

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 13, 2023

7:00 PM

Planning and Zoning Commission

*Joe Donahue - Chairman
Joe Wildenthaler – Vice-Chairman
Brad Richey - Secretary
Rick Deeds
Eileen Goodin
Deborah McDonnell
Steve Palsgrove*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler Eileen Goodin be excused.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Excused: 1 – Goodin

Approval of Minutes

December 12, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Joe Wildenthaler seconded by Rick Deeds, that the December 12, 2022 Minutes be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Public Comment

Public Oath

Election of Officers 2023

A motion was made by Steve Palsgrove, seconded by Deborah McDonnell to adjourn to executive session to discuss the election of officers for 2023.

- Time out 7:02pm.
- Time in 7:04pm

Chairman

A motion was made by Rick Deeds, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler for Joe Donahue as Chairman.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Vice Chairman

A motion was made by Rick Deeds, seconded by Brad Richey for Joe Wildenthaler as Vice Chairman.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Secretary

A motion was made by Rick Deeds, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler for Brad Richey as Secretary.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Public Hearings**CU-23-001**

Property Owner: 7 N High LLC c/o Nathan Doerfler
Applicant: Eric Wolford
Location: 7.5 N High Street
Request: Conditional Use to 1161.04(b)(2) to allow for a martial arts studio to operate on the subject property.

Mr. Haire presented the application for Eric Wolford for property located at 7.5 North High Street. The applicant is requesting approval for a Conditional Use to allow for a martial arts studio to operate on the subject property.

Mr. Haire discussed that the first floor of this building is a commercial restaurant and business use. To the north of this building there is a doorway that leads with internal stairs to the upper floor of the building. The upstairs space is 2,146 sq. ft. and was formerly a law office.

The applicant has provided a layout for how the intent on using the space for a martial arts studio. The majority of the space is a large open room noted in red on the plans. The rest of the space is office space, locker rooms, and a waiting area.

Chapter 1145.03 provides the criteria for evaluating a Conditional Use request. A martial arts studio is classified as a recreational use within the Old Town Commercial zoning district. This proposed use would be compatible with adjacent land uses and surrounding area. The OTC zoning district is designed to accommodate a mix of uses and there are other fitness users within the Old Town that operates above other businesses. The Old Town Plan also encourages expanding commercial growth within the district.

Staff discussed that the proposed use would not adversely affect site access, traffic flow or other public services. This is an existing facility with no proposed structural changes. The public health, safety, convenience and general welfare is not anticipated to generate any negative impacts.

Staff discussed that the applicant has not provided operating hours but based on their existing facility in Groveport they have classes at 6pm and 7pm on weeknights.

Based on the application contents and review of the conditional use criteria, staff is recommending Conditional Use Application #CU-23-001 to permit a martial arts studio be approved as presented.

Mr. Deeds asked about how many parking stalls are located behind the building. The application notes that they are going to utilize parking behind the building. Mr. Haire indicated that the public parking is located along the street in this area and there is no public parking behind the building. This building has no private parking spaces.

Mr. Donahue asked the applicant if there was anything they would like to add.

Mr. Wolford introduced himself to the commission and had a prepared statement for who they are as a company and their affiliation with Canal Winchester. Wolford discussed their community pride and the help that their organization does for people of all ages and backgrounds.

Mr. Deeds asked the applicant what the anticipated hours are. Mr. Wolford said that currently they train Tuesdays and Thursdays 6pm – 8:30pm. They anticipate going to a 4 – 5 day training regiment that may start earlier than 6pm. They would also like to train on Saturdays as well.

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

Jeremy Clark discussed with the commission his support for the program. Mr. Clark stated he is a veteran and the services Mr. Wolford offers has helped him personally with his PTSD.

Jeff Reed discussed with the commission his support for the program and Mr. Wolford specifically. Mr. Reed noted that he was formerly the CWSHS resource officer and has utilized Mr. Wolford for school training events.

