

DRAFT
MINUTES
VILLAGE OF SUNBURY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 25, 2021

Mayor Tommy Hatfield called the Sunbury Planning and Zoning meeting to order at 6:32 p.m., on January 25, 2021.

The meeting was started with a moment of silent prayer and the pledge of allegiance.

Members present: Tommy Hatfield, Joe St. John, Joe Gochenour, and Greg Elliott.

Also present – Dave Parkinson, David Brehm, Allen Rothermel and Steve Pyles

Mayor Hatfield thanked Mr. Lieurance and Mr. Ryba for completing their term of office on the Planning and Zoning Commission and agreeing to reappointment to the Commission. Law Director Brehm administered the Oath of Office to members John Lieurance and Rick Ryba. They were then recognized as present members of the meetings.

Extension of Reconstruction Period – David Martin – 33 West Cherry Street

The applicant is requesting a six-month extension to reconstruct the home located at the above address. The structure was declared unsafe for habitation due to a vehicle collision.

Mayor Hatfield introduced the first item of business, a six-month extension to reconstruct the home located at 33 West Cherry.

Mr. Dave Martin, the property owner, shared that the original plan to correct the damage to the home was to engage a house mover that would jack up the house and move it back on to the foundation. There are two companies capable of doing that work in Ohio and both have declined to do the work because it is a minor job. He has now engaged an architect to reconstruct the house by demolishing a portion of the front of the house and constructing a new front. This situation has led to a delay beyond the normal period allowed by the zoning code and he is seeking approval of an extension as per the code.

Mayor Hatfield asked if six months was sufficient. Mr. Martin responded that they plan to have him back in the house by May of 2021.

Mayor Hatfield asked if there were any other questions, there were none. He then asked Mr. Brehm what the necessary actions by the Commission were. Mr. Brehm replied that a motion and vote to extend the reconstruction period was being sought from the Commission.

Mayor Hatfield made a motion to extend the reconstruction period by six months, second by Mr. Ryba. The motion passed with six ayes.

Informal Presentation — Ravines at Meadow Ridge

Representatives from the Donald R. Kenny Company, Metro Development provided an informal presentation of a proposed development project located on land currently being considered by Sunbury for annexation located west of Interstate 71 and south of State Routes 36/37.

Mr. Joe Thomas from Metro Development started the presentation, noting that Mr. Farris and Ms. Tangeman were also in attendance representing the developer. He stated that Metro Development has done a variety of projects with an emphasis on multi-family since 2010. He noted two nearby projects either completed or under construction that would be similar. He shared a location map for the project and the current status of the annexation petition. He then proceeded to a site plan noting the property will be transected by a new roadway as part of a new intersection with I-71. While there will be some limited commercial land, the predominant use will be multi-family with 792 proposed units. The site plan is for three different developments with their own clubhouse and other facilities. Monthly rents will range from \$1,100 to \$1,450.

He also presented sample elevations for the buildings and interior photos from other projects. He then concluded his presentation with some history of the annexation and the project including the value of the development and how it will assist in funding the interchange.

Mayor Hatfield noted that some pictures of other Metro Development projects have been shared with the Commission to give them an idea of the product constructed by the developer.

Mr. Parkinson asked about some of the previous projects that had windows on the side elevation of the buildings. Mr. Thomas replied it was a product of the individual Planning and Zoning Board reviews, but he did caution there had been previous discussions with adjoining property owners concerning windows overlooking their property related to privacy. He said they have previously used other methods to break up the elevation without an actual window.

Mr. Parkinson asked about how three-bedroom buildings are different from the one- and two-bedroom buildings elevations. Mr. Farris responded the building length is extended with an additional window to the front and back elevations.

Mayor Hatfield spoke about timing of the reviews related to annexation and that the applicant wanted to share the project informally. Mr. Brehm responded that the property is in the annexation process, but the developer would like to move into the rezoning process when they can once the annexation is considered by Council so they can exercise options and move toward construction. He added that rezoning would not be considered until the annexation is approved by Council. The purpose tonight was informal and to get feedback from the Commission. Sunbury is also working on a development agreement with the applicant. He anticipates the rezoning would be considered by the Commission in March or April.

Mr. Gochenour asked Mr. Thomas about the count of units. Mr. Thomas responded, 204 one bedroom, 504 two bedrooms, 84 three-bedroom units.

Mr. St. John asked about anticipated variances. Mr. Thomas stated those are under discussion with his team. Ms. Tangeman stated the site plan is being reviewed for those items, Mr. Farris responded nothing significant, some items about parking ratios and widths. Building height and density are items he would also foresee.

