proposed addition would place the home 5.5 feet away from the right-of-way line.

Staff shared a concept image of the covered porch with the commission and discussed that Landmarks Commission reviewed the application and after a discussion recommended to P&Z that the variance be approved. Noting that the front porch adds to the character of the property and helps tie it into the existing streetscape and any usable front porch has to have an eight foot depth as shown.

Staff recommends that the variance VA-18-005 be approved as presented.

Mr. Richey asked staff if the steps that lead to the front porch are a concern as they are closer to the right-of-way line than the front porch. Staff indicated that typically the egress into a property is not limited by the right-of-way and they are exempt. There are many properties in the historic area where the steps go all the way to the sidewalk.

Mr. Slones discussed the application with the commission and commented that there are many homes in the historic district that have front porches that extend towards the sidewalk and they believe that what they are proposing will fit right in. The desire for a front porch is so that they can interact with the public and they hope the commission will grant their application.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for the Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Donahue, that the Public Hearing be closed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold and Richey

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by June Konold, that variance application VA-18-005 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold and Richey

SDP-18-006

Property Owner: Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust

Applicant: Seth Dorman, WD Partners

Location: 6647 Winchester Blvd.

Request: Site Development Plan approval to paint the exterior of the Walmart Building.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust represented by Seth Dorman at WD Partners. The applicant is requesting a Site

Development Plan approval to SDP-18-006 to paint the exterior of the Walmart building. Staff shared with the commission photographs of the current paint scheme noting that it is comprised of brown and beige tones. The new paint scheme will be several shades of grey and eggshell, but most notably the main sign will have the wall directly behind it painted "Walmart Blue".

Staff discussed that they have worked with the application on modifying the typical paint scheme on the building to something that better matched the buildings architecture and the applicant has complied with staff's request.

Staff also noted that the plans submitted do show signage changes, but those changes require a variance that was not filed for this meeting. The applicant plans on filing for the June meeting for the signage variance. Walmart has received a variance for a signage increase in the past.

Staff recommends that Site Development Plan SDP-18-006 for the exterior change be approved as presented.

Mr. Richey commented he knows signage will be at a future meeting, but asked staff if the blue around the main Walmart sign plays into the signage calculation or if it just the lettering itself. Staff indicated that the blue paint is the main decision factor on why this application could not be approved administratively, it is up to the commission to determine if the blue is part of the signage.

Mr. Christensen commented that the blue paint behind the main sign does provide more contrast for the sign to stand out.

Seth Dorman with WD Partners discussed the application with the commission. Mr. Dorman indicated that Wal-Mart is remodeling the interior of the store and as part of their nationwide branding initiative they would like to update the exterior of the building.

Mr. Christensen noted that Member Mike Vasko arrived at 7:18pm.

Mr. Richey commented to the applicant that he has concerns with the blue paint but more importantly the overall signage package. The concern is approving the paint change without seeing the signage package at the same meeting. There have been times in the past where other applicants have piecemealed applications and things that would not have been approved as a group were approved step by step, and that is an issue that the commission needs to avoid.

Mr. Richey asked if the applicant be opposed to tabling the application so that the entire exterior modifications are presented at one meeting. Mr. Dorman

indicated that Walmart would be comfortable tabling the application but in terms of Walmart's priorities, they would much rather have a blue background for the main sign than approval of the variance. Richey added that it is not necessarily the blue paint that he is concerned about, but more of what have the commission not seen yet that is going to be requested later.

Mrs. Konold commented that she is concerned with the blue background. The Waterloo Shopping Center was designed to be cohesive with matching brick and architectural standards with natural materials and adding the blue to the building could turn into the next applicant wanting an entire wall red or purple. It totally detracts from the intent of what the shopping center was supposed to look like.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by June Konold, that Site Development Plan SDP-18-006 be tabled.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold, Vasko and Richey

FS-18-001

Property Owner: Westport Homes

Applicant: Terry Andrews, Westport Homes

Location: PID 042-0384930 & 042-0384940

Request: Final Subdivision Plat Application for Canal Cove Section 5.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Terry Andrews with Westport Homes for property located at PID 042-0384930 & 042-0384940 within the Canal Cove Subdivision. The application is requesting approval to plat Section 5 of Canal Cove, which will consist of 40 buildable single-family lots and 1 reserve lot.

