

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
Violet Township Zoning Commission

June 18, 2019

Mr. Biancamano called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. and roll was called.

Members present: Daniel Rowell, yes; Mark Decker, yes; Robert Bussom, yes; Steve Palsgrove, yes, and John Biancamano, yes. Also present were Kelly Sarko, Zoning Inspector and Jennifer Huber, Township Legal Counsel.

Mr. Biancamano noted the Mr. Rowell is Secretary for the Commission.

Case Number 04-ZC-2019: an application for rezoning filed by M/I Homes of Central Ohio, LLC, c/o Aaron Underhill, Esq., Underhill & Hodge LLC, 8000 Walton Pkwy, Suite 260, New Albany, Ohio 43054 for property owned by Enveron Corporation, Attn: Agris Krautmanis, 1818 W. Centre Ave., Portage, MI, 49024. This application proposes to amend the Violet Township Zoning Resolution by amending the Violet Township Zoning Map to rezone Parcel Number 0360090700 consisting of 61.04± acres on the east side of Pickerington Road northeast of its intersection with Ault Road, from the R-2, Single Family Residential District to the PD, Planned Residential District to accommodate a 138-lot, single-family subdivision.

Ms. Sarko reported this property is located on the east side of Pickerington Road and is zoned R-2, Single Family Residential and is currently used for agricultural purposes.

Ms. Sarko reported the property is located on the east side of Pickerington Road and is zoned R-2, Single Family Residential and currently used for agricultural purposes. She explained the surrounding uses, residential and agricultural uses and Heron Crossing Planned District to the east, which is a 180-Lot Single Family Subdivision.

The applicants are proposing to rezone the 61.04-acre tract to a Planned Residential District in order to accommodate a 138-lot single-family subdivision. The proposed gross density would be 2.26 units/acre. There will be approximately 40% open space including a 10.3- acre Reserve, centrally located within the development which will contain an outdoor fitness equipment area for ages 12 and older as well as a pavilion. The remainder of the open space consists of a perimeter buffer areas, entry feature and retention basin areas.

Lot sizes vary in width from 55' to 63' in width. The majority of the lots are 55 feet in width. The application states: "the minimum lot width for homes shall be 60 feet at the front line for at least 90 lots. The balance of the lots in the subdivision shall have a minimum lot width of 55 feet. The minimum lot area shall be 7,150 square feet"

Setbacks for the homes are proposed to be 30 feet for the front; sides 5 feet minimum on each side, however there are encroachments up to 12 inches permitted for eaves, overhangs, fireplaces, cantilevers, and below grade window wells. The rear yard setback is proposed to be 25-feet.

The minimum home size for a ranch home is 1,500 square feet and a 2-story home is 1,800 square feet.

The Violet Township Land Use Plan defines this area as “Mixed Use Commercial” and the MORPC Insight 2050 Report shows this area to be “Mixed Use” and “Res Mod Suburban (3-5 units per acre)”

Ms. Sarko reported that Regional Planning Commission considered this application during its June 4, 2019 meeting. The Commission accepted staff recommendation for approval.

RPC Staff recommended the following: “The development, as proposed, appears to be similar in nature to the existing Heron Crossing Subdivision and will comply with the county future land use plan recommendations. RPC Staff recommends approval of the proposed development subject to the Subdivision Regulations Committee Comments listed above and attached.”

Josh Barkan with M/I Homes, 3 Easton Oval, Columbus and David Hodge with Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany were present. Mr. Barkan explained this project is an extension of Heron Crossing. He said they are in the final phase of development. He said their original price point for Heron Crossing was the high \$200,000’s but they consistently average around \$350,000.00.

He said they wanted a similar density to Heron Crossing and noted most of the lots in Heron Crossing are 70 feet wide. They are proposing 135 lots that are 60 feet and 50 feet wide. There will be 90, 60-foot wide lots. He said the product would be the same as Heron Crossing. What they sell is a 40-foot wide home and some lots have an option for a 3-car garage and that is the reason a 60-foot wide lot for 2/3’s of the lots is important. Often the third car garage is for storage purposes. The only thing different is the side yard.

Mr. Biancamano asked him to explain the 4-foot bump for storage. Mr. Barkan explained on the side of the garage they build on a 4-foot structural bump that gives them additional storage.

Mr. Barkan said part of the MORPC 2050 discussion was for density to increase toward Refugee Road.

Mr. Rowell asked if all of the lots were 55-feet wide. Mr. Barkan said they are at the minimum. Mr. Rowell asked about how many lots are 70 feet wide. Mr. Barkan said he was not sure. Mr. Barkan said the goal is to continue to build a great community at a great price that everybody can be proud.

Mr. Bussom asked if there would be a road into the school at some point and if so when would that occur. Mr. Barkan said yes there would, but was not sure when it would occur.

Mr. Bussom asked if they would be able to maintain their price point with 8-feet between homes. Mr. Barkan said there would be a minimum of 10 feet between the homes. He explained that people do not live in their side yards. He said minimizing maintenance on property and access to amenities is consistent with trends.

Mr. Bussom asked about the maintenance of the amenities. Mr. Barkan said the HOA would maintain them. Mr. Decker asked who the HOA would be. Mr. Barkan said this HOA would be combined with the (existing) Herron Crossing HOA. Mr. Decker asked if the documents of record provide for good condemnation. Mr. Hodges said it has not been turned over to the homeowners. Mr. Rowell asked why you would want to have a 315 home HOA instead of a 180 and 135 separate ones and what the benefit is. Mr. Rowell said in reality it causes a lot of anxiety amongst the residents by having it all together.

