

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

August 7, 2023

5:30 PM

Public Hearing

Chuck Milliken - President

Bob Clark - Vice President

Laurie Amick

Jill Amos

Steve Buskirk

Patrick Shea

Mike Walker

City YouTube Channel – [CityofCW YouTube Page](#)

City Council will also continue to accept written public comments prior to a council meeting. To be included on the Council agenda, comments must be received by noon the Friday before the meeting. Comments received after the deadline will be included on the next agenda. To submit a comment to City Council, click on the link below.

[Submit A Comment](#)

- A. **Call To Order** *Milliken called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.*
- B. **Roll Call** *Present 7 – Amick, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken, Shea, Walker*
- C. **Purpose of Public Hearing**

[ORD-23-028](#)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF CANAL WINCHESTER, REZONING APPROXIMATELY 16.36 ACRES OF FAIRFIELD COUNTY PARCEL 042-0388810, OWNED BY SHRIMANGESHI, LLC, LOCATED AT SOUTHEAST CORNER OF DILEY ROAD AND BUSEY ROAD FROM PCD – PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO PUD - PLANNED UNIT DISTRICT

D. **Staff Report**

Discussion started at 2:36 on YouTube Channel

Haire – I’m going to run through the staff report that was given at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and a brief presentation. The applicant is here as well, and they’ll provide some comments or be here to answer any questions that you all might have. Then, obviously, there’ll be a point in time for public comments as well. As Miss. Pearce mentioned, this is a rezoning application for 16.36 acres. It’s located at the southeast corner of Diley Road and Busey Road. It is part of a larger 35.5-acre parcel that is currently zoned PCD, which is Planned Commercial District, and they are looking to rezone that to PUD, which is Planned Unit District. What’s driving that change is that the PCD District does not permit any type of residential development to be located there. The proposal would include multi-family residential in the PUD portion. It would permit up to 244 multi-family apartment units and 5.41 acres of commercial outparcel development. When you look at the subject site, which is highlighted here on your screen, again, it’s part of the larger 35.5 acres that were rezoned in 2001 as part of the overall Pfeiffer property. It was annexed into the city around the same time. It’s been zoned PCD since it was brought into the city in 2001. The properties to the east are zoned PRD, which is Planned Residential District, and are developed with 329 multi-family apartments on approximately 49 acres. The properties to the south are zoned PID, which is Planned Industrial District, and that includes the Meijer store and all the out parcels. The PID does permit commercial uses on that parcel, and it was developed for commercial use. The property to the west is the Canal Pointe Industrial Park, and that’s zoned LM, which is Limited Manufacturing, and developed with various manufacturing and distribution-related uses. The properties to the north are located in Violet Township and consist of several large single-family homes. The site is split into two sub-areas. Sub Area 1, which is the commercial property, consists of 5.47 acres. Sub Area 2, which is the residential portion, is 10.89 acres. The development text is basically the text standards that are being written for this specific development and create the specific zoning for this parcel. You’ll see that there are different standards for commercial and residential properties that are included as part of Sub Area 1 and Sub Area 2. Again, 244 multi-family units, 422 bedrooms, for a density of 22.41 units per acre on the residential side, with a total of 389 parking spaces. A total open space of about 1.83 acres on the residential portion of this property. Specifically looking at the commercial subarea, the development text that’s been written for that consists of 5.47 acres. There are a total of four out parcels shown on this site now; that’s the maximum number of out parcels that would be permitted there. It could be less than that; it depends on whether it’s going to be driven by the development that occurs there. Whoever is attracted to that site will determine those specific lot dimensions. The only dimension that would be determined is the 250-foot lot depth on those outlying parcels. The specific development standards that have been written for this area currently in the PCD are very limited because it’s a planned district. They don’t have to meet any of our commercial development standards that we have in the city, but we currently regulate building materials and building placement; all

