

**City of Columbus**  
**Public Hearing – Chapter 7A Zoning Regulations Amendment – Planned Unit**  
**Development (PUD) Standards for Senior Housing in the Suburban Residential (SR)**  
**District (PC-15-112)**  
**November 18, 2015**

The November 18, 2015 Public Hearing to receive testimony regarding the amendment to Chapter 7A Zoning Regulations – Planned Unit Development (PUD) Standards for Senior Housing in the Suburban Residential (SR) District was called to order at 8:39 p.m. by Chair Garth Sternberg at the City Hall. Present were Commission members Pam Wolowski, Jesse Preiner, and Jody Krebs; City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, Planner Dean Johnson, and Recording Secretary Karen Boland.

Also in attendance were City Council members Denny Peterson, Bill Krebs and Jeff Duraine; Roger Nase, Pat Preiner, and Jon Wycistah.

**Sternberg:** On to Public Hearing and discussion: Chapter 7A – Public, Zoning Regulations Amendment – PUD Standards for Senior Housing in the SR District, pages 21 through 24. And, at this time, I will ask the recording secretary to please read the notice as published.

Notice was read at this time by the recording Secretary.

**Sternberg:** Thank you. Dean?

**Johnson:** Okay. Uh, this is another one that you've seen more than once. There are several components to this. There's a clarification right now in the suburban–or proposed– in the suburban residential district, which we did not have zoning area identified within the community at this time. But, as a result of this, it, it, we decided we should consider adding senior citizen housing, subject to the performance standards, which you haven't received yet, and these PUD provisions. The next category is just adding a reference to provisions from the PUD ordinance, um, in the community retail district, which has always allowed senior citizen housing, but now it makes reference to the new PUD provision. In the next section, uh, design and performance standards, there's a couple of clarifications that have come about through discussions with the City Council. What's described as senior citizen housing is an age restriction, uh, and then a percentage of those units that's dedicated to that age restriction. And that's very common in other communities. And they chose 55 years or older, and 80% of those units need to fulfill that age limit. There is a little policing requirement in that as times go on, but that, that's pretty standard provision in a lot of communities. The other was an increase from what used to be 16 units per acre, which was just in the dimensional standards category of the ordinance. And it was added to this, and clarified that it would go up from 16 to 20 units per acre. Then at the bottom of the page is that clarification within the performance standards itself; just eliminated that provision. The, the main additional provision then is, um, what is now Section 3 with the existing PUD provisions, with, within the community. Section A or number 1 related to the suburban residential district itself. And that contained bonus provisions to increase from three units an acre to six units per acre. Section B was what you worked on last year regarding the rural residential PUD provisions, and now Section C includes the new provisions regarding senior citizen

housing. It includes a lot of the other PUD, um, recitals, if you will. It talks about, we're exchanging the potential from relaxation of some of our dimensional standards for an increase in the design of a particular project. That could be enhanced landscape design, it could be enhanced building materials—things of that nature. And, so, it's a give-and-take provision that needs to have some clarity. The second section, beyond purpose, just gets into the procedural component of this. And the only change that occurred, from the very first draft, was the reference that implied every project had to coincide with a plat. There could be a situation—and we talked about this earlier—where someone's proposing a single building, there's no division of property, and so that clarification has been made. Otherwise, there are a lot of references, because most, in most projects we would expect there be a, a concurrent procedure between the planned unit development review, which ultimately gets approved as a conditional use, and then the basic platting procedures that you allow, uh, in a normal situation. There have been provisions in the ordinance already about private streets when there are homeowner associations and maintenance agreements in place. That's extended, specifically for this development. Uh, there's a reference in here, which is common in other parts of the City Code, about the creation of outlots. We don't want remnants unless they have a purpose. We are talking about accessory uses, primarily medical or food service, that certainly would be allowed in some of these facilities. And then a simple reference to a required development agreement. What you haven't received—and, again, these changes relate specifically to the av- the creation of procedures to go through the process. What's not included in this ordinance, we couldn't get it done. I do have draft standards, and I think we're going to sit down in one more staff meeting, and then Elizabeth is going to distribute those, but they're not going to be inserted in this ordinance. But, on page one of this draft, it would be a continuation of what is referred to as 7A-766. And those will get into building design, density standards for different types of products. If they are detached homes, if they are attached units, like duplex or quads, it might establish different setback standards for a single-story building versus a two-story or a multi-story building. So those specific standards aren't included here, but this would complete the procedural requirements for someone to come through with a planned unit development related to senior housing. With that, I'll answer any questions.

**Sternberg:** Any questions?

**Krebs:** I do, Mr. Chair. So, um, those that you're developing, would that mean that we would have to come back and do another amendment to the ordinance or is that something that would be just interjected in there at the time of approval?

**Johnson:** No, you'd have a public hearing and, uh, the ordinance would simply read 'Section 7A-766 is amended by adding . . .' And it would continue in that format, and it starts out—we may re-format the whole thing, but I, I've set it up where it would be inserted here. But, we'd have to have another public hearing. But we're going to have, I mean, we'll need a work session, we're going to talk about it. Um, we have, you know, some tentative products that are being proposed and, and, while my preference would have been to create the standards in response to something and be as complementary as can be, we may be looking at revisions to those standards on the basis of the details of the proposals that we do get. And if we don't have proposals sooner than later, you could decide, should we hold them until we do get a proposal? Or do we adopt

them now and then you might amend them again. The one thing that happens with zoning is no matter when you think you're done, you're never done. We amend this ordinance ad nauseum.

**Krebs:** So if we adopt this and it doesn't quite fit that product proposal, do we do a variance to meet that?

**Johnson:** I don't, I don't see anything in this ordinance, which is dealing with the procedural element, that would inhibit anything that's on the books or might come in the future.

**Krebs:** Okay.

**Johnson:** The specific standards: what's the setback? what's the product look like? what are the height limits? those other performance standards, we've not had a proposal and so we don't know what we're reacting to. But, on the basis of a lot of other ordinances that I've reviewed in other communities, there are a lot of standards that are common, and it doesn't mean you have to agree with them. You could modify those as we talk about it or, when you have a specific project, somebody would say, 'well, I was hoping we could have ten-foot sideyard setbacks, not 15.' I mean, there's a starting point. What I've created for you to look at is a starting point, and we'd be happy to give them to an applicant when we've got a product to review, because we like that feedback. We don't, we don't try to aimlessly go about amending the ordinance all the time.

**Sternberg:** Any other questions? Okay, I'm going to open the hearing to the public. Is there anyone here from the public that wants to speak on the matter? Okay. At this right—I'm gonna to close the meeting with the right to reopen if it becomes necessary.

Hearing closed at 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Karen Boland, Recording Secretary