



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 22, 2013

AGENDA

- 1. **Perimeter Center Planned Commerce District, Subarea I – Crown Kia – Sign**
13-082INF
(Informal Discussion) **6400 Perimeter Loop Road**
Informal Review
- 2. **Village of Coffman Park PUD**
13-076PP/FP
(Preliminary Plat Approved 6 – 0)
(Final Plat Approved 6 – 0) **Kenzie Lane**
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat
- 3. **Tartan West – Villas of Corazon**
13-078AFDP
(Approved 6 – 0) **0 Corazon Drive**
Amended Final Development Plan
- 4. **NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace Centre – First Team**
13-083CU
(Approved 6 – 0) **3868 Hard Road**
Conditional Use

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, and Joe Budde. Victoria Newell was absent. City representatives were Tammy Noble-Flading, Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Rachel Ray, Jordan Fromm, Vinny Wang, Jennifer Readler, Alan Perkins, and Libby Farley.

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. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any comments or corrections regarding the July 18, 2013 meeting minutes.

Ms. Kramb noted that Ms. Amorose Groomes' name was misspelled on Page 3.

Ms. Amorose Groomes corrected her comment on Page 7, 'She stated silver maples barely made the her list of the landmark trees program.'

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the July 18, 2013 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Hardt seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined that the order of the cases heard would be Case 4, 2, 3 and 1. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**1. Perimeter Center PCD, Subarea I – Crown KIA – Sign
6400 Perimeter Loop Road**

**13-082INF
Informal Review**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting an informal, non-binding review and feedback to replace an existing 15-foot tall, 50-square-foot ground sign for an existing car dealership in Subarea I of the Perimeter Center PCD, located on the north side of Perimeter Loop Drive, approximately 370 feet west of the intersection with Mercedes Drive.

Rachel Ray presented this proposal to replace an existing ground sign with a new ground sign that would be consistent with the KIA corporate branding standards for sign color and design. She said the existing Crown KIA dealership sign is located in the southwestern corner of the site. She said the Crown Auto dealership was zoned PCD, Planned Commerce District as part of the Perimeter Center development, and Subarea I was created specifically for automobile sales facilities. She said included in Subarea I are the dealerships of Crown Mercedes Benz, to the west, Crown/Chrysler/Dodge/Jeep to the east, and Crown KIA. She said a revised development plan for a third dealership was approved in November 2001 for the Chrysler dealership. She said the Chrysler approval also included modifications to the signs for the overall dealership campus.

Ms. Ray presented the existing 50-square-foot, 15-foot tall, internally illuminated sign with a dark blue sign face and translucent white lettering for the copy and logo which included the KIA dealership name. She said it was difficult to see on the rendering, but there is a red circle circumscribing the KIA lettering. She said that was a condition of approval that it be a subdued shade of red when it came before the Commission in 2001. Ms. Ray said the existing sign sits on a brick base consistent with the existing signs approved for the adjacent dealerships in the campus.

Ms. Ray said the proposed ground sign is to be installed in the same location as the existing one and it is approximately 14 feet in height with a rectangular aluminum base and two decorative scoring marks midway through the base. Ms. Ray said that the aluminum sign cabinet is approximately 37-square-feet and has just the KIA logo. She said the sign cabinet includes an opaque white background and an illuminated red KIA lettering.

Ms. Ray said the development text for Subarea I of the Perimeter Center PCD states that architecturally integrated signs are required to meet all applicable Zoning Code requirements. She said the existing overall height and area of the sign meet Code requirements, but the size of the logo and the fact that it is an oval shaped sign cabinet is inconsistent with the requirements. She said this would require a minor text amendment if the sign were to be approved. Ms. Ray said that in addition to the Zoning requirements, the 2001 condition of approval requiring a subdued shade of red would apply to the KIA sign.

Ms. Ray said that the applicant is requesting feedback from the Commission on the proposed sign before a formal application is submitted for an amended final development plan. She said that Planning proposes the following discussion questions:

- 1) *Does the proposed KIA sign design meet the development text requirement that signs be "architecturally integrated" with the dealership campus?*

Ms. Ray presented photographs of existing sign bases on campus that were consistent with the beige brick material that is used as the predominate architectural feature on the buildings. She said the proposed sign has very little resemblance to that particular feature. She showed a photo of the existing KIA, Crown Mercedes, and Chrysler/Dodge/Jeep/Chrysler/Ram dealership signs with very similar sign bases.