those items wouldn't necessarily follow that. It would follow the existing Greengate text, the Pfeiffer text that was approved in 2001. This is developing specific commercial standards for how those properties would be developed, how they would look, what materials would be there, building heights, setbacks—all that's in this development text that you have in front of you. The development standards have been developed with a minimum building height of 28 feet. Essentially, these are going to be much taller buildings than you would typically see in a commercial outparcel. The maximum height is 40 feet with three stories. There is an exception written if it is for hotel use; it would be allowed to be four stories and up to 60 feet in height. The setbacks are a minimum of 42 feet from Diley Road and a maximum of 58 feet. Again, this is similar to our commercial development standards. We require a build-to-line that sets those minimum and maximum depths to keep a consistent feel on Diley Road. The buildings will be within that variation of setbacks, so there's both a minimum and a maximum. In typical zoning, you basically have a minimum setback that's required, but there's nothing that would require it to be built up onto the road and give it a street presence like this text would. Greengate Boulevard, the minimum setback is 20 feet, and the maximum is 30 feet. On Busey Road, the minimum is 35 feet, and the maximum is 45 feet. There's no parking permitted between the building and the road right-of-way. The building would set in front of any parking that would be on that parcel. Access to the site shall only be from Internal Street (A), which is the street that runs parallel to Diley Road. It would run between Greengate and Busey. There'll be no direct access from either Greengate, Busey, or Diley Road to any of the commercial out parcels. They would all come from the private road to the rear. Pedestrian access is required from all the public streets, so sidewalk connections are required from Diley, Sub Area 2, which is the residential area, and then there's an 8-foot asphalt path on both Greengate Boulevard and along Diley Road. Those would connect to the regional paths that already exist there. There's an existing multi-use trail on the south side of Busey Road adjacent to the Redwood developments, which would then connect over to Busey Road Park, and we'll connect to the existing trail that's along the east side of Diley Road. We've also required the Greengate residential, the condominiums that are currently under development. They have an 8-foot concrete path on the north side of Greengate Boulevard, and that would be extended with this development along with the roadway. Again, connecting to the regional trails will make this a walkable development. The landscaping standards are the same as our zoning code, so under Chapter 1191, landscape standards, they've agreed to meet all the landscape standards that we have in our existing zoning code. The building design standards are set to Chapter 1199, which is our commercial development standard, so that's 80% natural materials on the exterior of the buildings, 40% window glass on any road frontage, and then various other standards that require articulation. Again, all those standards don't currently exist in the PCD that they're in. These were written in to basically try to make this a more cohesive development and to make it match what we're developing elsewhere in the community. The signage standards would meet the zoning code in regards to Chapter 1189. Each outlot would get one sign that faces Diley Road and up to two comprehensive development signs, which you'll see later in your packet. It would identify both the residential and the various outlying parcels. Those would be kind of branded towards the overall development once it's named. There's decorative lighting that's required in this, and there would be a maximum fixture height of 18 feet, and those will be on a six-inch riser, so 18 and a half feet, which is more pedestrian-scaled lighting, and that is what we require in our commercial development standards as well. Sub Area 2, the residential standards, has the applicants requesting 244 apartment units as part of this sub area. They've committed to constructing one public eating and drinking establishment, one recreational facility, and a clubhouse. The upper left-hand corner of that area is the area where the swimming pool and clubhouse are. They've committed to making that publicly available. A lot of multi-family communities around Central Ohio and around the country are looking at making the apartment clubhouses more of an amenity for the residents that both live there and live in the neighborhood. They're becoming an amenity for the overall community