Josh Short spoke to the commission about his pride in downtown Canal Winchester. Mr. Short discusses why he feels that Mr. Wolford's business will enhance the community.

Deseray Meadows spoke to the commission on how the martial arts gym has helped her personally with confidence and making good choices with her friends and getting through school.

Stan Belvon briefly discussed the legitimacy of the character of Mr. Wolford and the success of his business.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

A motion was made by Rick Deeds, seconded by Brad Richey that Conditional Use application #CU-23-001 be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

VA-23-001

Property Owner: Molto Canal Pointe LLC
Applicant: Molto Canal Pointe LLC
Location: 7585 – 7717 Robinett Way
Request: Variance to Chapter 1185.03 to reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required.

Mr. Haire presented the application for Molto Canal Pointe LLC for the property located at 7585 – 7717 Robinett Way. The applicant is requesting a variance from Chapter 1185.03 to reduce the minimum number of parking stalls required to be installed on the property.

Mr. Haire discussed that the zoning standards require 1 space per each 1,000 sq. ft. of building area. The minimum number of parking stalls to be installed based on this calculation would be 840 spaces. The applicant received variance approval #VA-21-010 when the project was proposed to reduce the total parking count to 739 spaces. The request this evening is to further reduce the parking initially constructed to 655 parking stalls. The applicant has noted that this reduction is based on what they are seeing for current tenant demand and they would rather leave the areas open for greenspace now and have the ability to add an additional 76 parking stalls later.

Staff discussed that a number of similar variances have been granted in the past for these large industrial users. OPUS was granted variance #VA-19-001 to reduce the site by 340 parking stalls, with 200 identified as future spaces. Northpoint was granted variance #VA-19-014 which allowed a reduction of 222 parking stalls.

Staff discussed a positive for not installing all of the parking now is it would reduce stormwater runoff. Granting this variance does not allow for a higher economic benefit as this area will be left for future parking demand.

The CEDA Land Use Committee met of February 2, 2023 to review the proposed variance request and recommended approval as presented. Staff is also recommending that application #VA-23-001 be approved as presented. The applicant is proposing to construct only the parking that is necessary for the intended operations while reserving space on the site for future parking when or if it becomes necessary.

Mr. Donahue asked staff what triggering event would occur for them to need more parking. Staff indicated that the triggering event would be that a tenant that wants to locate in the building needs the additional parking to fulfill their employment needs. They would then construct the additional parking, but the area would be set aside already for it. There is no parking on this section of the street.

Justin Muller representing the applicant introduced himself to the commission and said he is available for any questions.

Mr. Donahue opened up the Public Hearing.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler to approve Variance application #VA-23-001 as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

FDP-23-001

Property Owner: Meijer Stores Limited Partnership

Applicant: Aaron Heydinger – Gandee Heydinger Group

Location: 8300 Diley Road

Request: Final Development Plan amendment for the Meijer store to add a drive-thru pharmacy window and relocate the garden center.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Aaron Heydinger for property located at 8300 Diley Road. The applicant is requesting a Final Development Plan approval for an amendment to the existing Meijer store to add a drive-thru pharmacy window and relocate the existing garden center.

Staff presented the application to the commission providing a brief history on the zoning for the site and original plans for the drive-thru pharmacy that was to be located on the front of the building.

The majority of the work that is proposed for this project will be on the southwest corner of the facility. This area is utilized now for seasonal storage items and displays. Approximately 2,500 sq. ft. of the building end is being removed and 28,000 sq. ft. of area disturbed for the project. Staff noted that the existing metal fence for the garden center western boundary is moving back 67 feet to install the new pharmacy drive-thru loop.

The proposed pharmacy drive-thru project will require adjusting the existing access drive into the facility. The eastbound turn lane heading south is shown to be removed so that northbound lane heading into the Meijer parking lot does not conflict with the new pharmacy configuration. The pharmacy loop will be separated from the rest of the vehicular traffic with landscape islands to and they will also help screen the area from the remainder of the parking lot.

