

Canal Winchester

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



Meeting Minutes - FINAL

August 6, 2018

6:15 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

City Council

*Bruce Jarvis - President
Mike Walker – Vice-President
Jill Amos
Will Bennett
Bob Clark
Mike Coolman
Patrick Lynch*

- A. Call To Order *Jarvis called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.*
- B. Roll Call *Present 6 – Amos, Bennett, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker*
Absent 1 – Lynch

A motion was made by Bennett, seconded by Clark to excuse Mr. Lynch. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 – Bennett, Clark, Amos, Coolman, Jarvis, Walker

C. Purpose of Public Hearing

ORD-18-029
Development

An Ordinance To Amend Part 11 Of The Codified Ordinances And The Zoning Map Of The City Of Canal Winchester, Rezoning An Approximately 11.954 Acre Tract Of Land From Exceptional Use (EU) To Planned Residential District (PRD), Owned By The Dwight A. Imler Revocable Living Trust, Located On The Southeast Corner Of The Intersection Of Hayes Road And Lithopolis Road And Consisting Of Parcel Number PID 184-002994, And To Adopt A Preliminary Development Plan And Development Text For A Proposed 79.5 Acre Planned Residential Development (Middletown Farms) ([Ex. A](#), [Ex. B](#))

Ordinance Attachments: [Planning and Zoning Recommendation](#)

D. Staff Report

18-085

Middletown Farms Staff Report

Andrew Moore: This evening I will be talking about the 2-part application from the Planning & Zoning perspective, there will be one ordinance for city council, that's why it's written as one ordinance; the first portion of this application is the Zoning Map Amendment 17-007; this is specifically for the rezoning of the 11.954 acres directly behind the star on the map from the EU (exceptional use zoning district), to the PRD (planned residential district); because this property has multiple zoning districts on it, and one of them is already a PRD, only a portion of this needs to be rezoned to PRD; a lot of the remainder below it is already PRD, so it just needs a new development text accompanied with it; so highlighted within the pink boundary is that 11.95 acres; that's the first part of the planning & zoning application; the second portion is for the development text for the entire PRD, which would be the entire 79.48 acres located on the street here; the request is approval for a preliminary development plan, and it's associated development text for 117 traditional single family homes, and 58 lifestyle homes; I'll distinguish the difference between them both in the application as I move forward, but I just wanted to help show why there's two different portions to this application from a planning & zoning aspect; also, after my presentation, the P&Z chairman is present – he can be here to answer any questions as well, if you have anything for him; the application being discussed this evening is for the 79.48 acres highlighted within the pink boundary; this is for that entire preliminary development text for that PRD; this PRD is broken between two sub-districts, that will be discussed – just to give you some sight bearings here, everything within the red boundary is city limits; the pink area is the edge of the city limits, along Hayes Road and ? Road there; the pink

boundary is overlaid on top of them to give you some bearings on where we're at; when I'm doing this presentation this evening as well, I know I gave you all of the applicant's information for the entire preliminary development text; I'm not going to be going through all 300 pages this evening, I'm going to give a summarized version; I tried to give those packets to you guys a week ahead of time, so you'd have enough time to sit there and look at them, look through them; if you have any questions for me as I move forward, or as I get to the end, please let me know; I'll try to do a quick summary of everything so that you guys more discussion this evening.