rather than just being an amenity for the folks that live there. The swimming pool would be an amenity for only the residents of this development. According to the development standards set forth for the multi-family units, the minimum building height is 20 feet and the maximum is 38 feet and three stories. The setbacks on Greengate Boulevard are 30 feet at a minimum. Busey Road is a 40-foot minimum, and then the eastern property line is a 20-foot minimum. There's a central green corridor that goes through the center of the development. The green areas along Greengate Boulevard and Busey Road are setbacks. Busey Road is 40 feet, Greengate Boulevard is 30 feet, and then the eastern property line is 25 feet. The eastern property line was an existing older fence row with mature trees. We required when they developed the Redwood development that they buffer that and protect those trees, and we're requiring the same here. We want to maintain those mature trees in that area, so by setting that back 25 feet, you should have plenty of space there to not impact those with grading and to be able to maintain those mature trees in that area. The landscaping standards include the area to the east of the property line that will have mature trees maintained, but those will also be enhanced by additional plantings. They'll be adding additional trees in that area. You can see there are heavy street trees along both Greengate Boulevard and Busey Road. The green corridor will be heavily planted throughout the center of the site, along with all the landscaping trees that will be required within the parking lot island. The idea is to get as many trees as possible in this development because they are meeting our standards in regards to the number of trees per square foot of building as well as the number of trees for parking. Total parking counts in the development are 299 surface parking spaces and 90 garage parking spaces. The majority of the buildings here have a garage underneath. Those garages are not individually connected to the units. They're an open garage that has maybe three or four bays that are all connected as one. They're designed to store your vehicles, and you wouldn't be permitted to store other items in your garage space. It's for vehicles only, and so that is a popular trend amongst many apartment communities that have garages on the first floor of the space. This is the overall identification signage for the development. You'll have one of these signs at the multi-family complex and then one for the overall development that includes the commercials. In terms of the building details that are required, all buildings shall be designed to face outward. Exceptions are buildings five and eight, which are internal to the development. Those have garages that face outward from the development, but they're all internal and surrounded by other buildings in this development. All buildings are required to have a strong cornice detail, which you can see at the top of the third floor here. It's a cement board trim detail that's at the top. All buildings are required to have four-sided architecture, and what that essentially means is that, as you can see in the elevations here, the building materials are the same on all elevations. The first floor is brick around the entire development. Above that is vinyl clapboard siding and then cement board trim details. There are aluminum railings on each of the balconies that are provided with the units, with the exception of the patio spaces on the first floor for each of those units. There are no railings there, so people would be able to go in and out of those doors throughout the development. All windows are required to have grids, and they'll simulate divided light. What that means is that, basically, that would have the grid bars on both the internal and external sides. It's what we typically require in all cases in Canal Winchester. All garage doors shall be architecturally compatible with the building design and feature windows in the top panel. This is what we require in many of our developments to not make it so much like a wall of garage doors, but we would require that window in the panel to lighten up the design. All stairwells shall be internal to the building. When you're looking at the elevations, there are two doors that are the primary access doors. Those are fully enclosed and conditioned stairwells that access the upper-floor units. These are often called breezeway style apartments, where you see an opening between the buildings that has the stairways going up. We're requiring those to be enclosed with windows and look like part of the finished space of the building. First-floor units shall have open patios. It's required to be open, and they wouldn't be permitted to have that privately fenced off from the street or the surrounding units. The second and third-