- 2) *Would the Commission support a campus-wide request to modify the existing dealership signs? If so, what design considerations should the applicant address through revised campus-wide signs?*

Ms. Ray said the Commission was probably familiar that many car dealerships bringing forward requests to modify their signs and other site elements to be consistent with corporate branding standards. She said in fact, the adjacent Crown Chrysler dealership and the Mercedes dealership came before the Commission in 2009 with request to modify their secondary architecture elements to be consistent with their new branding standards. Ms. Ray said that other car dealerships have received approval from the Commission for comprehensive, campus-wide signs and branding packages. She presented for an example, a photograph of the adjacent MAG dealership to the east which was approved with a special sign plan with five separate categories for different types of signs which included campus and dealership identification signs, directional signs, brand signs, and wall signs, all of which were generally intended to be internally oriented to the site and provide more of a wayfinding onsite campus identification.

- 3) *Does the Commission support minor development text modifications to allow a logo to exceed 20% of the maximum permitted sign area (max. 10 square feet), permit an oval-shaped sign cabinet, and permit a sign that is not "architecturally integrated" with the existing dealership buildings (depending on the outcome of Discussion Question 1)?*

Ms. Ray reiterated that the proposed sign design includes a logo that exceeds that maximum permitted area of 10 square feet, and is oval-shaped rather than rectangular as required by the Code.

- 4) *Others as determined by the Planning and Zoning Commission.*

Tom Hart, 2 Miranova Place, Columbus Ohio, representing the applicant, Marc Wigler, President and General Manager, Crown Automotive Group, said that proposal was driven by the national standards for the manufacturer and contract requirements for signs. He said that their current sign has been there for ten years and they were looking for a modern upgraded approach to the signage for KIA. He said that they appreciated that Dublin has this informal process so that they can get the Commission feedback and understand their thoughts on the issues outlined by Ms. Ray.

Marc Wigler, (5912 Preston Court, Powell, Ohio), concurred that they appreciated this forum where they could try figure out what is needed. He said that they had a lot of pressure from the manufacturer to incorporate branding standards that are important to the dealership, as all three dealerships have this type of sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment regarding this application. [There were none.]

Richard Taylor said that the sign was attractive, but unfortunately, Dublin has always been against what they called 'lollypop' signs, like this one. He agreed that the existing campus signs were dated and that an upgrade would be appropriate. He said he thought it would have to be campus-wide. He said to a certain degree, this sign was architecturally integrated with the existing building, but that theme would have to incorporate all the signs. He said that it was previously done with the MAG campus. He said likewise, the Mercedes dealership revised the entryway, the dealership integrated it with the existing signs. He said regarding the size of the sign, he did not support the logo being larger than Code permits. He said if the sign is going to be changed, he thought the logo should be kept the maximum size permitted, be integrated into the building and that all the signs be comprehensively modified.

Joe Budde said he agreed that an argument could be made that the look of the sign is integrated with windows of the building and could be acceptable. He said he agreed with comments made by Mr. Taylor that the logo and that it be limited to what Code permits. He said he also agreed that campus-wide approach to modifying all of the signs.

Warren Fishman said that he agreed with the comments of the commission members. He recalled however, that that when this campus went in with all of the dealerships, the Commission talked a lot

about the fact that it would be low key since it was across from residential development and that it was not going to be a typical auto car mall. Mr. Fishman agreed that the signs were out of date, but said that they had to remain low key, even more than MAG which was in a different location. He said this is kind of the entranceway, and he thought that they did not want to exceed the size or the shape that is in the text now, and he would not be in favor of changing the text. He said he was not in favor of the proposed sign because it looked too commercial and not fitting with the surrounding area. He agreed that there should be a sign package for all of the dealerships that are low key, in good taste, and this not be a big blaring red sign that said KIA.

Mr. Wigler said that 20 years ago when the dealerships began, there were no facility image guidelines like the manufacturers have today. He said the KIA signs are usually 35-feet tall, but he told KIA that the City would not allow that because it was a huge departure from what they have. He said he understood about the sign being low key, but the problem they have is that there is such a departure between three manufacturers. He said the pylon sign was not what Mercedes Benz wanted and Chrysler wanted an entryway which the Commission approved. He said that he understood that they were one campus and they want the signs to be similar, but that there was no real similarity between a KIA and Mercedes. He said that they believed it was time to upgrade the dated signs.

Mr. Fishman said that he sympathized with Mr. Wigler, but there were many other communities that would not allow the sign and perhaps they just do not have KIA dealerships. He said he did not think the sign proposed was typical of signs in Dublin. He reiterated that was reflected in the early meeting minutes, that Crown promised low key, non-blaring, and high end signs. He said he would not support this sign.