Staff discussed that the subject property is zoned Planned Residential District and is subject to the Canal Cove final development plan approved in July 2015. Out of the existing three 4 phases in the Canal Cove subdivision, only 13 lot remain vacant. Staff briefly discussed the conditions of approval for the subdivision in terms of home size and design.

In July 2015, when Westport Homes reapplied for the Final Development Plan for Canal Cove sections 3-7, the conditions of approval were updated. Some of the notable conditions of approval that directly effect this plat are the following:

1. Approval of the final landscaping plan will need to take place prior to final plat approval for Section 5. Major trees removed will need to be replaced on-site in Reserve areas and dead or diseased trees will need to be removed.
3. Paths shall be included on the north and south side of the wetland area in Reserve D and connect to the existing sidewalk network on the north and south

running streets on each side of Reserve D. The construction materials used and exact location are subject to future approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to approval of Section 5.

5. A multi-use path shall be included on the north side of Hill Road right-of-way along the entire frontage of the development.

And finally, Fairfield County required a turn lane leading into Cannon Drive at Section 1 with the approval of the Section 4 expansion. Staff noted that the turn lane has yet to be completed at this time.

Mr. Moore discussed the conditions of the final development plan approval with the commission, noting that the path within Reserve D has been designed to be a 4' concrete sidewalk, rather than a pea gravel path as previously indicated in 2015 and the multi-use path along Hill Road has yet to be completed. In 2017 when Section 4 Plat was approved, the applicant indicated the turn lane on Hill Road and the 8' multi-use path would be completed by late Summer/Fall 2017.

Staff recommends the applicant's request for the Final Subdivision Plat #FS-18-001 be approved and recommended to City Council with the following conditions:

1. The 8' multi-use path along the Hill Road be completed prior to the final plat approval.
2. The turn lane on Hill Road into Cannon Drive be completed prior to the final plat approval.
3. The electric easements as noted in "Note D" be submitted for review prior to the final plat approval.

Mr. Donahue asked staff if the discussion from 2015, specifically condition #5 for the multi-use path was also discussed during the plat process for section 4. Staff affirmed that during the plat process for section 4 the developer indicated the multi-use path along hill road would be constructed in late summer/fall of 2017, same with the turn lane construction. Mr. Donahue stated that both are currently under construction and have been for some time. Staff affirmed and stated that they believe both will be completed with the asphalt work of section 5.

Mr. Donahue asked staff if they could approve the plat with the conditions as presented when in 2015 the same conditions were in place. Staff indicated that this will help speed up the process and the applicant will not be able to build any new homes on section 5 until the path and turn lane are completed.

Terry Andrews with Westport Homes introduced himself to the commission and commented that there were many weather delays late last year that prohibited the turn lane and multi-use path from being completed at that time. However,

the path and turn lane are bonded. Mr. Andrews indicated that the stone base for the bike path is in place so it is close to be completed.

Mr. Richey asked the applicant when the stone base was put in for the bike path. Mr. Andrews indicated it was installed summer last year. Richey asked if the stone base was going to be proof rolled before it is paved. The applicant indicated it was proof rolled last week.

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Mike Vasko that Final Subdivision Plat FS-18-001 be recommended to City Council for Approval with the following recommendations:

- 1. The 8' multi-use path along the Hill Road be completed prior to the final plat approval.**
- 2. The turn lane on Hill Road into Cannon Drive be completed prior to the final plat approval.**
- 3. The electric easements as noted in "Note D" be submitted for review prior to the final plat approval.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold, Vasko and Richey

ZM-17-007

Property Owner: Dwight A. Imler Revocable Living Trust

Applicant: Westport Homes

Location: 11.954 acres of property located at PID 184-002994 (Located along the corner of Hayes Road and Lithopolis Road).