floor units shall have balconies with metal railings. Again, the metal railings are specified so that we're not looking at treated lumber or some other type of railing that's common on residential units. They are required to be metal railings. One of the items that Planning and Zoning made in the recommendation is that all mechanical units shall be on the rooftop and fully screened at the height of the unit. What that means is that all the HVAC units, air conditioners, and compressor units will all be on the roofs of the building. There are three different styles of buildings here. There are three-story units and two-story units. The building that fronts Busey Road is a two-story building. At the Planning and Zoning Commission, some of the feedback that they got was that for multi-family building type C, the massing of that building was too large with the adjacent single-family homes on large lots there; many of those are one-story ranch-style homes. The buildings that Redwood built are all one-story. They thought that having a three-story building that close to Busey Road would increase the massing too much and be out of scale with the other development. They asked the developer to look at basically changing that and seeing if it could work as a two-story building to better fit the context of the area. The developer did come back with a two-story design, and that's what is shown on your screen. As part of that, they removed the garages from the first floor of that unit. You have units on both sides of the building, on the first floor as well as on the second floor. When you're looking at the rendering of what that unit would look like, the rest of the building materials would match. The entire first floor is brick, and the second floor has vinyl clapboard siding, aluminum railings, and cement board trim details. This would set it back a minimum of 40 feet from Busey Road. Busey Road also has a pretty significant right-of-way, and it's actually set back, I think, close to 80 feet from the road. There's a 60-foot right-of-way, which is basically 80 feet from the center line of Busey Road. There's the four-sided architecture, showing that the garages are non-existent on the rear of this building. Basically, the front and the back of these are replicas. They exactly match. There is a mix of one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units proposed for this development. This lays out the standards for those units. The one-bedroom unit is a minimum of 784 square feet. The two-bedroom units are 1,105 square feet. The three-bedroom units are 1,451 square feet, as proposed. It gives you an idea of the layouts and sizes of the units that they have proposed. The minimum dimensions are 675 square feet for a one-bedroom, 950 square feet for a two-bedroom, and 1,275 square feet for a three-bedroom. That's what's written in the text. In terms of the other buildings in the development, there are two other styles of buildings. One building contains three bedroom units, and the other unit contains only one and two bedroom units. This commercial building at the corner is a publicly open bar restaurant for use by the folks who live in the development as well as the public. There is additional parking adjacent to this to provide that, and then there's on-street parking that's required on all the private streets around the development and will be on Greengate Boulevard to serve this commercial use as well. This building will be 100% finished brick. There will also be a clubhouse associated with the development that is private for the use of the development only, as well as a fitness center. The CEDA Land Use Committee met on June 8, 2023, and recommended the zoning amendment and the preliminary development plan be recommended to the city council for adoption. The group noted that the proposed development filled a need in the corridor and had high-quality design standards that matched the standards of the community. The Planning and Zoning Commission met on June 12, 2023, and they moved that the zoning amendment ZM-22-001 and preliminary development plan PDP-22-001 be recommended to city council for approval, with the one condition that the applicant add the development text within Sub Area 1 and that all mechanical units be mounted and screened on the rooftop. It has been included in the development text. The developer did amend that in the packet that you have here in front of you. I would be happy to answer any questions you have about any of the proposed development standards or plans presented to you.

E. Public Comments – Three Minute Limit Per Person

Discussion started at 28:35 on YouTube Channel

Kay Sargent, 6732 Braeswick Court – I'm glad to be here tonight. I wasn't planning on speaking. I didn't realize that you could speak at a public hearing. A couple of things: the first is that I think it's really good and important to have additional housing at an entry level here in Canal Winchester, especially with additional jobs in the area. I think that's very important. I really have not dug deeply into this particular situation, but I think in terms of development, we have to look at housing, daycares, and preschools. We have to look at transportation. We have to look at a number of things abroad, and housing is one of those. My background is safety, and one question I have in terms of safety is: with all the mechanicals on top of the buildings, one thing that I've seen too often is that people who have to service that equipment and have to go up there and service it around in any kind of weather, do they have access that's at least 15 feet from the edge of the building, and is the equipment they access of the same standard? You won't find that in OSHA, but you will find it in interpretive letters, so I think that's very important. Our people in management have lots of challenges, and we have to help them in terms of the design.

F. Council Discussion and Recommendation**Discussion started at 31:32 on YouTube Channel**

Amos – Let's start with the garage situation. Can you share with me some other developments that are potentially doing that? I'm so outdated on apartments.

Haire – I think it's becoming more and more common. You basically have a pod if you're looking at the floor plan. You either have two or three garage bays that are connected. The idea is that it's not there to serve as your specific garage for a specific unit, so if you're in that building, you can lease a garage space, and whichever one is available would be the one that is assigned to you. There would be an additional cost to lease a garage unit. It's my understanding that the garage space will not be linked to a specific unit.

Amos – Is the management company going to be on site or off-site?

