

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 6, 2013

AGENDA

INFORMAL REVIEW

- 1. Post Road Retirement Village – Dublin Senior Community** **6840 Post Road**
13-045FDP **Informal Review**
(Informal Discussion)

NEW CASES

- 2. Tartan West, Subarea B – Villas at Corazon** **Corazon Drive**
13-033AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Approved 6 – 0 -1)
- 3. Kumon Dublin** **6543 Commerce Parkway**
13-041CU **Conditional Use**
(Approved 7 – 0)
- 4. Metro Center** **425 Metro Place North**
13-044AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Approved 7 – 0, Text Modification)
(Approved 7 – 0, Amended Final Development Plan)
- 5. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A1** **6600 & 6620 Perimeter Drive**
13-046AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan**
(Approved 7 – 0, Text Modification)
(Approved 7 – 0, Amended Final Development Plan)

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Alan Perkins, Kristin Yorko, Jonathan Lee, Marie Downie, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any comments or corrections regarding the May 16, 2013 meeting minutes.

Ms. Newell corrected her comments on page 14, fourth paragraph, third sentence, ‘...very flat in the elevations that is in the packet, and on page 16, second paragraph, she replaced the word ‘block’ with ‘designation’.

Mr. Fishman referred to his comment on page 12, paragraph 3 and explained that he wanted to know whether there was going to be shopping in the area. He amended the sentence, ‘Mr. Fishman asked for access for to shopping in the future’.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved to accept the May 16, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Ms. Newell seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Claudia Husak reported that the Community Plan will be introduced at City Council on June 24th.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that all the cases on the Agenda tonight were eligible for Consent with the exception of Case 1, Informal Review – Post Road Retirement Village, Dublin Senior Community. She asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the consent items. [There were none.] Ms. Amorose Groomes determined that the order that the cases would be heard would be Case 3, 5, 2, 4, and 1.

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. Post Road Retirement Village – Dublin Senior Community 13-045FDP

6840 Post Road Informal Review

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting informal review and feedback for the construction of a memory care facility and associated site improvements within Subarea A of the Post Road Retirement Village Planned Unit Development District, located on the north side of Post Road, west of the intersection with Avery-Muirfield Drive.

John Hardt recused himself from this case due to a potential conflict of interest.

Claudia Husak said that some of the Commissioners present were members in 2006/2007 when this rezoning went through the process. She presented a map of Subarea B, which was created at that time for an additional building as part of the Dublin Retirement Village campus. She said Subarea A was currently vacant. She said immediately to the west is the City owned entry drive to the Red Trabue Nature Preserve and to the rear there are walking paths and landscaping. She said at the tree line on the northern portion of the site there a floodplain, so the developable portion of the site is at the southern end of the site. She presented a photograph showing the existing facility, the vacant portion being discussed tonight, and the park drive. Ms. Husak said that the Parks Director asked that it be pointed out that especially on the right side the existing trees planted many years ago and how they had reached maturity today that provides the park entry drive the look and feel hoped for when you drive into the park. She said that was also discussed at City Council level when the rezoning was approved.

Ms. Husak reviewed the discussion items outlined in the Planning Report to guide the informal discussion:

1. Does this proposal adhere to the preliminary development plan or should the applicant make revisions to the proposed layout?
2. Will the Commission consider a minor text modification to permit a memory garden within the required side yard along the western property line?
3. What considerations should the applicant make to address mechanical equipment for the individual units?
4. Other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Husak presented the 2007 approved Preliminary Development Plan for almost 90,000 square feet for the senior care facility. She said that between the reviews at the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, the applicant decreased the size of the building and increased the setback along the western property line, specifically because Council expressed concerns about a building at a height of three stories close to the park entry drive. She said that it was reviewed a couple of times at City Council to get the building as far away as possible from the western property line and those materials were included in the Commission's overview packet.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site plan includes a smaller, 81,000 square-foot building. She said that the applicant is proposing 88 rooms with 100 beds, with a few rooms will be operating at a double occupancy. Ms. Husak said that the applicant is adhering to the building setback on the western side, and in the front, there is an 86-square-foot setback required which is met. She said the parking and access aisles are shared with the existing facility. She reiterated that to the north, there are many limitations to the buildable area due to easements and the floodplain. Ms. Husak said that the proposed building has two courtyards in the center. She said that landscaping is proposed along Post Road. Ms. Husak said that underground stormwater management is being proposed.