Request: Property be rezoned from Exceptional Use (EU) to Planned Residential District (PRD).

Mr. Moore presented the application for Westport Homes in regards to the 11.954 acres located at the corner of Hayes Road and Lithopolis Road. The applicant is requesting that this piece of property be rezoned from Exceptional Use to Planned Residential District. Staff informed the commission that this application is directly related to the following application for the approval for the Preliminary Development Plan for 79.488 acres, which includes the 11.954 acres in this application so they both will be discussed together.

PDP-17-003

Property Owner: Dwight A. Imler Revocable Living Trust

Applicant: Westport Homes

Location: 79.488 acres primarily located along Hayes Road and Oregon Road (PID 184-002994, 184-003001 & 184-002998).

Request: Approval for a Preliminary Development Plan and associated development text for 117 Traditional Single Family Homes and 58 Lifestyle Single Family Homes.

Mr. Moore discussed the application for Westport Homes for the 79.488 acres of property located at Parcel ID 184-002994, 104-003001, and 184-002998, commonly known as the intersections of Hayes Road, Oregon Road, and Lithopolis Road. The applicant is requesting approval for a Preliminary Development Plan and associated development text for the Middletown Farms Subdivision which includes 117 Traditional Single Family Homes and 58 Lifestyle Single Family Homes. This application was tabled from the February P&Z Meeting where the applicant was requesting 194 homes.

Staff informed the commission that they will not be discussing the application in great detail like the February meeting, but will compare the primary changes in the application to the commission.

Staff discussed that the first change that can be seen is the reduction in the number of lots. The previous plan called for 132 Traditional Single Family and 62 Lifestyle Single Family Lots. That has been reduced to 117 Traditional Single Family and 58 Lifestyle Single Family, a total reduction of 19 lots across both sections. When looking at the comparison between the two, the gross and net density has been reduced. Additionally, staff noted that the percentage of open space on site has also been reduced from the February plan.

Staff discussed the changes in access from the previous presentation noting that Subarea 2 had one access point on Lithopolis Road and one access point on Hayes Road. The access has since been modified to remove the Lithopolis Road access and have two access points on Hayes Road, creating an additional cul-de-sac. The access for Subarea 1 has not changed from the previous proposal.

Staff noted that when this development was first proposed the developer was showing two access points on Hayes Road and staff recommended one be moved to Lithopolis Road.

Staff overlaid the old plan on top of the revised plan and noted that while they both appear similar, the applicant has removed from the development text the word "minimum" from lot size and frontage and has instead inserted the word "typical". Staff discussed concerns in approving a development text that states a "typical" frontage or lot size and indicates the concern in regulating that. With the current development text, the number of lots could be capped but the lot size would be much harder without a minimum.

Staff noted that the front yard setback is still shown as 25 feet, the side yard at 8 feet, and the maximum lot coverage at 35% for the Subarea 1. Subarea 2 still is showing a 25 foot front yard setback, 5 foot side yard, and the lot coverage is still noted To Be Determined during plot plan submittals for the homes. Staff again noted that a TBD for lot coverage is not something that can be regulated.

Staff shared the hydrology map with the commission and noted that the applicant is still showing two lots will have portions of the wetland on the property and they are to be filled.

Staff recommends that the Zoning Map amendment ZM-17-006 be denied as presented. The applicant has not shown that they meet the purpose and intent of a Planned District as set forth in Section 1173.01(c) with this application.

Staff also recommends that Staff also recommends Preliminary Development Plan PDP-17-003 be denied as presented. The applicant has failed to meet the following sections of the zoning code.