Moore: Up on the screen here is that same 79 acres, I just rotated the map; this map is the orientation that the rest of the development plan is going to be oriented; I didn't want you to be confused with landmarks, because there's no landmarks on there; when looking at the development plan here, this plan is comprised of 2 sub-district; sub-district 1, which I'll highlight clearer on the next slide, is the main area here; this area consists of 117 – I believe the applicant is calling it a traditional single family home -on 54.3 acres; sub-area 2, which is this portion on the other side of the ditch, is a detached lifestyle home – 58 of those units on 25.2 acres; when looking at the development plan as well, you can see on the illustrations in the packet the breakdown from the public right of way, to the open space being dedicated; as part of this plan, you'll see better on a colored slide later; the open space that splits these two sites apart – the area that splits these two sites apart is also the ditch that is associated with the stream corridor protection zone, floodplain, stuff like that within that as well; it just kind of helps break apart the site naturally between the two sections; up on the screen here you can see sub-area 1 and sub-area 2; just showing the mass here of what collimates the breakdown between the 2 different units, and the land separation that separates that them both; looking at sub-area 1, you can see here in the development text that the applicant is requesting for the setback standards in the lower right-hand corner, and then illustrating on one of the diagrams what a traditional lot would look like in terms of setbacks in a plain box scenario here on the left; for the sub-area 2, you can see the same thing, showing that sub-area 2 is going to have smaller lots, it's going to have tighter setbacks between the units; it would be 5 feet from the house to the property line; along sub-area 1 would be 8 feet from the house to the property line; sub-area 1 would have about 16 feet of separation, if they're built right to the limits that they have; sub-area 2 would be 10 feet between the units, which would be they're built right to the limits of where they're supposed to be at; sub-area 1 has 2 access points along Oregon Road down here; sub-area 2 has 2 access points on Hayes Road over here, keeping the delineation completely up Lithopolis Road for this section, and then all the access from sub-area 1 would be the first left right after you head to that roundabout, heading westbound out of town; one thing – just to point out when looking at the development plan, that I kind of summarized in the staff report; the applicant wasn't very clear on what is the minimum setback, what is a typical setback; they used the word 'typical' in development text, which is kind of hard to regulate; on one diagram, they do show that the setback is 68 feet at the street, and this is a very square lot; on another page, they show the setback that has a minimum value of 75 feet; for some clarification – Haire: That's the frontage, not the setback; the road frontage – 68, or 75; they listed it as 2 separate ways; Moore: When looking at the rest of the plan here, again as I was noting, the green space that kind of splits the two sections naturally that the applicant has shown on this slide in green – this is the open space that is being dedicated to the subdivision; code requirements for PRD

require 20% of the development be open space; due to this landmass lineation, they ended up with a little over 30% of open space being dedicated; also on the map here, you can see that they are going to be doing a compacted stone path throughout the natural area to connect the two; 8-foot asphalt bike trails along the frontage streets to the main roads, and then sidewalks throughout the whole development; when looking at the development as well, this is where I was kind of talking about that natural breakdown between the two sections; the area in the dark blue, the pinstripe line – that is the, more or less, the limits of the water in that ditch; the blue that is over on top of it is our stream corridor protection zone; the stream corridor protection zone, and the floodway are pretty much the same limits; this means that you can't build in this area, regardless of what you're looking to do; everything that's in the green is a wetland; as you can see, there are portions of wetland that are being proposed to be filled on residential lots, to help mitigate and help make those lots more suitable build sites; the area in the red here is a 100-year floodplain that the applicant is looking to develop on as well; one thing that PRD text talks about in length in many sections of the code is when you build a PRD, you should be building to the site characteristics, and building to something that is suitable for the site; as well as creating something unique, that fits the community, and fits the area that it's in; just a brief comment – it looks like a lot of subarea is being filled in to mitigate the 100-year floodplain; while that is permissible by our code, it's not really falling the scheme of what we would consider a planned residential text for working with the existing site features; Clark: Where would the water that the dirt is filling in go – is it coming back to the retention pond, then? Moore: Yeah, it would be contained within the retention ponds, and it would also be contained within the existing dark blue area here; the way that the engineering would have to be designed is that the water wouldn't be able to go elsewhere, to be dispersed on the other properties; that's something that we would be looking for during the engineering review; they're just kind of taking away the natural feature that's already servicing the property; Coolman: Do you think the capacity of the retention ponds that they're proposing is enough to handle that? Moore: We haven't done the engineering review, so it's hard to say.