Ms. Husak said along the western boundary, the applicant is proposing a memory garden, which will be explained further from an operational standpoint. She said that Planning would like to receive Commission feedback as to whether or not it supports or could support a use of that setback in this type of an arrangement and design proposed. She said a six-foot tall fence is proposed around the memory garden and reminded the Commission that they have recently approved this fence height for memory care facilities. She said usually, they have looked at having a wrought iron style fence that would open with masonry columns interspersed along the fence line, which the applicant is okay with, but the height of that type of fence would require a modification to the development text because the Code limits the fence height to four feet. Ms. Husak said other elements proposed for the memory garden are a walking path, seating areas, an outdoor grills, mailboxes, and clotheslines.

Ms. Husak explained that Planning is looking at this as a use within the setback, which would not be permitted, and therefore the Commission would have to be comfortable approving a text modification to allow this to take place within this area of this site. She said that the applicant had provided renderings. She said Planning had concerns about the fence close to the tree line that juts in and out on the plans. She said considering the drip line of the trees and the masonry columns proposed, Planning would like to work with the applicant more to get the fence away from the trees as much as possible if the Commission were to be okay with it in this particular area.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant is proposing all four elevations of the building be stone, brick, and hardiplank siding. She said the applicant is also proposing PTAC units beneath most of the windows trimmed out to match the window trim with a lighter color. Ms. Husak said at the rezoning stage, there was concern about noise mostly from any kind of ground-level air conditioning units, particularly stemming from the existing building having had older units that were apparently bothering some of the neighbors to the north in Indian Run Meadows. She said that those units have been replaced since then, and Planning has not heard any complaints. She said that the management of air conditioning for this particular building was definitely something that came up at the City Council level as well as at the Commission meeting. She said that at that time, there were thoughts on the applicant's side that those units might be on the roof, but that is not part of the proposal tonight. She presented elevations of the heavily landscaped existing building with stone and stucco as the primary building materials.

Rocky Goins, Vice President of Development, Senior Star, 1516 South Boston Avenue, Suite 301, Tulsa Oklahoma, said that the company had been a member of the Dublin Community for 20 years. He said they were proposing 80 living units. Mr. Goins said they are proposing to have memory care on the ground floor of this building with assisted living on the two upper floors. He said they want to divide their memory care into two different distinctive 'neighborhoods', each having a residential kitchen where food

will be served to bring back memories of living at home, an activity room, and in the middle, a common area activity room which they call the 'Cracker Barrel' with a country store and an operating soda fountain also to bring back memories. Mr. Goins said that for dementia residents, their short-term memory is disabled or lost, and they tend to fall back to their long-term memories, usually happy points in their life. He said that was why they create indoor and outdoor 'lifetime destination stations'. He explained that inside, they will have between 12 and 16 stations, each having unique aspects of their lives, for example, one will be a nursery station where they can hold a baby, one will be a wedding station with a wedding dress, and one could be an office. Mr. Goins explained that outside, they will have different exterior destination stations such as a car station where an inoperable automobile with a radio that can be listened to and the window can be opened will be located. He said the residents will be able to freely gravitate to the station where they feel special at their will so that they are not stressed.

Dan Foster, the applicant's landscape architect, presented slides showing the memory garden. He said a benefit will be that it will provide visual interests for the community and people going to the park. He said it will be something with a garden appearance and garden structures that is heavily landscaped. He said it creates a usable outdoor space where people will gravitate to instead of just a lawn that has to be maintained. Mr. Foster said that it creates a safe place for the Dublin Senior Community residents to enjoy the outside. He said it will help exercise their mobility and improve their memory. He said it will give them a meaningful activity to be a part of the community. He said any of the garden features proposed could be found in any residential project of single-family homes or an apartment complex within the side, front, or rear yard setbacks. He said that they were not asking for something unique in terms of the components included, but to have a garden space. He said on the far end, residents can feed birds and sit in garden chairs. He said the mailboxes will provide interaction so that the residents can feel like they are receiving mail.