Mr. Biancamano asked how they control the HOA. Mr. Barkan said they have a board and they slowly turn it over to the residents. There are typically three members of a board for a HOA. Therefore, they would have representatives of M/I sitting on the board until they are sold out.

Mr. Biancamano asked Mr. Barkan to discuss the central amenities. Mr. Barkan stated the open space is a quarter mile or the size of a football field. There is an outer ring, an inner ring, and a gazebo where you could have a cookout. Mr. Biancamano asked if people want a house whose back door opens to an exercise facility. Mr. Barkan said the scale of it is important. He said there are still several hundred feet to get to the exercise facility. Mr. Barkan noted there is a strict fence policy with 4-foot fence, white, off white, or light natural wood colors permitted.

Mr. Barkan said they have been meeting with the neighbors and some things have come up in conversation as well as some things Mr. Ricketts has expressed interest. One item is to move an access point to the middle of the southern boundary. In order to accommodate this request, they straightened the road and added a cul-de-sac. Mr. Barkan said this is the option they are currently considering.

A discussion about the stub street ensued.

Mr. Decker said he likes the curves, as it tends to make people slow down. Mr. Barkan said his thought is in the future, the county could control that. Mr. Bussom said this needs to be addressed now and not in the future.

Mr. Rowell said he believes he will get a lot less pushback from this group by moving that stub in the cal-de-sac scenario 3 or 4 lots to the left. Mr. Barkan said one of the issues in the RPC comments is this particular radius so the thing they like about this is that it satisfies fire trucks, garbage trucks, and things like that.

Ms. Sarko asked how to move the stub on Mrs. Hesch's property so that it is not on one side and it can be better utilized.

Mr. Decker questioned phasing and said generally, the majority of the amenities do not come on until the last phase and said that is bothersome to him. They are selling this subdivision with great amenities and they are not putting them up until they are ready to leave. He asked if they could adjust this so the amenities are built in the first phase. Mr. Barkan said they cannot in the first phase because they would have to build on both sides of the park. He said he could get it in the second phase as soon as it is safe, then they can get them in. He said it will not be practical to build the open space and then have to come back and put in sewer and grating. Their goal is to get in as soon as they can. After the second phase is approved then they would put the amenities in.

Mr. Decker asked if they have given any thought to the fact that the exercises machines are going to create a potential liability for small kids. Mr. Barkan said they have explored that. Mr. Decker said one of the exhibits shows a footprint of a building or something that is not shown on any other exhibit. He asked if it was the Gazebo.

Mr. Bussom asked where the mailboxes were going to be. Mr. Barkan referred to Exhibit F-1 – there are three locations.

Ms. Sarko said that in the development text she would like to see a chart showing the acreage, number of lots, the gross density, net density, open space, row acreage, etc. Mr. Barkan said it was on a chart in C-3. She would like this moved over to the dimensions page.

Ms. Sarko said in the development text, that she would like to see the use and purpose for each reserve area. Concerning the retention basins, they cannot be included as open space unless they are improved with pathways. The Zoning Resolution states in Section 3V3-02(C) Public utilities, public easements, rights-of-way for roads, flood plains, flood ways, and rights-of-way or easements for watercourses, ditches or drainage shall not be included in the calculation of open space unless such land is improved with walking trails, bicycle paths or similar purposes for public enjoyment. She asked if in Reserve C and E, they could include some pathways so it can be included in the open space calculations. Mr. Barkan said they would address this.

Ms. Sarko said Mr. Barkan has indicated this is mostly an adult (older than 12 yrs.) recreation area and wanted to know what the distance was between the lots in 83 and 84 and the tot lot in the original Heron Crossing. Mr. Barkan said that in Heron they did a modified version of their tot lot. It is smaller because the school had a big complex and that is why they did it. Ms Sarko said there should be somewhere in close proximity where parents and toddlers, with children in strollers should not have to walk far. Ms. Sarko said she has been an advocate for exercise equipment for a long time but she thinks there needs to be something for the smaller kids.

Ms. Sarko asked if they given any consideration to mounding and landscaping along the northern property line - some screening, some mounding, something to provide that homeowner some privacy. Mr. Barkan said they would look at this. She asked if additional landscaping along Lot Number 1 to screen the view of the house when entering and exiting the development. Mr. Barkan said they could do that.

Ms. Sarko said she would prefer, from a zoning perspective that the front setback be 30' feet instead of having a 6-foot encroachment for a front porch. Ms. Sarko wants the front building setback to be the front building setback – that the porch needs start at the front building setback which is 30 feet.

Ms. Sarko said there is a reference to tree preservation zone in the development text. She noticed there are trees along the east property line and maybe include that area in a tree preservation zone.

She would like a specific color and style fence to be designated for the visible from Pickerington Road.

Ms. Sarko would like the divergence request moved to the back of the development text and a note placed in that particular section which a divergence is being requested.

The next meeting will be July 16, 2019. Ms. Sarko said she would like any changes submitted a week before so the Commission has time to review.

Mr. Rowell made the motion to continue this public hearing until the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 16, 2019 at 7:30 p.m. at the Violet Township Administrative Offices located at 10190 Blacklick Eastern Road. Mr. Palsgrove seconded the motion. Roll call vote: All ayes.

Mr. Bussom made the motion to adjourn at 8:55 p.m. Mr. Palsgrove seconded the motion. Roll call vote: All aye.

Approved By:

Dan Rowell, Secretary

Date: August 20, 2019

John Biancamano, Chair

Bob Bussom, Commission Member

Mark Decker, Commission Member

Steve Palsgrove, Commission Member