Staff presented the detailed plans for the pharmacy drive-loop noting the center area will display seasonal items. Due to this area having pedestrian movement throughout, staff had asked that this island provide pedestrian crossing zones

and the fencing and brick columns on the plans be added to help define the walkable area. Staff noted that one of the concerns with the proposed storage area is the rendering shows the display of bagged/pallet display items. Staff is recommending that this area be restricted to seasonal baskets and flower sales only and that mulch, topsoil and other bagged products not be permitted to be stored/displayed in this area.

Staff discussed that within the garden center the applicant is proposing two new shade canopy structures and a hoop style greenhouse. On the south wall of the building will be an extension of a covered walkway.

On sheet C105 & 106, the applicant shows in order to separate the vehicular traffic for the new pharmacy pick-up loop, they are proposing to remove the eastbound turn lane leaving the parking lot to separate the pharmacy traffic que from the rest of the shopping traffic. The pharmacy loop will be further controlled by additional landscape islands being installed.

As part of the FDP proposal, the applicant is showing an overhaul/cleanup on the landscaping around the facility. Zones at the front of the building in addition to along Diley Road and Busey Road have been identified for additional plantings and replanting's. Some of the original trees along the store front are now on an invasive species list, so those are proposed to be removed and planted with more suitable species.

The CW Urban Forester has reviewed the plans and recommends that sheet LS-1.2 be updated to include the new pharmacy loop landscape islands plant material specifications to match the renderings. The landscaping within the new islands is there to aid in screening the drive-thru but also help restrict traffic movements that are unwarranted.

The applicant is also showing that the existing "C" engraved limestone medallions on the development brick columns are proposed to be replaced with matching text as the Canal Winchester round CW medallion.

The CEDA Land Use Committee met on February 2, 2023 to review the Final Development Plan application #FDP-23-001 for the proposed changes to the pharmacy drive-thru loop and garden center at the Meijer store at 8300 Meijer Drive. The committee made a motion to approve the application with the following recommendations:

1. The applicant modify the fence location for the pharmacy loop at the garden center to reduce and sight triangle concerns with oncoming traffic.
2. The applicant work with city staff to look at adding an additional exit point for the pharmacy traffic onto Meijer Drive.

Staff recommends that FDP-23-001 be recommended to City Council for approval with the following conditions:

1. The drive-thru island be only used for seasonal hanging baskets and flower displays. No mulch, topsoil or other bagged products may be stored/displayed in this area.
2. Sheet LS-1.2 include information for the plant materials within the new landscape islands around the pharmacy drive-up loop.
3. The CEDA Land Use Committee recommendations be further evaluated during Civil Engineering review for traffic concerns.

Mr. Richey asked staff if the intent behind the staff recommendation for not storing the bagged material specifically but bulk items such as pavers and other items that are directly loaded onto a vehicle. Staff affirmed that this area should not become a loading zone for materials that are too heavy to carry.

Mr. Deeds asked staff if they should request a loading zone be identified off to the side of the garden center. Staff indicated that there are market exit points on the south side of the fence now for egress. One of those may be more appropriate for a loading zone.

Mr. Deeds commented that the pharmacy loop drawings show two stop signs at the pedestrian crossing areas and a yield sign may be more appropriate. Staff noted that change could be made in the conditions for approval.

Mr. Donahue asked the applicant if there was anything additional they would like to add.

Dennis McClain representing the project introduced himself to the commission noted that he has been working with staff on this project. During the discussion it was brought up that in the rendering it was showing pallet display items in the island and that is not the intention. This pallet display area is in the rear of the garden center. This includes salt, mulch and rocks. This island will display mums in the fall, hanging baskets in the spring. Items that are easy to grab and go.

Mr. McClain discussed that loading areas on the plan are actually fire exits. However, those gates are wide enough that if someone wanted to use it for a loading zone they could park on the south side and the store forklift could pick the items up and take them out to the customer. No loading zones will be around the pharmacy drive.