Moore: To kind of summarize a little bit here, to date the applicant has not met the following code sections; I'm not going to read through this list, it was noted in your staff report; I numbered them I think items 1-9; I had context within those to show you exactly what's not being met, it's just a summary for you guys to look at; as Bruce mentioned, Planning & Zoning did recommend denial of this plan to city council; while this is not an appeal per say, because no development text can be adopted by Planning & Zoning Commission, city council is the only body that has the ability to do that; this is just the hearing for city council; you can kind of think of it as the same as a zoning text change, instead this has to do with physical property and the development specifics; if I have any questions from the commission on anything, I'd be glad to help answer, again this is a quick recap; I wanted this to be more of your guys' discussion; Jarvis: Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Moore? Thank you very much, I suppose we will be hearing from the applicant this evening as well, and I noticed that we do have someone from Planning & Zoning in the room, but also might have a little more detail – Mr. Christensen if you would, on Planning & Zoning's decision and how they arrived at that.

Bill Christensen: Basically, it was just a long laundry list that staff provided us of what was wrong – between the design and what was needed for us to pass it, we actually tabled it once;

they came back with some changes, and there still wasn't enough there – it still was a long laundry list of needed things to happen; that's where we decided to just go ahead and turn it down; there was just so many things that still needed to be done with it to – Jarvis: To the best of your knowledge, have any of those concerns been addressed between then and now?

Christensen: There was just one or two maybe changed during the tabling; they cut back a couple properties I think; Jarvis: Substantially, no.

E. Public Comments – Five Minute Limit Per Person

Jarvis: Before we open this to public comments, I would like to give an opportunity to the applicant to also address us.

Tom Hart, 2 Miranova Place: Thank you Mr. Jarvis, I am the zoning attorney for Westport Homes; with me tonight are Jack Montino, president of the area for Westport Homes, and also Jeff Strong, our landscape architect from EMH&T; I'm going to provide some overview comments for you, and then Jack will get into some of the details that he wants to cover in terms of architectural commitments, and how this development compares to what's being built in Canal Winchester today; there are a couple of things I want to make clear up front; we are not, as Westport Homes, with this application really trying to meet these standards that are in your code under Chapter 1130, what we call the 'R3' standards; because this is a planned district, this is a planned unit development under your code and Ohio law that allows flexibility away from those standards, based on justifications and rationale that a developer proposes and proposes to provide; the laundry list of items that was discussed and shown on the screen that have been kind of the matter – the main matter, and the main points of debate through our process at planning commission; we weren't trying to meet those, because they don't meet today's market; those standards were written probably in the run up around 2006 I think they were adopted; the market tanked after that time; there's been one other residential housing development that I believe has been approved by the city since that time, I think we're number 2; it appears that that other residential development – Turning Stone – did not have the benefit of having those Chapter 1130 standards apply to them, as they have applied throughout our enjoyment of the process so far; that's a big issue for us, it's the reason we came to council in May for a work session, to talk about the market and talk about how the 2006 standards in 2018 have some relevancy issues, they have some significant challenges in terms of the housing market and what's going on today; let me talk about what Westport is trying to accomplish, it's pretty easy summed up in one word – that's 'value'; we're trying to deliver a product in a market that we think really checks the value box in a big way in terms of what's out there on the market today, and what we can provide in terms of traditional single family housing on the market between \$315,000-\$350,000 to start; empty nester housing – which this market lacks – we think we can hit that market at about between \$275-\$295, for the empty nesters, for mainly first floor living; that's what we're trying to accomplish by presenting a planned district with standards that differ from the code; value in today's market trumps lot size, value in today's market equates to things like more perimeter open space, more common useable open space; protection of natural areas for the residents' enjoyment; not necessarily big lots, with big side yards, and kind of major green grass to mow and take care of; in the housing market today,

busy families and empty nesters, the most precious commodity is time; they're telling us in the industry loud and clear: 'we don't want to mow, we would like to get someone else to mow, and we'll pay fees to our association'; in terms of family housing – we still want pretty big houses, we still want fairly decent-sized lots, but we don't want the mega-lots of the past; I'll be honest with you, I call your code standard for single family housing the 'mega lots of the cretaceous'; 14,400 square foot lots are not what the market is targeting for families these days, that's just being honest; our lot sizes are 85 wide, 80 wide, and 75 wide; those match typical suburban development patterns in central Ohio, and in this community; if you could break down our main challenges with the code standards that are in the staff report, and at Planning Commission, it's that we want to do slightly smaller lots, we want to do empty nester housing; the code that is being applied to us doesn't allow either; we want to have more perimeter open space, more common open space, and less side yard; especially empty nester folks – they pay for their side yards to be maintained, those people don't – they're downsizing, they don't want big lots anymore; people also want bikeways, and path connections, and the ability to access open space; a couple points on some of the details that I'll get into, or I can get into later; it's real important to let you know that I respect the Planning Commissioners view that not much has changed; we have tried in good faith to make lots of changes in the process; I guess I'll walk through those now; when we started the process, we were going to propose duplexes on this site;