1. Chapter 1130.01 – Architectural Diversity
2. Chapter 1130.06 – Side load garage requirements
3. Chapter 1130.07 – Front Load Garage standards
4. Chapter 1130.09 – House Size and Setbacks
5. Chapter 1173.03 (b)(4), front yard setbacks and color diversity standards.
6. Chapter 1173.04 (a)(1)(A), indication of major trees on site and plans on how the 1% annual flood plain is to be mitigated for future development of single family homes.
7. Chapter 1173.04 (a)(2), listing all the standards in chapter 1173 that are not being met, and providing information on what adjustments, amenities or other compensations are being provided with the plan to offset the use of reduced standards and demonstrating how the modified standards will result in the best possible development for the site.
8. Chapter 1173.05 (a)(4), listing all of the standards in the zoning code that are not being met and justifying deviations from those standards.
9. Chapter 1153.21, not clearly identifying whether the school district will be requesting land dedication or cash-in-lieu of land dedication.

Staff noted that from the February submittal to now, with the reduction in the number of lots proposed the applicant does now meet the density cap under a PRD and the applicant also meets another requirement stating in the preliminary development plan what section of the zoning code the planned district text is based off of.

Staff updated the commission that they talked with the school superintendent last week, and it also appears that the applicant has not worked out the land dedication or fee-in-lieu of with the school district as of date. According to the school, the last time they spoke with Westport Homes was back in February.

The applicant is showing in the development plan that they are going to meet the 20% side load garage requirement in subarea 1 with 23 lots out of the 117, however that only equals 19.6%. Staff also noted that code requirement is 20% of the entire subdivision, so 23 lots out of a total of 175 lots is only 13%. There have been no examples of what a side load garage would look like for review.

Mr. Donahue asked staff if it is accurate to state that the Lithopolis Road entry was removed and replaced with a cul-de-sac and two entrances on Hayes Road.

Staff affirmed. Mr. Donahue asked if a traffic study has been done to analyze those changes. Staff indicated that a traffic study for this area has not been completed. As of last week, staff provided comments for the developer to modify the study's MOU and the parameters to study.

Mr. Donahue asked staff about the logistics of this being two applications and voting procedure. Staff indicated that the commission would have to vote on both applications as they are related to one another.

Mr. Christensen asked about the applicant filling in a ditch. Staff indicated they were unsure of the ditch the commission was talking about.

Mr. Christensen asked if the applicant was present.

Molly Gwin representing the applicant introduced herself to the commission.

Mrs. Gwin addressed that the deviation from the setbacks are tied to the total lot square footages are minimized based off of a planned district. Adding that a planned district is not a strict code and is typically changed for what the market wants in terms of style and density. One of the changes since the last application, the density has gone down. What the developer is seeing is buyers don't want large yards with new products.

Mrs. Gwin discussed the open space being provided with this development is at 35% while code only requires 20%. This amount of open space is provided by the fact the lots are smaller. And as Staff has noted, the lot size in subarea 1 has increased from 68 feet to 70-85 feet wide. With this increase there are a loss of 19 units.

Mrs. Gwin commented that the Canal Winchester present zoning code does not allow for any sort of empty nester detached product to be constructed in the city. The product they are offering are doing well in the market and while code has strict standards on garage setbacks, the developers feel they are making up for that with an architecturally enhanced appearance to the garage doors that blend into the homes. All of the elevations will also be required to have front porches.

Mrs. Konold asked Mrs. Gwin if she stated the lot sizes can vary in the subdivision. The applicant stated that the development text does not note "typical" as a way to get around minimum lot sizes and they are more than willing to change it to state minimum.

Mr. Christensen commented that the way that the development was just presented by Mrs. Gwin, all setbacks could vary as the development progressed to get things to fit. Mrs. Gwin commented that the base code that is being varied is R-3. The attempt is to set minimum standards for the entire development. However, a PRD as a legal matter should be able to pull for many different code sections. Although with this development the setbacks have been

condensed to allow for more open space. Noting that current code standards do not allow for empty nester type of development with a 14,000 sq. ft. lot. The proposed lots in Subarea 1 will be about 10,000 sq. ft. which is what today's buyers are looking for.