Mr. Foster said regarding the setback, this site is in a residential district and the Planned Unit Development is set so that these unique kinds of spaces can be created within the community. He said that arbors, trellises, and open fences are permitted by the Code. He pointed out that six-foot high fences have been permitted for safety reasons in the past. He said that a solid landscape buffer is needed on the driveway edge coming in so that the residents will not be able to see beyond it and want to go beyond it.

Mr. Goins said that all vegetation planted will be edible because sometimes people will want to eat what they see. He said they also will create a labyrinth if followed will lead to the other side of it which a lot of residents with dementia value because it gives them a sense of accomplishment as they go through it. Mr. Goins offered to answer questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application.

Lois Kohn, 6470 Post Road, said she lives independently with her husband at the Dublin Retirement Village. She said they had to be realistic being in their late 80s, that it would be wonderful if they could transition to this adjoining facility as this as the need might arise when their inability to be alone comes.

Steve Langworthy asked where the ideas for the activity stations in the memory garden were derived.

Mr. Goins said that they had researched articles from many different associations. He said that the National Alzheimer's Association had reviewed their plans and made comments. He said that the National Nurse's Foundation assisted them to create the labyrinth. He said that they had a lot of collaboration with many of their competitors that they viewed as bench markers in what they do.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the stations were periodically changed.

Mr. Goins said that they were not changed unless something was not being used; in which case, they would come back to the Commission to with something they liked better. He said he said that a statistic

stated that at 85 years old, one-third of seniors will get dementia. He said that medicine is doing a great job preserving the bodies, but the mind has not been mastered.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no additional public comments or questions and asked that the Commissioners begin their discussion using the four discussion points provided as a starting point.

Richard Taylor said that it looked like an attractive building. He said other than the PTAC units; he had no significant concerns about the elevations of the building.

Mr. Fishman said he thought it would be nice to match the existing building with stone and masonry, which was attractive. He said he also had a real concern about the outside units sticking through the wall because it made it look like a hotel. He said it would look more Dublinized without them. He said he also had a little concern about the hardiplank proposed. He said when the existing building was approved the Commission went to a lot of pains to get it to look like it does.

Mr. Taylor noted that this was a much taller building and that it might be more appropriate to break it up a little more with different materials. He said that the proposed materials seemed okay.

Amy Krumb said she did not have any problems with the architecture, however she was concerned about the air conditioning units especially because it faces a park, the noise they would generate, and the view. She pointed out that the top floors will be very easily visible driving in and from the park.

Ms. Amorose Groomes recalled that when previously approved, they were low and heavily landscaped.

Mr. Taylor recalled that the last air conditioning units approved were actually screened with aluminum screens.

Ms. Krumb recalled that the last units were creatively screened with louvers and landscaping. She said however, her biggest concern was that the units on the upper stories would be visible from the drive and the park. She said she was totally fine with the use, but she did not want to see it at the expense of the entryway into the park. She said if there can still be a useful space and the fence does not interfere with the growth of the mature trees, however how far they have to be, she was fine with that. She said she did not want to see the trees fail or die because they were too close and the roots were damaged.

Ms. Krumb asked if the hill, landscaping, and underground detention area on the south side would remain or be bulldozed and redone. She noted that there were existing, a couple of nice trees on the south side and a nice mounding. She noted that there was not a lot of room for the proposed building. She said she thought they met all the requirements except for the garden, which she said was okay as long as it was not at the expense of the existing landscaping.

Ms. Husak said yes, but there was a requirement on the Post Road elevation to have mounding and landscaping which can be seen on the proposed plan.

Mr. Fishman said the problem he had with hardiplank was that it required maintenance and it could look shabby. He said it would be nice if masonry and stucco with stone, not necessarily matching the existing building. He said every time he had seen air conditioning units sticking out a wall it was strictly due to economics. He said they could do a nice job putting them on the roof and the new units were quieter and very efficient. Mr. Fishman said that individual air conditioning units could be done with rooftop units just as easily as with the PTAC. He said this was a massive building and they should have rooftop units. He reiterated that he would like to see masonry and stone on this building, but he was okay with the architecture. Mr. Fishman said he had no problem with the memory garden except he would echo Ms. Krumb's comments about the landscaping and the entrance.

Joe Budde said he was conflicted about the air conditioning units and was not familiar with putting them on the roof and still having individual room controls, which were extremely important to the residents in such a facility. He said he supported having the units side-mounted as long as they could be screened appropriately so that they did not stand out and the noise factor is controlled. He said he did not have any problem with the memory garden in the side yard as long as the trees are not affected. He asked if the building was adequately setback from Post Road.