Haire – You would have to speak with the developer about management companies and how they would handle that. I assume that they would have an on-site operation, but I don't know that for sure. I will mention that the developer did complete a traffic study. It shows the improvements that were recommended. They did turn lane analysis and traffic counts, which have been reviewed and approved by both the Fairfield County Engineer and EMH&T on behalf of the city. The results of that traffic study recommended improvements, including a traffic signal at Diley Road and the future Greengate Boulevard and Howe Parkway, as well as the turn lanes that are shown. The existing turn lane for northbound Diley Road exists, and then it's in that configuration. There would be a required re-striping of the southbound turn lane on Diley Road to have a 175-foot turn lane with a 50-foot diverging taper associated with it. On the Greengate Boulevard side, there would be a required 150-foot left turn lane with a 50-foot diverging taper. As part of this development, Greengate as a whole adopted the Greengate TIF in 2017, which is currently in existence. We collect incremental revenue from the existing Redwood apartments that are there. As part of that TIF agreement, the city has agreed to finance the construction of this roadway. Redwood has contributed money into an escrow account that we have held since they built their building. We have over \$400,000 that they contributed to construct the portion between their developments. We didn't have them build any infrastructure at the time because it didn't exist on either end to connect to. Now Greengate Boulevard has been connected from Hill Road throughout the residential development that's there, the condominium development. The TIF would basically pay for the rest of the construction along with those escrow funds to construct from Diley Road over to the existing residential development that's there.

Amos – I heard you say 1.83 acres of open space; does that include the water basin?

Haire – It does not.

Amos – So, 1.83 is the green space that I see with the trees.

Haire – Correct.

Amos – I'm not going to lie; there's not a lot of green space in here. We've heard the whole philosophy year after year that in the parking medians, those trees have such a short life expectancy because they just don't have any ability to flourish. I'm concerned that with the amount of green space, it's going to look very commercial and not neighborhood versus apartment.

Haire – As part of this overall development, back in 2001, Mrs. Pfeiffer set aside the ground for the Busey Road Park. It was to satisfy any of the open space requirements on any of the developments within any of the properties that she owned. There's also an existing preserve that's located just south of the Redwood apartments on Diley Road; there's an existing tree preserve that exists between Meijer and this development. That area is required to be preserved. You've got Busey Road Park to meet the open space requirements, along with that preserve for the entire area.

Shea – Are there any other gas lines looking at this site or future development under the existing PCD?

Haire – No.

Shea – The existing PCD is the standards that was put in place in 2001 with Pfeiffer.

Haire – Correct.

Shea – How do those standards compare and contrast with the new development texts?

Haire – There are very few, if any, standards. There are no standards necessarily required for building materials. There would be no standards required that would prevent drive-troughs from encircling the building or garage doors facing Diley Road; any of those things wouldn't be prohibited like they are in our commercial development standards.

Shea – Would you gentlemen consider updating the commercial standards on that PCD development parcel to match what we're doing in Sub Area 1?

Don Feathers, Kulkarni Properties – I don't know if you want me to answer your questions now or kind of go back to where we started with this. I'd like to kind of give a little bit of background on where we came from with everything first. The property has been owned since 2006 and covers 36 acres. It was originally bought for four and a half million dollars back in November of 2006. At that time, the thinking process was kind of in the heyday of commercial real estate. Every Walmart, every Home Depot, every Lowes— everybody was building back then. It was kind of the thought process back then for this land, and then, of course, we hit the Great Recession, things stopped for a long time, caught back up, and then the land has