Amy Krumb said as shown, she did not think the sign blends into the architecture. She said she would have to see campus-wide signs for all three dealerships that have sign faces that match. She said that she was fine with an oval sign, but she would not support the height. She suggested that the KIA sign that was four feet off the ground, might be acceptable but she would have to see the base. Ms. Krumb said if all the dealerships had a similar base that integrated into the buildings, she thought it would look nice. She did not want to set precedence by allowing them to exceed the 20 percent permissible for a logo size. Ms. Krumb said she had no problem with the red color or the oval sign, but she had a problem with it being that high and not matching the other signs.

John Hardt noted that the development text required that the signs be architecturally integrated with the buildings. He said that this is part of the Perimeter Center PCD, and that similar language appears throughout the entire planned area, and all of the existing signs included common masonry elements and match the buildings. He said he was not inclined to drop that architectural integrated language from the development text and he would want to see a solution that incorporates the requirement. He said a proposal that incorporates all three signs would be something that he would be supportive of. He said he did not think they all had to match, but they needed to incorporate common elements and have a unified base. Mr. Hardt said he had no problem with the shape of the cabinet as long as it met Code requirements for maximum size. He said he agreed with the other Commissioners that the logo should be limited to twenty percent. He said that the City just recently modified our sign requirements to allow more flexibility with logos but he was inclined to allow further variations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that she thought there were options available to architecturally integrating these signs. She said she did not know that they all needed to be the brick. She said other elements of the building could be incorporated into the signs. She encouraged the applicant to find one that suits the dealership. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would support a campus-wide request to modify this dealership signage. She said she thought the existing signs were very dated and detracted from the area. She said she would not support exceeding the 20 percent for the logo, so she thought they needed to adhere to the Code. She said in terms of the oval shape, she was supportive of it opposed to the square. She said she would supportive of more latitude if they reduce the height. She said the sign cannot be seen from US 33, so she did not know it to be critical to maintain the height.

Mr. Hardt commented that the applicant should be cautious about referring to the Midwestern Auto Group campus as an example. He said those signs came through with a great deal of discussion and they were approved based on the fact that they are architecturally integrated with that building. He said it did not necessarily make them a good fit for this building. He said he thought they needed to come up with something that was unique to this facility.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicants had received clear feedback from the Commission.

Mr. Wigler said that they had received clear direction and thanked the Commission for their feedback. He said that they would like to upgrade the signs and maintain a high standard of signs.

**2. Village of Coffman Park PUD
13-076PP/FP**

**Kenzie Lane
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a preliminary plat and final plat for a subdivision of 2.339 acres into two reserves to facilitate the development and construction of 28 condominium buildings, on the north side of Wall Street, east of Discovery Boulevard.

Gary Gunderman presented this application for the site located between Post Road and Wall Street. He said that the Agenda and Notices incorrectly stated that the parcel was 8.77 acres being split into three parcels, when it was actually 2.339 acres being split into one reserve. He said technically, this is a preliminary and final plat, but it is more of an administrative issue intended to transfer the title to the subject area from one person to another. Mr. Gunderman said there is no impact or change in any of the development features. He explained that the previously approved final development plan for the 63 condominium project remains unchanged. He said that there was nothing about this particular action that has any impact on it. He said all it does is make it possible for the ownership to transfer of this area which was a feature that probably was not necessary in the past. Over the past few years, financial institutions have taken a somewhat different attitude. He said to proceed with this project and obtain building permits and financing, the applicant needs to have title to the underlying real estate. Mr. Gunderman pointed out that that this was a Reserve lot because the intent is to continue with condominiums over the top of this area just as the first portion of project has been done. He said otherwise, it would have been called a lot, but as a reserve, its intent is unique because it is to have condominiums on top of it. He said that there will be no change in the approved final development plan. Mr. Gunderman said that this final plat will allow the applicant to take title to this area, but if they want to continue on with more of the project, they will need to do something similar, and depending upon how development proceeds may need to amend the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Gunderman said that Planning recommends approval of this preliminary plat with no conditions, and that it be recommended that City Council approve the final plat with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal, including labeling the contour lines on the preliminary plat, and;
- 2) That the utility easements be labeled as private on the final plat.