Ms. Husak said the building setback from Post Road was within an inch.

Mr. Budde said he had no problem with that.

Victoria Newell said that she did not think the building architecture needed to match the adjoining building, but she wished it included more of the elements from the existing structure that blended with this building. She said the building proposed will look completely different than the existing one and it would be better if they complemented each other a little more. She said she appreciated the design of the memory garden, but Red Trabue is a nature preserve and the park is a very natural setting, and it is preserving the natural state. Ms. Newell said the memory garden will have some of its appearance right next to the park entrance, and she could not support the proposed location. She emphasized that she appreciated and understood why they wanted to have the memory garden for the residents, but she did not think it was the appropriate location for it next to the entry, so close and built within the setback area.

Mr. Taylor thanked the applicant for presenting the project and the fascinating details about the memory garden. He asked if the approved 2007 building was smaller or larger than what is proposed.

Ms. Husak reiterated that it was bigger when the Commission saw it, but it got smaller when it went to City Council for approval.

Mr. Taylor asked if there were the same number of stories on this building as was on the other one.

Mr. Goins said that the number of building stories had not changed. He said this layout was more efficient and the rooms were the same size. He said they make the hallways 8 feet wide to avoid residents feeling cramped.

Mr. Taylor referred to the potential sewer movement to the north and asked if the building still fits within the new boundaries of setbacks and everything.

Ms. Husak said yes, but there really was not a setback requirement to the north. She said because of the constraints there are giving it a setback. She said they can move the sewer and sewer easement if they get an agreement, but not much because of the floodplain.

Mr. Taylor said the memory garden was obviously a much needed use, but he agreed that the entrance to the park should stay as it is. He referred to the Development Text setback requirements where it stated 'That there shall be a minimum building and pavement setback of 30 feet from the western boundary'. He asked if the material in the memory garden counted as paving in that context.

Ms. Husak said the material in the memory garden would count as paving. She said that this Informal Review was brought to the Commission since there was a very long discussion at City Council about this feel of the park drive. She said that Council was concerned about the building being there in the first place and wanted it to be moved.

Mr. Taylor said that there was an extensive discussion in 2007 at a higher level about maintaining that and so those were the reasons he did not support it. He confirmed that the underground detention basin was not currently there, but the mound was there. He pointed out that the text did not specify any dimensional restraints on the mound except that the height had to be between four and seven feet and vary, so it could be narrower. He said if the mound were modified somehow, there looks to be 40 feet between the paving setback and the building on the south side. He asked if that could be an alternate location for the memory garden.

Mr. Goins said they considered that and there were issues in play. He said that they had the right-of-way area for the future expansion of the road, and they added a bikepath that would cut through the mound anyway. He said they love the mound and would hate to lose it, but for those reasons, the mound would go, but they have increased the elevation where they are going to try to do that. He said another thing that they are going to do is to replant it with 3.5-inch caliper trees. He said they want the property to look establish and that should help with the streetscape.

Mr. Taylor said there appears to be on these drawings a fairly large area between the south side of the building and the 40-foot pavement setback and they are quite a ways away from the right-of-way or bike path.

Mr. Goins said that understood that they cannot plant trees on top of the underground storage area.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought a better location for the memory garden is to the north because there is no reason that it cannot be built in a floodplain. She said that they are not permanent structures and landscaping can be placed in the floodplain without any issues.

Ms. Husak said that the underground management of the stormwater does not have to be in the proposed location, so it is potentially something that could be moved. She said the restrictions about what can be built in the floodplain and floodway are very strict so fencing cannot be built.

Kristin Yorko said that nothing can be built in the floodway and then if the floodway, plus 20 feet is less extensive than the floodplain, then they have that additional buffer. She explained that if the floodplain is less than the 20 feet outside of the floodway, then they could potentially do a fence in there, but they would have to do compensating storage and make sure that water still flowed through and it would not dam anything or cause any problems.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that this floodplain was a different character than the 100-year floodplain along the river.