Mrs. Gwin noted that one important aspect to note is that with this project, Subarea 1 will have a price point of \$315,000 to \$350,000. In 2017, 104 homes closed in Canal Winchester and they were all around \$234,000. These homes will fit a spot in the market that have not previously been met.

Jack Mautino with Westport Homes introduced himself to the commission.

Mr. Mautino addressed that side yards and minimum lot with have a minimum value. In subarea 1, the minimum lot width will be 75 feet and minimum side setbacks will be 8 feet.

Mr. Mautino stated he is surprised by staff's comment that they have not been working with the school superintendent when they just had a conversation, talking specifically about a school site on this property. Based on the fee calculation, they would be right around \$600-\$700 a home.

Mr. Mautino discussed that this proposal includes two distinctive home site. Subarea 1 with 117 traditional single family homes, down from 132 homes that was presented in January. Subarea 2 will have 58 lifestyle homes, down from 65 from January. Those homes will all be detached and fee simple so the home owner will own the lot and home on public streets. All lawn maintenance for subarea 2 will be controlled by the HOA.

Mr. Mautino stated the price points for subarea 1 would be \$325,000 upwards of \$400,000. That would be 10-15% higher than Canal Cove closings to date. The lifestyle homes would go for \$285,000 to around \$300,000. This particular buyer does not downscale, they downsize.

Mr. Mautino discussed that this plan has 35% open space, rather than 20% that is required. This plan is to promote less property the home owner has to maintain and provide more public gathering space.

Mr. Mautino discussed architecture of each subarea with the commission, noting that the homes in Canal Cove do not comply with the new Canal Winchester architectural standards. All traditional single family homes will have a minimum 100 sq. ft. front porch, architectural garage door, coach lights, dimensional shingles, brick or stone water table on front all homes along with other requirements. All of the lifestyle series will have covered front porches, architectural garage doors and one-third of the homes backing up to Hayes Road would have a bonus room to help break up the rear façade.

Mr. Mautino stated that the intersection on Lithopolis Road was relocated to Hayes Road due to a traffic concern of people turning that direction from

Lithopolis Road. Although access could be brought back but be limited to a right-in/right-out.

Terry Andrews with Westport Homes added that the access on Lithopolis was moved back to Hayes Road to help with drainage for the area and to help with traffic safety.

Mr. Mautino asked the commission if there were any questions.

Seeing no questions, Mr. Christensen opened up the application for a Public Hearing.

Resident Bruce Kelly discussed his concerns with the commission in regards to drainage of the area and how the development will impact this entire area and his property. Staff discussed briefly drainage design with the applicant.

Resident Mike Quick also stated his concerns are with the drainage. Subarea 2 is terribly wet and all of the houses within the cul-de-sac are in the worst parts. Mr. Quick also discussed his concerns with the ponds and their effectiveness. While the applicant is saying they have so much extra reserve space, that design is forced by the land conditions. That reserve area is too wet to build on.

A motion was made by Mike Vasko, seconded by June Konold, that the Public Hearing be closed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Donahue, Christensen, Konold, Vasko and Richey

Mr. Andrews directed the commission to the utility diagram in the packet and discussed the storm water control for the site.

Mr. Vasko asked the applicant what the applicant would do with the pond if the cul-de-sac was removed. The applicant indicated that they designed this area as a cul-de-sac to appropriate the drainage concerns. Vasko elaborated and asked what the plan was if the cul-de-sac design is not approved by the commission. Mr. Andrews added he will review the old plan and get back to Mr. Vasko.

Mr. Richey asked the applicant about the proposed connection to the current lift station pipe and the capacity for the area. Staff responded saying the sanitary pipe from the lift station heading towards this development is designed to be oversized to serve the surrounding area.

Mr. Andrews indicated that the pond would be shifted with the road connection to Lithopolis Road. Mr. Vasko commented his dilemma is he does not like long cul-de-sacs and that if there is ever an accident or fire truck in the road, the entire street is trapped and cannot exit. A grid street system is preferred to alleviate those types of concerns.