Jarvis: Mr. Hart, I'm sorry to interrupt – I wasn't sure how long you were going to go – when we open to this public, we have a five minute limit, but you are over five minutes; you mentioned that there are going to be other speakers representing the applicant; I just wanted you to be aware that we're kind of a little pressed for time, at 7 we're supposed to start another meeting; we want to give time for everybody to say what they wanted to say; Hart: If it's okay, I just want to wrap in under a minute, and then Jack has some comments and we'll be done; one main point is there an existing zoning approved on this property – it has 208 or 209 housing on it; it includes multifamily housing, it's from back in 2004; there's no approved site plan that goes with that, but this property is zoned today for 209 units; we started out with 68-foot lots for traditional single family; we did move to 75's, 80's, and 85's; we started out with a density that was 3.81 – we moved to 3.44; the site plan before you has 19 fewer lots than when we started; there's a big point being made today in our industry about how empty nester housing is less intense, creates less traffic, it has very few school children; it's density should be given recognition that it's less intense, that it's more quiet living; I think it's appropriate to turn over to Jack to talk about the architectural commitments that we've made in the text, to go right at some of the concerns staff has raised along the way on porches, garage detail, and the homes that back up against Hayes Road.

Jack Mautino, : I'm the Division President of Westport Homes here in Columbus; I first want to say that as Tom was pointing out, there have been a lot of changes to the plan; when we talked about some of the residential code requirements imposed in Canal that were dated back to 2006; we talked about this before – can you show me a location in which we can look at those house types? What we were told was that 'we haven't done one since then'; what I can do is go back and say 'what works within this community, and what works in other communities'; what I like to look at is Canal Cove; Canal Cove was originally approved in the late 90's, early 2000's; it

was a good plan, a really good plan; I can say that there is a distinct architectural difference today in what we're building to what was built there in the early 2000's by Dominion Homes, as far as the architectural elements on the front of the home; as we worked with staff, we said 'okay, how can we enhance this, so that we can come to some type of agreement where the garage doesn't have to sit 4 feet behind the body of the home, are there some other architectural elements that we can do to the homes'; such as the architectural-styled garage doors, then the garage wouldn't extend more than 4 feet in front of the front porch; the lifestyle series having a minimum of 50 square foot front porches; on the traditional single family series – having a 100 square foot front porch; this would be just the lifestyle series of some of the homes that we propose – you can see that we're bringing that front porch element out; I didn't even know what a 'snout house' was, until someone told me that the garage sticks out about 18 feet, and then they put a blank, white door on the front; I get why people don't want this; if you notice even in a place like Canal Cove, the doors are complimentary to the architecture; they're being incorporated in the architecture; that was a real key element – bringing the front porches out is a key element in the architecture; does that offset the code requirement of having to have the garage sit back behind the body of the house; does it really matter that much, or are we more concerned that we don't want that 8-over-4 sitting out there by 18 feet; so we went back and made some architectural changes to the homes; as far as Canal Cove – one thing I do want to read – because I get that we want to talk about what the zoning is, and how this changes from Canal Cove; these planned districts are designed to guide development in an orderly, coordinated, and comprehensive manner – to preserve the natural quality and beauty, and provide supported community facilities with diverse, sound, urban environments; provide a more successful, and a more useful pattern of open space and recreation area; utilize natural topography and geographical features – scenic vistas, trees and vegetation; provide a more efficient manner of development that reduces in investment of utility lines, streets, and infrastructure; that goes to smaller, more compact lots, bigger open space; promotes development pattern in harmony with the municipal land, uses, objectives, and priorities; this was all in staff's report – as I look at this particular plan, we've done all of that; if I contrasted to Canal Cove; Canal Cove – beautiful community, I'm very proud of that community and how it's coming about; very proud of the average sales pricing that is now in excess of \$315,000; we're looking for higher price points when we move into Middletown Farms, if we're fortunate enough for that; both in the traditional single family, as well as the lifestyle series; if you look at Canal Cove – 85 acres, it has 238 lots; 2.8 units on the gross side; it had 10.5 acres of open space; 70-foot lots; when we talk about the progression in development, this is an 80-acre site, 175 lots – 2.2 as far as the gross acreage; 22 acres of open space; 75 and 80-foot lots; it has evolved, the architecture has evolved, the community has evolved; that's why we're so excited about this; this is a great plan, it offers great opportunity; 117 single family homes, and 58 active adult homes; I know there's a lot of people that want to speak, I would be happy to answer any questions.