Ms. Yorko said that it had the same 100-year floodplain classification.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a 100-year floodplain was certainly different. She said there were a lot of Dublin houses in the 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Taylor said there seemed to him that there may be some other options for the underground detention basin. He said they have been done under parking lots in the past and there is the 30-foot setback space on the west side where at ground level, there would be no evidence of it. Mr. Taylor said he would like to see that it be explored to see if the memory garden could be located somewhere else than as shown because he would not be able to be in favor of that.

Mr. Taylor said that wall mounted PTAC units have been very begrudgingly allowed by the Commission, either because they were set back quite a distance from the street, and/or they were in a location that was not going to bother anyone because when older, they are not very quiet. He recalled that at the recently approved Heartland of Dublin, they were allowed, but only after they reduced the number of wall

mounted units significantly by moving some to the back and using a custom screen to screen them from view.

Mr. Taylor said that he also noticed that the said the current Dublin Retirement Center has a central chiller unit. He said it was not impossible to do this building that way.

Mr. Taylor said the fence at the Alzheimer's Care facility at Emerald Parkway had a similar configuration with stone posts, and he recalled the Commission discussing the post height, but the building was setback quite a way from the street. He said there was a landscape mound, so it was pretty well visually screened from the street. Mr. Taylor said he hoped that they could find a way to locate this facility here because different levels of care like this seem to work well. Mr. Taylor said if the architecture needs to be stone, it was fine with him they way it was, but if the individual heating units can be addressed and the memory garden can be relocated, he was good with everything.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said her comments did not deviate far from those of the other Commissioners. She noted that the plans submitted showed the fence was located on the property line. She said in the past when the Commission approved a six-foot higher fence, it was earned with landscaping on both sides of the fence. She said she did not think the Commission had ever approved a fence on the property line. She said typically, the Commission asks that the applicant be respectful of the limitations of its neighbors, so whatever the setbacks are for the neighbor would be the minimum setbacks for this owner. She said fencing would fall, in her opinion, within those setbacks.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would not be in favor of fencing on the property line, particularly at a six-foot elevations and when they are only planting one side of it. She said she would like to see the memory garden relocated with courtyard space shuffled, relocation of the underground detention, or whatever has to be done. She said she could support a memory garden that fronted on Post Road which she did not think would be problematic. She said the fencing could be far enough off the road leaving room to landscape heavily on either side of the fence to make it not quite so visible. She said regarding the through the wall heating/cooling units, she could probably only be supportive of them on the east side of the building which would be consistent with what the Commission has approved in the past. She said they are not typically allowed on the frontage of adjacent properties where they can be audible or visible, and to the rear at a City park. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a memory garden was a great idea, which would certainly serve the residents well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if Mr. Goins had any questions or needed clarification on anything that would help him in pursuing this project.

Ms. Newell said that all the Commissioners were supportive of the memory garden, but their issue was the location being proposed. She referred to the comment made that the applicant wants the patients to wander and feel that they can travel to different locations within the building. She asked if there was some thought to redesign where all the memory garden was not in one location, or maybe smaller gardens with more up towards Post Road and a portion along that area, but smaller and maybe going to the rear so that there would be smaller destination gardens that might help this application. Ms. Newell said in terms of through wall units, there are other mechanical ventilation systems that can be used that are more costly, a variable refrigeration system, which is what she thought Mr. Fishman was trying to reference. She said they are extremely efficient, but they are substantially more costly than a through the wall unit.

Mr. Goins said that cost was important in health care and they would like to make it affordable so that residents can afford to come into the community.

Ms. Newell said she thought a variable refrigerant flow would be very appropriate for this size of building, so when you take in terms the life-cycle of the through wall units, it is actually relatively short and the variable refrigerant flow units will have more of a life cycle return and they are externally efficient.

Mr. Goins said they would look at that system.

Mr. Goins said they would like to have only one memory garden to make it easier to see where the residents are located. He said less supervision will be needed to reducing the risk of separation. He said this is an exceptionally tight site and they spent a lot of time locating the memory garden.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the underground water storage basin could be placed under asphalt.

Mr. Goins said the challenge was that it was so big that there was nowhere else on the site to place it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested that they could pursue a relationship with their neighbors to put some of the water storage under their parking lot. She said the majority of the Commission had indicated that they are not going to put a fence on the Red Trabue Park.