Mr. McClain discussed the landscape refresh as part of this project with the commission. The Urban Forester recommended making the landscaping for this site easy with little maintenance so it works for the Meijer store team and looked good for the city. The medallion in the brick piers are also going to be replaced with more appropriate lettering to match the city logo.

The applicant discussed that they no issues with the CEDA Land Use Committee recommendations and working with the city during the engineering review process to make any necessary changes.

Mr. Deeds discussed he recalls the original proposal for this site was the same as what was installed at the Lancaster store and that layout does not work well. The updated design looks much better. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Donahue discussed with the commission that he is unsure if the CW medallion note is adequately captured in the application but would like to add it to the motion for approval. Additionally, the stop signs in the pedestrian crosswalks need to be further evaluated for pedestrian safety.

Mr. Donahue noted this is going to be a recommendation to City Council for review.

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Joe Donahue, that Final Development Plan application #FDP-23-001 be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The drive-thru island be only used for seasonal hanging baskets and flower displays. No mulch, topsoil or other bagged products nor landscaping stone and other pallet display items may be stored/displayed in this area.**
- 2. Update sheet LS-1.2 to include information for the plant materials within the new landscape islands around the pharmacy drive-up loop.**
- 3. The CEDA Land Use Committee recommendations be further evaluated during Civil Engineering review for vehicular traffic and pedestrian safety within the drive-up loop.**
- 4. The brick columns along Diley Road and Busey Road have the limestone medallions replaced with Canal Winchester "CW" logo lettering.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

ZM-22-001

Property Owner: Shree Kulkarni – Shrimangeshi LLC

Applicant: Donald Plank, Esq. – Shrimangeshi LLC

Location: 16.36 acres of property located the corner of Diley Road and Busey Road (PID 042-0388810)

Request: Property be rezoned from PCD (Planned Commercial District) to PUD (Planned Unit District).

Mr. Moore presented the application for Shrimangeshi LLC representing 16.36 acres of property located at the corner of Diley Road and Busey Road. The applicant is requesting approval to rezone the property from Planned Commercial District to a Planned Unit District. Staff discussed that the applicant

has filed for a preliminary development plan for 244 apartment units with 5.41 acres for commercial outparcel development along Diley Road.

Staff provided a brief zoning history to this site and surrounding uses in the area. The applicant is requesting for this rezoning to PCD to PUD to add residential uses to the site. A PCD district is all commercial while a PUD district is mostly residential with a maximum of 40% commercial permitted.

Staff discussed that this application has been reviewed for the criteria for a rezoning listed in the staff report among the criteria required for a planned district development text. The intent behind a planned district is to promote the progressive development of land and construction while encouraging imaginative architecture, design and site layout while having flexibility in buildings and sensitivity to the natural environment. A planned district is designed to guide development in a comprehensive manner that preserves natural beauty and supports community facilities with a diverse sound urban environment.

Staff discussed that a PUD rezoning has minimum standards to meet such as a minimum of a 20 acre site. This site is 16.36 acres. Another base standard is 6 units per acre, this site is 22.4 units to the acre.

Mr. Moore went over the site plan with the commission noting that the 16.3 acre area requested for rezoning is part of an overall 35.5 acre tract. The 16.3 acres has been broken down into two sub areas for product type and standards. Subarea 1 is identified for the 5.4 acres for commercial outparcel development and Subarea 2 is identified for the 244 multi-family units. A phasing plan has also been provided showing the residential subarea would be constructed first, along with the regional stormwater basin and the extension of Greengate Blvd. to the south of the site.

Staff discussed Subarea 1 with the commission noting that the list of prohibited uses was not very clear based on how it was written. Additionally, the development standards for what zoning section to reference conflict on more than one occasion regarding building design, signage and landscaping.

Staff discussed Subarea 2 noting that there are a few discrepancies for deviation requests not being noted along with what appears to be misleading information on adjacent property setbacks. The applicant is requesting a reduction in the total number of parking spaces within this zone and has not considered any parking need for the commercial restaurant/bar use proposed as the anchor for the residential subarea.