Clark: Are you considering any garages on the side? Mautino: Yes we are, there is none here; this would be some of the premier series homes; Clark: I'll be honest, those all look like the same home to me; Mautino: Same designer, they do look similar; Clark: It's not what we're looking for; Mautino: Right now, we're at 19.4% side loads; code requires that we get to 20 – I'd

certainly be happy to get another 80 foot lot, and get it to 20%; not for the empty nester, though; because we would have a maintenance association that would maintain the open space on the empty nester; those homes we actually proposed to be 50 feet wide; Clark: Which one of those are an empty nester home in here? The lifestyle – the whole series, okay; Mautino: Those homes would range in square footage from 1,400-2,300 square feet; there is no livable second floor; most of them – except for a few – don't have an option for a second floor, and if they do, that is nothing but a bonus room, craft room, activity room, there is no bathroom up there.

Lynch: Are these all the same model, but different elevations? Mautino: No sir, this would be the Haden, the Baxley, the Barrimore – these 2, they are the same home, but with different elevations; so you're looking at a combination of plans and elevations; these 2 are the Hollister; Lynch: So you guys are proposing with this project – based on the code it says that you can have the same model, but you can't have the same model across the street or within 2 houses; Mautino: We have no problem meeting that; Hart: Let me clarify – your code addresses this issue in 2 places; under the planned district it talks about facades; you're not allowed to have the same façade next to each other, or directly across the street; under the R3 standard, it uses 'model'; it's like an old-timer taught me a long time ago, our industry builds about 5 houses on the inside; those 5 houses could have a hundred front elevations; we're very confident that we'll meet the section that says we'll have to have different facades next to each other and across the street, under the planned district standards; that's 1173 3-1B I think maybe; that was the exact same scenario that was applied to the Turning Stone site, and we would meet that; a model could be – our models replicate many times, but they almost always have a different front; different door location, different windows, different dormers; Mautino: Who typically holds us to that standard is our customer; they don't want that same house to be next door to them, across the street (unintelligible); Lynch: I'm sure that's why it was put in the 1130 Code back in '06; Mautino: Some of the things I wanted to pass out to you are pictures of other communities; I just wanted you to look at those elevations; one of the communities is in Westerville, the other is in Dublin; the other reason that I bring these to the attention of this group is because in today's code, those homes would not be approved; Jarvis: I hate to move this along, but if you have any closing comments, feel free to make them, as long as they're brief; Mautino: I am very excited to be in the Canal Winchester community, in Canal Cove; I'm very proud of what we're building down there, and what we continue to build; we enjoy being in this community, we recognize the value of this community, and being in the Canal Winchester community; what we'd like to do is continue to expand on that growth, with continued modified architecture and design, and continue to bring development, as well as offer opportunity to existing residents in Canal Winchester.

Jarvis: Before I open this up for public comments, is there anyone on staff who would like to comment regarding this development?

Jarvis: I guess I need to ask staff or legal if any action is required by council this evening? Haire: This is a first reading only, so it would be basically the action to move it on to the first reading; Jarvis: Nothing beyond that; Jackson: Correct; Jarvis: Is there a motion to forward this to full council? Haire: I don't believe we have to have a motion, it's listed under the first readings; Jarvis: Alright, so it goes to the agenda without motion; Jackson: Correct.