Mr. Goins said that they were sorry to hear that. He said he thought what they heard was that they were not going to have the fence on the property line, but that they could set it back and landscape on both sides of the fence.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes and that maybe the applicant could work on the layout of the building. He said he thought the Commission was concerned with the aesthetics of the building and how it fits the development. He said if there are development problems, the applicant has to solve that and he thought he could by reconfiguring the building or making the building smaller. Mr. Fishman said that he thought the ideas and the concepts were great, but we have worked long and hard and Red Trabue is a gem in Dublin. He said he agreed that they cannot have a fence next to the entrance. He said however, he thought it could be worked out by reconfiguring the layout and maybe the building.

Mr. Taylor said he did not support the memory garden in the location shown, and he assumed by default, that included the fence.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was not necessarily opposed to the memory garden in the location shown, if it were well landscaped and screened, but she could not support a fence along the drive to Red Trabue park, particularly one that is six feet tall.

Ms. Newell said she did not think it was at that location. She said the building is going to be massive, right next to the entry and that was why there were concerns about it becoming a three-story building. She said unfortunately, it is a tight site and they have maxed out the development, which was the issue that they all were all struggling when they looked at the memory garden clearly pushed up to the property line. She said that is not done with most development within the City of Dublin.

Mr. Taylor said he was in favor of keeping the original 30-foot setback to the building the way it was discussed in 2007.

Ms. Amorose Groomes reiterated that she could not see putting fencing along the roadway to the Red Trabue Park, particularly one that is six feet tall.

Mr. Goins asked if the fence could not be seen from the road would that be acceptable

Mr. Taylor said no, not to him because something would have to be put there to block the view, and what the text, City Council and the Commission talked about six years ago was that was to be a 30-foot setback and there was an extensive discussion about keeping it the way it was.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the setbacks and vistas is what makes Dublin, and they typically do not go to property lines with anything other than trees and grass. She said that was kind of what makes us and we would really love to have this in Dublin, here but it has to work for everybody including the residents that are in love with the park and frequent it. She said it has to be a 'win-win' for everyone, and when they go up to the property line with things, it is not a win-win any longer.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she hoped that the balance of the Commission's comments were clear and will help the applicant in moving forward with the decisions that have to be made. She thanked Mr. Goins.

Mr. Goins thanked the Commission for their feedback.

**2. Tartan West, Subarea B – Villas at Corazon
13-033AFDP**

**Corazon Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and approval of modifications to an approved plan to eliminate 2 buildings and expand the footprint of up to 15 buildings in Subarea B of the Tartan West Planned Unit Development District. The 31.7-acre site is located north of Corazon Drive at the northwest corner of the Tartan West development. Ms. Amorose Groomes determined that a staff presentation was not necessary for this consent item.

Ms. Newell said that driving by the site, she noticed that nearly all of the asphalt pavement, the driveways, and the entire stance of curbing through this development are abnormally deteriorated for the age of the construction. She suggested that staff should look into it for future development and to what standards the pavement and curbing is being installed. She said the curb is cracked literally almost every foot or two consistently and there are raised humps on several of the driveways that would suggest to her that the subsurface grade is not being adequately prepared.

Ms. Husak said it should be installed to City standards, even if it is private and that she would look into the issue.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application.

Jim Harris, 9357 Pratolino Villa Drive, a board member of the Corazon Homeowners Association, said he wanted to make sure that staff's recommendation on the condition is made part of this application that the site elevations have the same architectural integrity and trim work as what currently exists. He pointed out that the submitted drawings show an inferior product.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the applicant had agreed to the condition, which addressed his concern. She said that the drawings would not necessarily reflect that, but the text will. She explained that the text will trump the drawings when it comes to the development process.

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to approve this Amended Final Development Plan application because the proposal complies with the development text, provides more diversity in housing choices within the Subarea, and is consistent with the theme and appearance of the remaining residential units and as modified the amended final development plan criteria and existing development in the area, with one condition:

- 1) That the side elevations have the same amount of detailing with building materials choices, including stone, as the elevations approved by the Commission in 2011.

Rob Jereb, representing Steve Newcomb, Newbury Homes, Inc., 169 South Liberty, Powell, Ohio, said that they agreed to the condition.

Victoria Newell seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, abstain; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

**3. Kumon Dublin
13-041CU**

**6543 Commerce Parkway
Conditional Use**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and approval of a Conditional Use for an educational institute to be located within an existing office building located on the west side of Commerce Parkway north of Perimeter Drive.