Staff discussed that the landscape plan presented is not a commitment to any standards within the code and the stormwater basin has not been identified to be regional for the entire 35 acre tract or just the Subarea 2 for the residential zone.

Mr. Moore further noted that the residential building design standards are hazy and it is unclear what type of exterior product they would be constructing. Same was said for the signage and lighting sections in the plan.

Staff notes that the deviation requests for this project are in summary to increase density with building height and reduced setbacks and parking standards. However, there is no distinguishable text provided to show how the residential will be compatible for a mixed-use development with the commercial subarea. Staff is requesting more information on the integration between the two zones.

Mr. Moore briefly notes that a traffic study for this project has not been submitted for review as the scope of work was just identified last week. This traffic study may impact the proposed site layout, design, access or dedicated right-of-way as shown.

The CEDA Land Use Committee met on February 2, 2023 to review the proposed rezoning application #ZM-22-001 and preliminary development plan application #PDP-22-001 and recommended that the application be tabled for the applicant to further develop the plans based on the Canal Winchester Staff report and work through traffic study results with the City, Violet Township and Fire Department.

Staff recommends that the Zoning Amendment ZM-22-001 and Preliminary Development Plan #PDP-22-001 be tabled at this time. The applicant has not provided enough information in the proposed rezoning to the PUD district to address all of the various comments discussed within the staff report.

Mrs. McDonnell asked if there were any concerns with the detention basin being located on an adjacent parcel. Mr. Haire indicated that it is permitted and there would be a maintenance agreement that would be established for it between the two properties.

Mr. Deeds discussed he was concerned the access from this site to the adjacent parcel would be impeded given the proposed basin location. Staff indicated that the basin on this plan is conceptual and size calculations for final design have not been completed. Mr. Deeds notes that it is good to consider future access now and let the applicant know of that concern.

Mrs. McDonnell commented to staff that this project is showing a private road that would lead to both residential and commercial areas and this is something that is not typically promoted. Staff discussed that this site has been requested by the applicant to add residential to this overall development. That discussion started by looking at vertical mixed use first, then transitioned into horizontal mix of uses and how to feed the energy off the residential area. The roadway

design with the on-street parking and narrow integration is to slow traffic and limit who would want to develop on the outparcels.

Mr. Richey brought up that staff notes the traffic study has not been completed but asked if the applicant has hired a consultant to do the study. Staff noted that they have had inquiries from firms on what the study should entail but not an official submittal for review.

Mrs. McDonnell noted to the commission that she is disturbed by the requested height for the product. Mrs. McDonnell asked staff if they had looked at a two-story product at all. Staff indicated there has not been any discussion on two-story product in this style but staff has asked if townhomes have been explored rather than single floor apartment units. The applicant indicated that the market study they did was for this three-story breezeway style product. Staff did note that this plan does show the breezeways are not visible and that they have internal stairwells.

Mr. Haire noted that the idea is to have attached garages and that adds height to the product. Half of the first floor for each building is garage space. That is a feature that is required in the multi-family zoning district by either having them attached or building separate single-story garage space.

Mr. Donahue notes that a PUD is 40% commercial and 60% residential. Staff clarifies it is a maximum of 40% commercial. This site is 2/3rd residential and 1/3rd commercial.

Mr. Donahue notes there are 10-11 deviations identified and gaps in the proposal. The applicant has not provided enough information to get a decision on the zoning request and until the discrepancies have been discussed and resolved. Donahue noted that he would be more curious on how the applicant would respond to these issues first, rather than the project in general.

Mr. Donahue called the applicant up to discuss the project further.

Craig Moncrief representing the legal team for the applicant introduced himself to the commission and passed out a pamphlet of information to be discussed with the board.

Mr. Moncrief noted that they are here this evening to introduce the proposal and receive feedback. The CEDA land use committee provided good feedback on February 2nd and they are looking for more this evening.