F. Council Discussion and Recommendation

Bennett: Mr. Haire, there were a lot of numbers from Mr. Mautino about comparing Middletown Farms to Canal Cove; how do those two developments compare – are they almost very similar? The lot size, number of units, I understood there was going to be more green space out at Middletown Farms; Haire: Canal Cove was initially approved in 1995, so 95 and 96 were when the approvals were gained for that; in terms of minimum square footage, Canal Cove's 1,400 square feet; their smallest model for the lifestyle is I believe just over 1,400 square feet; in terms of the housing size, it would be similar to what they're proposing there; in Canal Cove, the setbacks – we require an 8-foot side yard and a 12-foot side yard, it has to be 20 total; the minimum is 8, it could be 10 and 10, it could be 8 and 12; here, what they're proposing on the standard single family is an 8-foot side yard on both sides would be the minimum; on the lifestyle units, they're proposing a 5-foot side yard, so there would be 10 feet between the units; a regular single family would be 16 feet between the units; in Canal Cove, you could have 16 feet between the units, if both units would build to the minimum, which is 8 feet; density-wise, Mr. Mautino went through the density; they're a little less dense than Canal Cove is in terms of the open space that they're proposing on providing; Amos: Mr. Haire, when it comes to the floodplain, I guess I have concerns with so many of those housing units being in the floodplain; having had my house, and had to go through an evaluation to get out of a floodplain, to avoid paying an absorbent amount of insurance; after they restructure this, based on some of the things you're saying – who's going to apply to see if this is still going to be in a floodplain, who takes on the responsibility? Haire: We go through the engineering plans, and as part of those engineering plans they'll do a permit; a floodplain development permit is required under our code, so we'd require that to allow grading within the floodplain and fill; then they would go through FEMA to do a map amendment; they'd basically apply to FEMA based on the fill, based on the plans that they're proposing and the fill, and the area that is going to be removed from the floodplain; FEMA would need to approve that map amendment, and basically that would become a part of FEMA's records that this area has been filled, and is no longer a part of the floodplain; Amos: What's the time limit on that? Haire: I believe they do it within 90 days, is that correct? Yeah, so that's their goal is to have it within 90 days of receipt; Amos: Just to confirm, you said there is 12 feet of side setback in Canal Cove, correct? Haire: I believe it's 8 and 12; Amos: Throughout this, I heard them criticize our building standards, for lack of a better word; as we go through Canal Winchester, in my opinion, we constantly see houses – I went out and measured between my house, and my neighbor's house, it's 20 feet between our houses, so we're at 10 and 10, we're in the old village; I think that's close, I cannot imagine putting 5 and 8 on each side, so 16 and 10; I cannot imagine being able to look into my neighbor's house; I know that they keep pushing the 'this is what people want, the smaller yards'; my concern is longevity-wise; yes, right now, people may want smaller yards, but is that – my concern is in 15 years from now, when we all know the times change – is that going to make this development a harder sell? Right now, many of us have big yards, and we're not having any problems selling and buying our houses in Canal Winchester; that's one of my big holdups, I understand cost-wise for the company that they need to get so many on there to be beneficial; you're not putting much space in between these homes; I understand you're making them look prettier on the outside – I still could hand my neighbor milk through the window I feel like; longevity-wise, I'm

not sure that in 15-20 years that that's what people are going to want; Jarvis: Eventually the baby boomers will be gone, and whoever replaces them will have their own tastes; Amos: They may want bees and chickens someday, and with that setback you're not going to get it.

Jarvis: Let me state for the record that Mr. Lynch joined us at 6:33, I apologize for the delay.