Claudia Husak said that Planning Assistant, Jonathan Lee, had recently graduated from The Ohio State University with a Masters Degree in City and Regional Planning. She said that she wanted to thank him for helping the past two years. She said that Mr. Lee is currently seeking further employment and he is highly recommended.

Ms. Amorose Groomes wished Mr. Lee all of the best and thanked him. She said that he had prepared a wonderful presentation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this case. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Richard Taylor moved to approve this Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor. (Approved 7 – 0)

**4. Metro Center
13-044AFDP**

**425 Metro Place North
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting review and approval of modifications to the parking requirement for an existing office building located on within the Metro Center Planned Unit Development District, between Metro Place North and Metro Place South, west of Frantz Road. She explained that motions for a minor text modification and the amended final development plan will be necessary. She said that the Commission is the final authority on this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those intending to speak in regards to this application, including Jack Reynolds, Smith & Hale, LLC, (37 West Broad Street, Columbus); representing the owner and the applicant and City representatives. She determined that the staff presentation was not necessary for this consent item.

John Hardt commented that if he understood the parking calculations correctly, they have arrived at number of parking spaces based on a certain amount of office and general and medical offices. He said

since he had been through this before, he was a little concerned that if there is ever any finer interior tweaks of leasable space it would mess up the calculations and the applicant potentially would have to go through this process again for what would be a minor issue. Mr. Hardt suggested that the required parking spaces be rounded down to 400 spaces to give a little latitude to deal with changes, if the applicant has no objections to that.

Ms. Kramb asked if this application also had a Text Modification requested.

Claudia Husak said that she had reflected that number of spaces with the requested Text Modification

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if 405 parking spaces had been rounded down from 410 spaces.

Ms. Husak explained that they had three less parking spaces than what was required.

Ms. Amorose Grooms agreed that the condition should be amended to 400 in lieu of 405 parking spaces.

Ms. Husak clarified that meant that 400 spaces were required for this building at this size.

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited public comments regarding this application. [There were none.]

Motion # 1 and Vote – Minor Text Modification

John Hardt moved to approve this Minor Text Modification to modify the development text to require 400 parking spaces for the 101,944-square-foot office building located at 425 Metro Place South for either regular or medical office use because the required text modification is minor in nature and the site has more than adequate number of parking spaces available based on the observations from the building owners.

Amy Kramb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote – Amended Final Development Plan

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because the proposal is consistent with the criteria for an amended final development plan. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Grooms, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

5. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A1 13-046AFDP

6600 & 6620 Perimeter Drive Amended Final Development Plan

Chair Chris Amorose Grooms introduced this application requesting review and approval of modifications to the parking requirement for two existing office buildings located within Subarea A1 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North, on the north side of Perimeter Drive west of Avery Muirfield Drive. She said that motions for a minor text modification and the amended final development plan will be necessary. Ms. Amorose Grooms said that the Commission is the final authority on this application. Ms. Amorose Grooms determined that a staff presentation for this consent item would not be necessary. Ms. Amorose Grooms swore those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Brent Davis present and City representatives.

Ms. Amorose Grooms invited public comments in regards to this application. [There were none.]

Motion #1 and Vote – Minor Development Text Modification

Richard Taylor moved to approve this Minor Text Modification to modify the development text to modify the development text to require parking at a ratio of 1 parking space per every 250 square feet of either regular or medical office for two existing office buildings (6600 and 6620 Perimeter Drive) within subarea A1 of the Riverside PCD North because the required text modification is minor in nature and the site has more than adequate number of parking spaces available based on the parking counts provided by the applicant. Joseph Budde seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote – Amended Final Development Plan

Richard Taylor moved to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because the proposal is consistent with the criteria for an amended final development plan. Joseph Budde seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Additional Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested that the Communications portion of future meeting agendas be moved to just before the Commission Roundtable so that the public and applicants would not have to sit through the conversations unless it was pertinent to them.

Jennifer Readler said that her new contact information, effective June 1st, had been distributed by Ms. Husak. She announced that seven attorneys had moved from IceMiller to Frost, Brown, Todd. She said that City Council will be considering a resolution transferring the contract on June 10th.

Commission Roundtable

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no roundtable items to discuss.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 18, 2013.