The applicant discussed the history of this site with the initial 300 acres rezoned in 2001. This site is a 35 acre parcel with 16 acres being requested to be rezoned to allow residential land uses. Mr. Moncrief discussed the surrounding land uses

with the existing multi-family to the east, large lot residential in the township to the north and industrial to the west.

The applicant discussed that the team had a market study performed to check the viability of this project. That study looked at how what type of units to provide, mix between number of bedrooms and their sizes and what expected rents would be based on demand. Rents range for \$1,400 a month for a one-bedroom to \$1,700 for a two-bedroom. The idea is that the development on this northern 16 acres will spur further development on the southern half of Greengate Blvd.

Mr. Moncrief talked about the two different subareas and they have incorporated a private road to connect the two subareas and they have committed to a bar/restaurant concept that goes beyond the standard clubhouse concept in which it would be open to the public. This site has a central greenspace and will extend the bike path in this area to connectivity. The development text was created to allow the commercial to work well with the residential by restricting certain uses and site layout regulations.

Property owner Shree Kulkarni spoke to the commission proving history and details for this property. Mr. Kulkarni stated he has owned this site since 2006 and over 17 years there have been many changes. The applicant discussed that they went through this process before zoning the site Planned Commercial District and that previous plan is unworkable in today's environment. After 2008 the prior plan died. The existing PCD zoning district allows for all commercial uses within the General Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial zoning district. This proposal is restricting some of those currently permitted uses in order to get residential on the site.

Mr. Kulkarni discussed he disagrees with some of the comments from staff. They would be happy to do all different types of development on this parcel; however, they are working within the market. The community needs more housing from that 22-35 year demographic. Townhomes could be an option if the site was larger but given its size the project would not work for them financially. High rise buildings with structured parking was explored and that product time is also cost prohibitive. Horizontal mixed use works.

The applicant notes that Greengate Blvd. is going to get constructed regardless by the city in the event nothing gets constructed on this site. The goal is to make the most use of the new roadway by having uses that utilize this roadway. Garages were added to this development because they are the right fit for this development. That decision does increase cost. Same with the restaurant. Parking was discussed by staff on Greengate Blvd and this is going to be a city road so for the private development to show it may not be the most appropriate.

The applicant notes that they have work to do and they want to put their best foot forward on this project that puts together a really nice plan that fits the

area and is what the community wants. On the west side of Diley Road there is industrial buildings and that provides a different feel. To the east is multifamily. This project needs to fit the feel for Canal Winchester.

The applicant notes that they typically do not sell their projects. This site will be an investment. That is why they are not afraid of building great residential.

Mrs. McDonnell asked the applicant why they are not rezoning the entire 35 acres and just half of the overall parcel. How would commercial on the remaining 19 acres to the south layout and what type of commercial development would go on the 5 acres. Mr. Moncrief noted that Greengate Blvd. will become public right-of-way that will naturally split the property. Mrs. McDonnell asked if the city will take over ownership of Greengate Blvd. Staff affirmed.

Mrs. McDonnell noted that the 5 acres show it could be 5 outparcels or maybe something less than that. Mr. Kulkarni stated that there is a mix of uses that could take place on this property, like driving on Gender Road.

McDonnell notes that a typical 1acre parcel is conducive to a fast food type restaurant and asked if that is what they are envisioning for this site or if it was something else. The applicant responded saying he thinks the community needs more food options and he will market directly to sit-down food restaurants or really nice fast casual. Whatever the market dictates.

Mrs. McDonnell asked if they design commercial sites or just residential. Mr. Kulkarni noted that G2 design is doing all of the land planning.

Mr. Donahue asked if there are similar projects to what is proposed in central Ohio. The applicant indicated that they have never done a project like this. This would be the first ground up residential project they have ever done.

Mr. Donahue asked for a brief history for the commercial on this site. The applicant states that they have the best retail marketing team pushing this site for 8 months now. There was a hint of an opportunity from a large commercial user but markets change rapidly and how fast they are interested they are gone. The ownership is committed to keep the rest for commercial and makes sense for the community. When they first purchased the property there was a Target a Lowes interested in the site but since 2006 there has been no commercial interest. Other than gas stations, they do not have much interest in the area. At this time, there is no plan to show them so it is hard to sell them something.