Lynch: It was noted in the application that there would be 4-sided architecture on these buildings; I've been through this neighborhood right here up in Dublin; has that been spelled out as far as what specifically that includes in each of these models that they're going to build, or is that something that's proved as each house gets built? Haire: I don't see it in here, in letter C: architectural and design standards, it mentions that each home shall include 4-sided architecture as permitted in 11305; I assume that they're going to meet 11305 in terms of design elements on each side of the home, but we don't have side elevations of the homes to know that that's the case; you're right, in Canal Cove, there's not; Lynch: There is no 4-sided architecture; Haire: There's many elevations that have no windows on the side; Lynch: That would not be the case in this subdivision, correct? Haire: I believe that in here that they're stating that they will meet Chapter 11305, which requires I think at least 2 design elements on each elevation; Amos: Mr. Moore, correct me if I'm wrong, you sent us all the examples of the homes that they were submitting as potential homes, correct? Moore: Yes, all of the homes that they submitted as part of their application were included in your packets; those homes include the front elevation, and the floorplan showing dimensions, and the push and pull of the elevations; that's not to say that they could build homes that are not with what they submitted, that's just showing the product sample of what they would like to build; if the market changes, and another developer comes in and buys out the lots, they just have to meet the standards that are written; I wouldn't hold the development to the specific models that are in that plan; it's really just to show you an example of what they would be proposing to build; Amos: I'm concerned, because I agree with Mr. Clark that I think a lot of them looked very similar, for having 16 models on that page.

Hart: Mr. Jarvis, I'll be brief – this is a public hearing, we would like to speak about our own standards, and our own case very briefly; first, the text controls the architecture more than the plan submissions; there's specific text commitments in the text we turned in that will control what gets built on this site; in terms of the separation between units – empty nester folks that we are targeting to buy the empty nester products, where we have the smaller side yards, don't want to maintain lawns; we are trying to get people who are surging the market, in demand for that type of product, that's our main focus with the 10 foot between the two homes; we're seeing 10 foot, and 16 feet between homes in the market; Clark: If they're not maintaining the grass, wouldn't they want more space between their neighbor? Hart: No sir, because they're paying for it; they have to pay extra to have that stuff maintained; Clark: That's got to be pretty minimal, a few feet to have the grass cutters; they could run through those yards pretty quick; Hart: My only point is, my people with my hair color are leaving the mower; Clark: I get you there, but you're already setting up a homeowners association to take care of all that, no matter how big the yard is; I understand the cost is a little bit more, to cut a little bit more grass; I think these people at that price range could probably afford it, and want the space, rather than looking over and seeing their neighbor cooking up a stew; Hart: I will respectfully disagree; this

is an amoeba – if you create more lots, if you create bigger lots, you lose open space; one of the benefits to the community that we’re presenting is 35% common open space; we’re saving the vast majority of the floodplain, our impact on the wetlands is very minimal; the way you get there is crunching lots, and in the market people don’t want big lots; if you press it one way, it comes out the other; Jarvis: Mr. Hart, I think we’re doing variations of the theme now, if you have any additional follow-up questions? Clark: No.

Jarvis: Mr. Mautino, if you could make it very brief; Mautino: I will, I will be very brief; if it would be council’s desire for us to come back and look at the side yards to be and 8 and 12; because we have no increased the lot widths from the 68 that we had originally designed to the 75 and 80 – I’d be happy to go back and modify those side yards to allow for that; in addition, if council said ‘we don’t like the 50-foot lots in the lifestyle section, could you make them 60’s, and get us 10 and 10?’, we can consider that as well; we are looking for some direction; Jarvis: I can’t speak for anyone else, but that presumes that we are very close – I think that there’s a lot of questions, there’s still some digestion that needs to take place with the materials that we were given, which may bring up some additional questions; I don’t know, I sense that when you talked about comparable like Cherry Landing and Turning Point; those were odd projects, I happened to be around when that plait was adopted by council; it was a surprise to everyone when it came out as good as it did, because it was such a problematic parcel, no house - they were going to be built on slabs; this was against everything that we stood for, yet we allowed it to happen because there were no other alternatives there, and at the time residential growth as part of the balance seemed to be in order; right now, Mr. Haire you might be able to correct me on this, we have 600 new homes that could be built under the existing projects right now, over the next several years; there’s a lot of residential development already in our pipeline; it does nothing for our revenue picture, it costs us in terms of infrastructure and maintenance, police and fire, things like that; if we’re not meeting you halfway or have our arms open about a residential project, right off the bat you almost have to sweep us off your feet; we’re looking at this, I think we’re digesting it; I don’t know whether the difference of a depth lot of 50 feet or 60 feet would sell 7 seven people on it; I can tell you that we’re going to be having 3 readings on this, we have time to think about it some more; if you have some additional information, or you want to propose something; feed that through your normal channels, we’ll hear about it, and can take that into consideration; Mautino: Those 600 homes that you referenced, are they within the city limits? Lynch: Yes, is that correct? Yes; they’ve already plotted and scheduled for the next 5, 6, 7 years, if they come to fruition; Haire: They’re at some phase of approval; Mautino: Okay, thank you.