Mr. Gochenour asked about tree removal. Mr. Farris responded a tree survey has not been completed, there are some preservation areas with the ravines. Mr. St. John noted the code needs investigated and anticipated by the developer.

Mayor Hatfield asked about flexibility on the three-bedroom product. Mr. Thomas responded that they had previously focused on one and two bedrooms, but they do see requests for three bedrooms, sometimes for use as office space or as transitional family housing while a house is built or during relocation. Mr. Thomas explored school impact and noted a study from Olentangy Schools about multi-family development.

Mr. St John asked about the road improvements contemplated in the area. Mr. Thomas responded that people would like to see right of way dedication, which they have agreed to do without cost. There will also be a TIF that could potentially fund the roadway infrastructure.

Mr. Gochenour asked about why the developer needs to annex to Sunbury. Mr. Thomas responded that they had previously spoke with a large master developer about annexation and the New Community Authority (NCA) to fund roadway and infrastructure improvements to the area. That was the start of discussion, today they are looking at a financial impact to make area infrastructure improvements and to access zoning that may be more flexible than available in the township areas.

Mr. Gochenour asked for clarification. Mr. Thomas noted the large amount of land consumed by the roadway right of way left a small developable area and they need higher density to capitalize on the smaller area.

Mr. Brehm added that there is a benefit both for Sunbury and the developer. This project will play a part in the development of Sunbury Parkway and the interchange, which has been under discussion for a decade, but finances have stalled progress. This project leverages funds to go toward these infrastructure improvements and open the development corridor in Sunbury.

Mr. Gochenour asked about sewer service, it will be served through the county.

Mayor Hatfield asked for other questions. Mr. Gochenour asked about open space calculations and if the parkway would be included. Mr. Thomas stated it would not be counted toward open space.

Mr. Parkinson asked about scheduling of the project. Mr. Thomas replied that they would be approaching the project as three developments of roughly 16 -24 months to completion and starting to lease during the construction process. Mr. Parkinson asked, sequences or overlap? About five years for the entire development? Mr. Thomas replied that was a good estimate.

Hearing no further questions, Mayor Hatfield concluded the informal presentation. He added that members could contact the developer to do a tour or staff for additional questions.

Discussion of Subdivision Code and Changes to Street Lighting Section

Mr. Parkinson shared a Power Point presentation about street lighting. The initial discussion was prompted by the color of the light related to LED replacement. Further, there was some discussion about the specified poles and luminaires in the existing code.

He further shared some options for new fixtures and poles that would improve the directionality of light to prevent leakage toward homes and to the sky.

Mayor Hatfield asked if the Commission would want to specify one fixture and pole or allow a few options to developers. Mr. Parkinson replied you may want to specify color of pole and fixture and the kelvin temperature and brightness but allow some individuality.

Mr. Gochenour asked about the costs of retrofitting. There was a discussion of this topic related to color, brightness and directionality of light. Mr. Ryba related his experience with a different planning board. Mr. St. John commented his interest is color and directionality more so than the actual fixture.

Mayor Hatfield commented he would like to have street lighting addressed for new developments as part of the planning and zoning process.

Mr. St. John asked about future steps for draft language. There was a discussion about language updates and the process it would take. There was further discussion about the question of doing a lighting change or integrate it in a wholistic, large rewrite.

Mr. Gochenour noted that the impact of multiple options of fixtures can adversely affect serviceability and maintenance. Mr. Elliott concurred.

To summarize, Mayor Hatfield said that by the second quarter some of the easier and crucial pieces of the code should be addressed.

No visitors were present to speak to the Commission.

Motion to approve Minutes of the December 14, 2020 Meeting

Motion to approve by Mr. St. John, second by Mr. Ryba. Minutes were approved with six ayes.

Zoning Report

Mr. Pyles briefly shared the zoning report and offered to take questions. He noted that he wanted to mention District 13 and the outside music as they were on a six-month probationary period. He intends to extend his ability to have music for one year unless there are concerns from the Commission.

Mr. Ryba asked about the car wash and if the site can accommodate additional structures. Mr. Pyles responded the plaza developer and Kroger are considering the proposal currently prior to it coming to the Commission.

New Business

Mayor Hatfield queried the Commission as to new business.

Mr. St. John mentioned the condition of the access drive behind CVS.

Next Meeting Date – February 22, 2021

Motion to Adjourn

Motion by Mayor Hatfield, second by Mr. Ryba. Six ayes, the meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.