Rosalind Childers, Vice President, Davidson-Phillips, Inc. said that they wish to continue what they started on Phase I of the development. She explained that they purchased ten buildings in April 2012 that were in various stages of occupancy. She said that they needed to have 18 units in order to sell it. She said there are many interested buyers waiting if they are able to continue to build the next 11 pads. She said that the 11 units in the Reserve area are already developed with pads, so the water, sewer, and storm sewers are in, and the only thing remaining would be the completion of the buildings and curbs. She said the property is currently owned by Coffman Partners, LLC and that is what necessitates the transfer and the plat.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application.

Gary Gray, (6022 Kenzie Lane, Dublin, Ohio), said that Davidson-Phillips had done a great job and everything that they said they would do when they took over the property. He said that he recommended that they be allowed to continue to do what they started.

John Hardt asked who currently controls the property.

Ms. Childers said Coffman Partners LLC, was the original developer, but this request will transfer it to the control of Davidson-Phillips, Inc.

Mr. Hardt asked if the original developer will retain control of the balance of the development.

Ms. Childers confirmed that the original developer will retain control of the balance of the site. She said they have a contract on the next area west if they are able to proceed. She said this will depend on the future use of the rest of the property.

Mr. Gunderman pointed out that if the alluded to development does come before the Commission and it is approved, then the area will need an amended final development plan.

Mr. Hardt said he understood that if anything other than condominiums were to happen to the west of this parcel, it would require a whole review process.

Mr. Gunderman said that if that did or did not happen, it would not impact this particular area. He said either way, this area remain unchanged because the utilities and other facilities are all done.

Mr. Hardt recalled that at the Informal Review several months ago, there was a proposal to turn the private road south so that it would loop and reconnect to Wall Street. He asked if this proposal will keep the private road in its original location.

Mr. Gunderman said that was correct.

Warren Fishman asked if this would be developed exactly like the previous zoning.

Mr. Gunderman said that everything will meet the same final development plan conditions that were previously approved.

Joe Budde and Richard Taylor indicated that they had no comments or questions.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the cut through shown was intended to possibly provide access to the office building site on Post Road.

Mr. Gunderman said that there was nothing on any of the plans that would suggest that.

Ms. Childers said that there is an office building with a walking path to Post Road, but that was all.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the office building was on and off again for a long time.

Mr. Gunderman recalled that he had tried to convince someone interested in the office building that they should combine that to make a better project.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that there were no more comments.

Motion #1 and Vote – Preliminary Plat

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Preliminary Plat because it complies with the preliminary plat criteria. Ms. Kramb seconded.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote – Final Plat

Mr. Taylor moved to recommend approval to City Council of this Final Plat with two conditions:

Mr. Budde seconded the motion.

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal, including labeling the contour lines on the preliminary plat, and;
- 2) That the utility easements be labeled as private on the final plat.

Ms. Childers agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

**3. Tartan West – Villas of Corazon
13-078AFDP**

**0 Corazon Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting additional patio options for residential condominiums in the Villas of Corazon, located in Subarea B of the Tartan West Planned Unit Development District, on the east side of Hyland-Croy Road, south of the intersection with McKittrick Road. 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 Steve Newcomb, Newbury Companies, (169 South Liberty Street, Powell, Ohio), Jim Harris, President of the Corazon Homeowners Association (9357 Pratinolo Villa Drive, Dublin, Ohio), David Hill, Vice President of the Corazon Homeowners Association (9353 Pratinolo Villa Drive, Dublin, Ohio), Joseph Schutt, (9340 Roseto Villa Drive, Dublin, Ohio), and City representatives.

Tammy Noble-Flading presented this amended final development plan for the Villas of Corazon which proposes alternative patio locations for four, single family condominium units in the subarea. She said the site contains a mixture of single-unit family and multi-unit condominiums being accessed from the two roadways. Ms. Noble-Flading said to the north of the site is zoned for commercial development and is part of the Tartan Ridge PUD, to the east are large lot residential development located within Jerome Township, to the south are other portions of Tartan West, and to the west is the Glacier Ridge Metro Park.

Ms. Noble-Flading said the applicant is proposing alternative locations for at-grade patios. She said Units #13, #17, #19, and #21. She said the bases of the request is to provide alternative patio spaces for units that have larger open space connected to them with the idea that the homeowners would either be permitted patio space to the rear or to the side. Ms. Noble-Flading presented the plat showing the 15-foot by-40-foot tentative patio locations where the property owner can select where to construct an at-grade patio.

Ms. Noble-Flading said as part of this proposal also includes to eliminating Unit #16 to accommodate patio space for Unit #17. She said that the applicant has also proposed landscaping associated with all four of the patio locations with horizontal and vertical elements to the buffering treatment.