Mr. Vasko stated he has concerns with the proposed plans, and as he has heard this evening there are still concerns of staff that need to be worked out with the issue of the road connection. Mr. Vasko asked the commission if they are ready to vote this evening with so many issues up in the air.

Mr. Mautino agreed that the traffic study needs to be completed prior to Council's full review. Now, if there are other issues that are not technical Westport is more interested in the commission's feedback on the plan itself. Mautino added that they will meet the 20% side load garage requirement in subarea 1 and this is a really good plan with the preservation of open space. The active adult buyer market is booming and this is a great product. This type of buyer is leaving towns that cannot provide this product to find it.

Mr. Vasko asked staff if any of the recommendations for denial have been resolved with the presentation from the applicant this evening. Staff indicated that the issues have not been resolved. Mr. Mautino indicated that the issues cannot be resolved because it is asking for an upgraded R-3 code which they cannot meet.

Mr. Vasko commented that he does not believe that this application is ready for a vote based on the number of concerns. While they can discuss the application, modifications cannot be made based off personal preference. One major issue is the unknown road connection with Phase 2. The use of the word "typical" in the zoning text may have been a miss use of the word, but while the applicant wants flexibility on setbacks that is not the only issue. Mr. Mautino stated that he does not want flexibility, he is saying the minimum lot width for subarea 1 is 75 feet. But due to the configuration of the roads they can range from 75 feet to 85 feet. Side yard setback will be 8 and 8 feet. However, without filing for an R-3 zoning district, staff is never going to approve the subdivision. Accommodations have been made to switch from duplex to patio homes, front porches, architectural features, etc. but to ask for the mega lot 14,000 sq. ft. and side load garage from a city and homeowner standpoint it does not make sense. Staff and Westport have been debating throughout the process, and Westport has made concessions to try and meet code but without meeting it full they will not receive staff support.

Mr. Donahue asked staff about the City Council work session last month where they discussed Residential Development Standards with Westport Homes and the result of if the application was denied by Planning and Zoning and an appeal process. Staff indicated that if the applications were denied it would not be an appeal, but a negative recommendation to City Council for approval. Council is the only body that can approve zoning map changes and Preliminary Development Plans, and P&Z is just the filtering body to ensure the plans meet code minimums. Now Council did have a discussion on Residential Design standards and the result as far as staff can tell from that meeting is they would like to form a committee to review the current standards and update them accordingly.

Mr. Donahue discussed that a lot of the same concerns from February were heard tonight and does not believe the list of recommendations for denial is ever going to be knocked down based on the current momentum and current code standards and suggest to the commission that a vote should be made this evening.

Mr. Donahue added while there are concerns with the plan and they are proposing a good product, it may not be a good product for this particular tract of land, based on personal opinion. However, what would tabling the application accomplish if the same plan comes back next go around.

Mr. Mautino commented to the commission a PRD is a negotiation of what would be the best use of the land. The previous plan did not come to fruition due to the housing collapse, but Westport is here with a PRD proposal, not an R-3 proposal.

The commission discussed amongst themselves.

Staff asked the commission to vote on each application separately for the record. Mr. Christensen added that both of these are recommendations to City Council.

Mr. Richey added he understands the applicants request for smaller lots and he has no problem with a development that has smaller lots, nicer homes, more green space and park land. Richey commented he agrees with Mr. Donahue's comments that there are too many items to get staff's list knocked down for their support. However, it would be important to understand what Council's discussion was on future updating the Residential Standards.

Mr. Christensen commented that Council has sent items back to P&Z in the past for reevaluation.

Staff commented that Council's discussion on the residential design standards resulted in Council exploring setting up a committee to revisit the current residential design standards. Right now they are trying to come up with the dynamics of the committee.

Mr. Vasko commented that this is not the first PRD that the city has accomplished. Right now it is troubling that the traffic study has not been completed at this point and if the plan goes for a vote this evening it will be a negative vote from himself due to not knowing road connections and possible traffic impacts. This is not a little item that needs to be determined; road locations are very important.