just been there as the existing farm that it is right now. With what's transpired in Columbus in general and macro economically, with more people looking for an apartment-type lifestyle or an easier lifestyle, there's more need for housing. We started working with the city about 14 or 15 months ago for this project. We weren't getting quite the same activity from a commercial standpoint or a retail standpoint at that time, just the overall macrocosm of how Columbus was growing. Obviously, we had the PCD, which gave us a ton of flexibility to build a lot of different things. I want to bring up that we did give up a car wash, Valvoline, and service centers for your automobile, so we gave up a lot of those things. We discussed with Andrew and Lucas that for us to be able to move forward from a residential standpoint, we needed to have more limitations than just a zoning text. We started working with the city and staff, and we felt we hired some of the best people in town who were recommended to us from an architectural standpoint. We all came up with what they felt the city needed, what they were working through with the comprehensive plan, and what the community and residents needed. The restaurant was very important to them. What we presented and what we've been working on with staff is based on a market study that was done in July 2022. Basically, what they do for multi-family is hire someone to go do a market study for the area. They look at the area and tell you what is missing from the area from a residential standpoint, whether that's workforce housing or a Class A type environment, what the community can afford based on demographics, and then what kind of layouts are available for one, two, or three bedrooms. Going through all that is how we came up with everything that Lucas has presented. The city was looking for a Class A type of project. It was always concerning from our standpoint, just because we were trying to make sure that we could get this financed. There were a lot of challenges as we moved through this. We filed on January 23rd; we had our first Planning and Zoning Commission meeting around February 13th; and we had a lot of work to do. We had 23 comments to get through. The zoning text was the main gist of it. We finally got through all those comments and negotiations with Andrew and Lucas sometime in May. We are aware that there's a comprehensive plan going on with the community, and Andrew and Lucas told us that we need to see how that comes out to see what the community wants. We're also dealing with the industrial buildings across the street. It showed up in the market study, and that was one of the biggest challenges. We did complete the traffic study. From a TIF standpoint, we will be able to pay for Greengate Boulevard and public improvements in this project. This is probably a \$55–60 million development. We're only taking 11 acres of the possible 36 acres, so we still have 20–25-ish acres that will be commercial development. We believe the apartments will kick-start everything—not only the apartments but all the growth that's going on in the Columbus marketplace. We've been marketing the site as more for big box users, but a lot of those are up on Gender Road right now. I'm not saying we won't get somebody here, but I don't think you're going to get the whole site to ever be all retail development. Another thing that we've looked at is how much residential apartment and multi-family living have changed dramatically over the past five years. We feel this will help bring in people who once moved to this area but maybe can't afford a house right now. Maybe they grew up here in the area, they want to move back, they're not quite ready to buy a house, interest rates are high, and they want to be in a walkable community. I think this will help attract people and bring some of those people here. I did want to answer your question: this will be professionally managed by full-time staff, full-time maintenance staff, and full-time property managers on-site. That's just the way these properties are managed today. You don't go make a \$55–60 million investment in something and run it that way. This deal in today's marketplace will probably take \$25 million in equity and \$30 million in debt to get done. That's a lot of equity and a lot of debt. All eyes will be on this project not only from a development standpoint but also from a bank and investor standpoint. At the end of the day, this project has to succeed. To succeed, you have to have professional management on site. It will be a Class A project. To answer your question, Patrick, regarding the land to the south of this, it was never discussed with the city. I don't want to say we would or wouldn't do it because we haven't discussed it.

This is the first time I've heard it tonight, so I'd have to talk to the city. From our standpoint, we want to get this development done, obviously, because we've been working on it for a year now. I wish we had started that conversation 12 months ago. I don't want to restart the process by having to go through everything again.

Shea – That's fair. The real reason this came up was because I sat down with Mr. Haire this morning and we went over your project in great detail, and I peppered him with questions. The question that it came to was that one of the reasons why he, as staff, recommends this to me is that it raises the commercial zoning standards of the property. I think that's a good thing because I think it's something that our residents have come to expect; they expect us to make sure that it's a nice product in the community. What I look at it as, though, is knowing that we still have this other parcel that is part of this other half of the property because it's all one parcel presently. There's never a better time to ask than the present. That would give us a chance to protect the development standards of that particular commercial piece, and if that's something that you and your partners want to talk about, I would love to hear what your thoughts are.

Feathers – Obviously, I'd have to talk with them about it first. We really want to keep pushing this forward, just from where we are and where we started. I understand what you're saying, but please remember that we're making a \$65-70 million investment in this project. I'm not going to go and mess around and do something on this piece of property that's going to jeopardize what I have on the other side.

Shea – That's as long as you hold it.