Mr. Donahue noted a concern is not the right word, but a rezoning the site is a massive ask and it would be good to see who they have worked with in the past. Can zoning be met and what the willingness to meet items in the staff report are. The zoning aspect specifically is important because available commercial land is limited. The right use for this land is important to this community. A vision for this site is there but there are also things that need to be worked out.

The applicant affirmed stating his only response is they have the best team he could assemble for apartment building development and land planning. So far there has been 6 months of feedback and changes. There has been progress from the start of this.

Mr. Donahue asked outside of phase 1 and phase 2 with this rezoning, would the rest of the property to the south be reserved for future residential development. The applicant indicated that the 19 acres would remain PCD zoning. This area is not being modified. Mr. Richey noted that this is the area that was mentioned there was big box interest in. The applicant affirmed.

Mrs. McDonnell asked if they have considered using the entire 16.3 acres for multi-family so they could meet setbacks and other items they are asking relief on. The applicant indicated that they did not, mostly because they think there is demand for commercial from the community. From a market standpoint it is not there today but may be there down the road.

Mrs. McDonnell asked what section of the community the market study said it was identified for, either low, medium or high income. The applicant noted medium income. This would be a housing community for a young professional. Mr. Moncrief indicated the market study targeted workforce housing. McDonnell asked if there are any low-income tax credit funding as part of this project. The applicant indicated there would not be it is all market driven.

Mrs. McDonnell asked if there was room to hit the minimum apartment square footages code calls for. The applicant stated there is room but financially it does not make sense. Its possible but not probable.

Staff briefly noted that the multifamily zoning district has that as the base standards but those code sections are older and the newest Old Town Commercial zoning code has a minimum of 720 sq. ft. for a mixed-use apartment size.

Mr. Deeds noted he thought that a big box would want a corner lot and this proposal is the opposite. Mr. Kulkarni noted he thought the same but proximity to Meijer's matters.

Mr. Donahue noted that the recommendation from staff is to table the application and asked if there are any more questions or comments from the commission to staff or the applicant.

Mr. Deeds noted that he thought a PUD development with residential would be more like Grandview yard or bridge street with a programmed mix of uses. Those projects are more blended and intentional where they look older and grew that way and not ground up development. That is the hesitancy he see's tonight. The plan has a lot more detail on residential than commercial. Driving up Gender Road you can see 3 – 4 other multi-family developments with commercial outparcel frontage with not much commercial on them. Mr.

Kulkarni asked for some more information on the example communities mentioned. Mr. Deeds stated they have an integrated hotel, apartments over commercial directly adjacent to a stand alone restaurant making it a mix. The entire 35 acre parcel could produce something similar. Mr. Richey notes that both Grandview and Bridge Street are both vertical mixed-use. The applicant responded saying in a perfect world building a mixed use development makes sense but from the market study this is not the spot. There is not the density here and this site is directly across from an industrial use. This is a unique spot. What they are trying to propose is something more unique than what you normally see. The applicant notes that staff has been keeping them heading in the right direction but this is an expensive product to build.

Don Feathers representing part of the ownership team states that they are here to get feedback from the commission directly. Each time there is a comment things get redrawn and rather than making a bunch of iterations from staff they wanted feedback from Planning and Zoning Commission. If their team is not even envisioning the same concept as the P&Z Commission then they are wasting time.

Mr. Richey noted that his opinion is apartment rates are about to go crazy with everything going on locally. There is a need for residential development. The price point and demographics targeted with this are good and the community needs more of it. Simple things like a signage, and unit sizes, setbacks and unit types need further explored. The fact is there is a shortage of good commercial land and a shortage of prime housing sites. Mr. Richey notes this is not a project he is in opposition of. Those other projects that Mr. Deeds noted in Dublin work there but in this area vertical mixed use does not make as much sense. Its not dense enough in Canal Winchester for that.