Staff added that based on conversation this evening, to help clarify the only section of the Residential Design Standards that relates to an R-3 zoning district has to do with lot size, setbacks, and square footage requirements. The rest of the standards are for all single-family residential districts, including this PRD.

Mr. Donahue asked staff what tabling the application would do. Staff responded saying that tabling the application should be done with the commission providing guidance to the applicant on recommended changes to the current proposal. A planned district is supposed to be a negotiation and changes should be made based on feedback. The applicant needs to get that feedback from the commission if there are changes that are to be requested.

Mr. Mautino commented on the traffic study and stated that since the December submittal they are still revising the MOU with staff and they are eager to set up a meeting with the city to try and work these matters out.

Mr. Mautino asked the commission that if traffic study aside, have the other concerns with the development been addressed. Mr. Donahue stated he thinks a majority have been address, but it is hard to understand why the plan is before the commission with 9 recommendations for denial in the staff report. The code may be a challenge, but without the traffic study complete and the other outstanding issues, why is the application back before the commission this evening. Mautino responded saying Westport cannot meet and other builders he is familiar with cannot meet the residential design standards set in place by the city with the 2006 code. The architectural style presented this evening does not meet that code requirement so they met with Council to try and see if the home styles presented would be acceptable.

Mr. Richey ran through the list of items that need to be corrected and noted that the list is not going to get substantially smaller if the application is tabled.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by June Konold to recommend to City Council approval of Zoning Map Amendment ZM-17-007 to rezoned 11.954 acres from EU to PRD.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 1 –Richey

No: 4 – Christensen, Vasko, Donahue & Konold

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by June Konold to recommend to City Council approval of Preliminary Development Plan PDP-17-003 for Middletown Farms for 117 traditional single family homes and 58 lifestyle single family homes.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 1 –Richey

No: 4 – Christensen, Vasko, Donahue & Konold

ZA-18-002

Applicant: City of Canal Winchester Planning and Zoning Commission
Request: Proposed Zoning Code Amendment(s) to Chapter 1161.04 Old Town Commercial.

Mr. Moore presented the application for a Zoning Code Amendment to Chapter 1161.04 of the Old Town Commercial zoning district. Staff discussed the changes include modifying the permitting uses, removing multi-family as a permitted use, and adding a mixed use category to the chapter. Staff discussed the mixed use section with the commission and noted that based on last month's discussion this update is to help recreate the 2 to 3 story mixed use buildings that already existing in the downtown environment. Current code limitations do not allow for this type of development to reoccur, and based off the Old Town Plan that was adopted by City Council that type of redevelopment is desirable.

Staff ran through a map showing all of the current mixed use buildings and noted the density on the screen for the commissions review. This density that currently exists is what the code change will allow to happen.

Staff recapped that the Landmarks Commission has authority over demolitions and new construction so the process will go through their hands prior to any recommendation to Planning and Zoning Commissions review. Based on small parcel size downtown large scale buildings aren't anticipated as it would be difficult to get through the approval of demolishing several existing structures.

Staff discussed the other miscellaneous revisions in the Old Town Commercial chapter.

Mr. Christensen asked questions in regards to parking standards and signage. Staff indicated all that can be determined when it gets to P&Z on specifics. It would all be project specific.

Mr. Christensen opened up the application for a Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey that this Public Hearing be closed.

This motion passed by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Christensen, Richey, Vasko, Donahue & Konold

A motion was made by Joe Donahue, seconded by Brad Richey that Zoning Text Amendment ZA-18-002 to modify Chapter 1161.04 be recommended to City Council for approval.

This motion passed by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Christensen, Richey, Vasko, Donahue & Konold

Old Business

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 8:58pm

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Donahue, that this Meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 – Christensen, Richey, Vasko, Donahue & Konold

Date

Bill Christensen - Chairman