Feathers – Yes, as long as we hold it. All I can say is that our goal is to hold it. As I said when we first started this project, there were a lot of things from an economic standpoint that played in the back of your head. It's a scary environment right now. There are a lot of projects being halted. Multifamily developers are stopping. Banks are very difficult to deal with right now. We're bullish on this project because we know the community needs it. I will also say, Canal Winchester, you guys are tough to deal with. If you talk to developers in Columbus, they will tell you that. Considering all those facts, we are bullish on this site. Part of it is because we know other people are coming in to try to put another project together, and it's not going to be easy. You guys aren't going to go from 244 units this year to 1,500 units in three years. We feel very comfortable with this development, and that's why we keep pushing it forward.

Amos – One of the things you said you were concerned about was a commercial building going directly across the street. I assume those will be front-facing towards Diley Road.

Feathers – Correct.

Amos – So, what's it going to look like to the residents?

Feathers – Good question. I'd have to pull up the zoning text, but the back has to look the same as the front.

Amos – Mr. Haire, as we're looking at the potential for this commercial development, potentially a big box, I know originally this was plotted for a Target and a potential for Lowes. With the potential of that,

what does screening look like? Would that need to be approved prior to that, or would that be handled on a case-by-case basis, or is that something that needs to be looked at now? With the parking situation, there's parking along all those roads. Is that something that needs to be looked at now or as those units develop?

Haire – Are you specifically talking about the out parcels that are shown here or the larger parcel?

Amos – I mean the out parcels here.

Haire – The out parcels have very specific requirements in the development text. Four-sided architecture. 80% natural materials, articulation, parking to the rear—all those things are required. Our landscape standards require that you screen any parking from the public right-of-way, so you're going to have hedgerows and trees as part of the parking areas. The idea between these is that you have a very cohesive mixed-use development that is very walkable. They're required to have sidewalk connections between the commercial and the residential. You'll see two different crosswalk areas in the development that show the crossings there, so it's designed to all be integrated materially and to be one cohesive development.

Amick – They did request a variance, or a deviation, between the apartments and Street A, and then you have the out parcels in front, and they did request that there be no screening required between the apartments and out parcels.

Amos – I think that's one of my main concerns: are the residents going to be seeing the semi-trucks pulling in?

Haire – Buildings will be in the front, and parking will be in the rear. It's designed with our standards, so you never have more than 12 parking spaces without screening on each side of them. It's the bay concept of parking. It'll be a highly landscaped parking lot.

Amos – I guess I'm trying to find the vision of it.

Haire – With the size of those parcels, you're not going to see those large-scale developments. The largest building you would see there is a hotel or a multi-story office building.

Feathers – The big box could potentially be on the south side.

Haire – With that, you have a detention basin that'll be between the apartments. It's designed to be a Regional Detention Basin that would serve all the commercial development and the multi-family development there. It'll be a larger detention basin that'll give you that buffer.

Amick – I have just a couple of quick questions. How many of the 244 units are required to be ADA-accessible?

Haire – From a code perspective, I don't know the answer to that question. People have various disabilities and varying degrees of access based on those disabilities, so I don't know specifically the answer to that. I'd assume the majority of the first-floor units would be, but there are also second-story units depending on someone's disability.

Amick – There’s no elevators, right? It’s all stairs.

Feathers – Correct.

Amick – So, you went from two parking spots per apartment down to 1.59, so you gave up 99 parking spaces. I know you mentioned that some of it would be over where the restaurant and the clubhouse area are; is that the expectation that for overflow for the residents, they would use that parking, or would you expect them to go to the on-street parking?

Feathers – As far as the restaurant being open to the public, you know we haven’t gotten into the design of Greengate Boulevard yet, but we have had preliminary discussions with staff and with our engineers about putting potential public parallel parking along Greengate. Also, we own the land to the south, and we’ve talked about designating part of that to be public parking if people want to use it for the restaurant to make sure residents have their own parking.