Lynch: One of the concerns I have is that part of the planning committee we’ve got that Bob and I are on; the 11-30 Ordinance talks about garages being set back; what we’re trying to do is, what 11-30 tried to do is not place emphasis on the garage door; it seems like a lot of these house, the garage door is right there, and it’s forward; I’m kind of concerned that they switched the text in this proposal from instead of 4 feet behind the front plane, they went 4 feet in front of the front plane; that includes the porch, the 4 feet behind the plane didn’t even include the porch if I understand 11-30 correctly; Haire: In their proposal? Lynch: No, in our code; Haire: Our code excludes the porch; Lynch: The garage was supposed to sit 4 foot back – this is the complete opposite; that concerns me, as we’re trying to create developments that don’t have

predominant garage fronts; I think that's one of the big challenges they had with the subdivision up at 33, Turning Stone; that was one big concern; Jarvis: That's something else I wanted to point out; we've had some turnover on council, different viewpoints; if that were being reviewed today, versus a year ago, whenever that was – it probably would've come out differently; Haire: Clarification on that is that it doesn't have to meet the standards, the residential design standards – those are not single family homes; Lynch: In defense of this subdivision, I will say that based on what I've seen around town – I travel all over town, I see a lot of subdivisions; smaller lots do seem to be the trend, and I think that's one of the things we may be addressing, is the size of the actual lots; smaller houses seem to be the trend, too, I think people want to downsize; what we are looking at is high quality, so that includes not just concrete fiberboard in the front, but 20% masonry or something in front; what happens around the whole house? Are we using vinyl siding, are we using concrete fiberboard? The vinyl siding that's in this proposal is .44 mil vinyl siding; that's kind of like (unintelligible); those would be conceptions that I would consider; the type of siding, 4 sided architecture, where the garage is located, porch size, too; Bennett: In the documents that we were supplied by Westport Homes – I guess I would ask are the first 2 pictures, are these garages 4 foot in front of, or even with? Mautino: That is not our product; I'm using that as an example of a different home builder, in a different community; by the looks of it, they're either flush, or just modestly ahead; Lynch: They don't extend beyond the porch, that's one thing I noticed in this neighborhood – this is in Dublin, right? What I noticed about that neighborhood is that there's not (unintelligible); they had wonderful 4-sided architecture; I hope that what you're proposing here is the exact same thing; the only difference there is that we have not gotten flush or behind the front porch; as you pointed out, your code calls for 4 feet behind the body of the home, exclusive of the porch; we'd have to go back and look; to get some of those columns in there today, with the carriage-style columns, the farmhouse style columns, you need at least 5; Lynch: (unintelligible); Mautino: From the front edge to the façade of the home; Amos: I believe you said 50-100 square feet; Mautino: The traditional single family we would propose a front porch of no less than 100 square feet; on the lifestyle, we had proposed no less than 50 square feet as a front porch, to make the porch more dominant.

Jarvis: I think if I were in your shoes, I would try to answer some of those questions if you can; not necessarily as a rebuttal, but if there was something that you could do that would prove that, and you could live with it; maybe that's what we need to talk about between now and the time that this comes for a third reading.

G. Adjournment at 7:11 p.m.

A motion was made by Lynch, seconded by Amos to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 7 – Walker, Bennett, Amos, Clark, Coolman, Jarvis, Lynch