Mr. Donahue agrees with what the comments he has heard from members Richey and McDonnell and looking at what financially makes sense is important but so is zoning standards like building height and setbacks. Aesthetics can be finalized down the road but the site plan is important. Mr. Feathers affirmed with the comments.

Mr. Richey noted on a smaller scale subarea 1 could be vertical mixed use with commercial on the ground floor.

Mr. Deeds suggested that maybe the entire 35 acre site could have commercial frontage on Diley and multi-family behind it if they are having issues getting big box development. Mr. Feathers noted they could look at it but they do not want to redraw it for it not to be the right move.

Mrs. McDonnell added she would like to see the traffic study results. Mr. Kulkarni stated that there are traffic studies that have been done in the surrounding developments. This rezoning from PCD to PUD would net in less trips. The applicant noted they have Tom Warner doing the study. Mr. Haire noted that Greengate Cove off of Hill Road did a traffic study that evaluated this

entire 35 acre tract as commercial with some assumptions to what type of commercial would be developed. This study looked at Greengate Blvd. and Diley Road only. That study noted the need for a traffic signal at that intersection along with some turn lane improvements. There is enough existing width on Diley Road for that turn lane but the existing median will need to be modified. The City has seen a traffic study for a Sheets gas station in the City of Pickerington that evaluates the corner of Diley and Busey but that study did not look at this site. Both of these studies have been shared with the applicants traffic engineer so they can have accurate counts in the traffic study. This study would look at the change in use and how much traffic will be generated from those uses. Potential traffic improvements would be identified for road widening, turn lanes, and the design of Greengate Blvd. A scope has been identified but it has not been turned in for review at this time.

Mr. Moncrief notes the expectation is the traffic counts will go down.

Mr. Donahue discusses that he is not opening up this application for the Public Hearing at this time as there are many items that still need to be addressed. Mr. Donahue discussed tabling these applications for further refinement.

Mr. Deeds recommended that the applicant tables the application. Mr. Kulkarni requested that his applications be tabled at this time.

A motion was made by Deborah McDonnell, seconded by Joe Wildenthaler that Zoning Map Amendment #ZM-22-001 be tabled at the request of the applicant.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

PDP-22-001

Property Owner: Shree Kulkarni – Shrimangeshi LLC

Applicant: Donald Plank, Esq. – Shrimangeshi LLC

Location: 16.36 acres of property located the corner of Diley Road and Busey Road (PID 042-0388810).

Request: Approval for a Preliminary Development Plan and associated development text for 244 apartment units and 5.41 acres of commercial outparcel development on the 16.36 acres.

A motion was made by Joe Wildenthaler, seconded by Deborah McDonnell that Preliminary Development Plan #PDP-22-001 be tabled at the request of the applicant.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Old Business

Mr. Moore updated the commission on the Chipotle project approved in December.

Mr. Moore provided the commission an update on the Community Plan public workshop #2 that will take place on February 22 and February 23. That event will be a mix of small roundtable discussions, focus area redevelopment plans, and public open house events. The entire process will be streamed on the City Youtube Page. Next steps will have the Steering Committee work with the consultants on finalizing a draft. As a reminder, Deborah and Rick are on that steering committee so feel free to reach out to them with questions.

New Business

Mr. Moore noted that they have filled the 7th member position on P&Z with Eileen Goodin. She will be at the March meeting but she is on the Community Plan Steering Committee and the Charleston Lakes HOA board.

Mr. Haire indicated that he has a vacancy for the P&Z Commission on the Housing Council that meets annually to review properties receiving any type of incentive. This is generally held at the end of march but staff will be asking for an appointment to the body during the March agenda.

Adjournment

Time Out: 9:20 pm

A motion was made by Brad Richey, seconded by Rick Deeds, that this Meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Donahue, Wildenthaler, Richey, Deeds, McDonnell & Palsgrove

Date

Chairman – Joe Donahue

Secretary – Brad Richey