Amick – Given that there are only 1.83 acres of green space on the property, is there any consideration for putting a rooftop garden on the clubhouse? Something where residents could go and have additional green space. I know they’ll have access to Busey Park and all of that.

Feathers – We haven’t discussed it. I have no idea what it would cost. At the end of the day, it kind of comes down to that. I’m not an engineering guy, so I have no idea.

Amick – Fair enough. Going back to the screening, and this is maybe not a screening question, but if you look at the first row of apartments, there’s going to be the private drive, otherwise known as Street A, and then you’ll have the out parcels, and there’ll be a sidewalk...

Haire – It’ll be a 15 foot setback.

Amick – From the sidewalk or from the street?

Haire – From the on-street parking, so you’ll have that buffer again from the street. You’ll have an additional 9 feet; that’s the parking space, so you have 24 feet between the travel lanes and the front of the units.

Amick – Will Street A have bi-directional traffic plus side street parking? So there would essentially be three lanes. On the private drive, with two lanes of bi-directional flowing traffic and street-side parking, will there be three lanes?

Haire – There would be three lanes where there are turn lanes. We haven’t designed the street yet, so it’s all concept. The initial concept would be a three-lane roadway with no on-street parking. Now, we’re rethinking that, and we don’t have a design specifically for a cross-section of what that street will look like.

Amick – I could see parking on Greengate but not on Street A.

Haire – The idea was that you’re having residential units run that street, which people are walking in and out of, to slow the traffic down from the commercial traffic perspective. Also, it will basically change the

type of users that will go into that commercial development.

Amick – Do you know why it was a deviation request?

Haire – When you request a planned unit development, you have to associate your development with a zoning district that we have, and then you request deviations from any standards associated with that district. When you're saying deviation, it's not necessarily a deviation because the zoning text is being written specifically for this development and creating its own standards. Our normal multi-family would require two parking spaces per unit; they're saying they'll have less than that, so it's a deviation from our typical multi-family standards, but this isn't typical in any other way of what we would see with a multi-family development. The idea was to make this a neighborhood not an apartment complex.

Amos – Is this Canal Winchester school district?

Feathers – Yes.

Amos – The access to the rooftop, where is that? Where will that be?

Feathers – Right now, we have a lot of concepts. We have the development text. We know what materials we need to build the next step. Once we get zoning approval, we will sit down with the architects and come up with construction drawings. That'll have all that laid out there.

Haire – Generally, the code would require internal access because this is three stories.

Amos – If you could just make note of Ms. Sargent's request, I would appreciate it.

Haire – I don't know what the code specifically is. There is a code for the distance from the edge of the roof. These will have parapet walls to screen those rooftop units, so you'll have a low wall as well.

Buskirk – Does that parapet wall go around the whole circumference of that roof?

Haire – With the cornice that's there, you know that'll be on a parapet, so I'm not sure how high that will be at this point, but I assume it would go all the way around to accommodate that cornice.

Amos – Are you going to talk with any potential developers for the out parcels?

Feathers – No. We would do that ourselves. Some of the partners we have said they'd do it with us, but we feel comfortable running those.

Amos – Do we have an idea what the width of these roads are that have parking on them? Are they still conceptual or do we actually have a width design yet?

Haire – They're conceptual. The private Street A is defined. We've consulted with the Violet Township Fire Department, and their biggest concern was access and, obviously, from a safety perspective, making sure they could access with trucks. The minimum standard is 26 feet, so I would imagine private Street A is a 26-foot-wide street. Greengate Boulevard will be no less than 36 feet wide. It's likely going to be larger

depending on whether parking is on one side or two sides; we haven't designed it yet. It's a 70-foot right-of-way with a minimum 36-foot width.

Amos – The sidewalks that are running along Greengate that are going to be paired up with the Diley Road bike path—are those going to be the three person?

Haire – Yes. They're 8 feet.

G. Adjournment @ 6:53 p.m.

*A motion was made by Amick, seconded by Shea to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:
Yes 7 – Amick, Shea, Walker, Amos, Buskirk, Clark, Milliken*