Ms. Noble-Flading said that Planning proposes a condition that solidifies the idea that the future property owners would be permitted patios either to the rear or the side, but not both; and a condition associated with the opposition that was expressed by an adjacent property owner which will eliminate Unit #13 from this proposal. She said that Planning recommends approval of this reviewed this amended final development plan application with the two conditions.

Steve Newcomb said that the original development was approved for 78 attached units and has been modified, since then, to respond to market demands. He said that there was more demand for detached units and through modifying the site design of this subarea, the lots have gotten deeper and wider which has created more demand for versatility to areas proposed for outdoor amenities. He said this was the general idea for this proposal.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this case.

David Hill, Vice President of the Villas of Corazon Homeowners Association, representing the Board of Directors, said that they had been before the Commission several times for modifications to this subarea. He said that the current homeowners are all supportive of completing the development within the subarea as long as they project is completed with all of the features that were originally committed to by the developer. He said that they appreciated the effort that the developer and the City has put forward in trying to address homeowners issues however, as the HOA, they were interested in viewpoints of all the residents.

Mr. Hill said that they gave this proposal a thorough evaluation on behalf of the homeowners. He said they looked at it in terms of the community uniformity which is a very important element in a condominium association; consistency on design elements, impacts to reserves and overall changes to the original approval. He said based on all those considerations, the Board opposes the patios on Units #19 and #21, is in support of the patio addition on Unit #17. He said that they are aware that Unit #13 has been removed from the proposal. He said that Lot #17 is an exception based on the fact that there is no space for a patio to the rear. He stated that the Board would like to review the design of the patio, and associated landscaping, to ensure it is consistent with the other units.

Jim Harris, President of the Villas of Corazon Homeowners Association, confirmed that Mr. Hill had let the homeowners association know the position of the Board trustees. He said that there were currently seven completed free-standing condominiums with five different exterior plans. He said they cannot have custom homes with several different exteriors and still maintain a common theme. He further stated that with each modification to the plan, units have decreased. He said that the five units already lost is \$15,000 a year in lost revenue. He said that they have the same ongoing expense and maintenance costs but less revenue to pay for the expenses. Mr. Harris said they do not want to have continual changes to meet the perspective buyers, that takes away from the uniformity of the community and decrease revenue generation.

Joseph Schutt stated that he was an adjacent property owner to Unit #13 and had expressed concern for a patio location, to the site of the unit, based on the fact that it would be located outside his dining room window. He said it was not what it was presented to be initially and felt it would have a negative impact to his family. He also stated that he spoke to the owners of Units #15 and #22 and was told that there had been some communication with the owner of Unit #18. He said the property owners were in favor of the proposed plan with the elimination of Unit #13.

Mr. Hill said that as a Board, they solicited from the entire community for feedback and they received same feedback that Mr. Schutt. He stated the difference in the information that he presented was that

the responses included 60 percent of the community. He said much of the feedback that the Board received was property owners felt that through modifications to the approved plan, it did not meet the proposal that was in place when they purchased their homes.

John Hardt said that he respected the Board members position in that they were speaking for the majority of the current homeowners, but he did not subscribe to the argument that the community should have complete uniformity. He said that he was sensitive to the fact that multiple amendments to the plan result in increased financial burden for the rest of the homeowners because of the reduction in units. Mr. Hardt said on the other hand, the Commission was hearing a consistent message that the adjacent property owners who would be most affected by this proposal were in favor of the request.

Amy Krumb said she came to the meeting thinking that this proposal was acceptable but based on the comments presented by the public, she believes these are valid concerns.

Joe Budde said he was perplexed as to why Unit #13 is not moving forward.

Warren Fishman said the developer was trying to sell units, which is a huge advantage to the community. He said if the same building materials are used, it will be a spectacular community. He said he did not want to see this tabled because he thought it would unnecessarily hold up the completion of the subarea. He said this was the first time he had heard that homeowners were against units being eliminated which would provide more open space. He suggested that they modify their deed restrictions to charge based on square footage or charge an initial small assessment to new residents the first year if their unit exceeds the square footage of the other units. He said when the project is finished there will be very few owners complaining that there is too much open space.

Richard Taylor said when the Commission considers all the different types of proposals and specifically how those proposals impact the surrounding community. He said that he did not see any impacts to the surrounding community with this proposal. He said that based on the fact that the Board received the information late in the process, he was not prepared to make a recommendation on the proposal.

Steve Newcomb said that he was not sure of if much would change because he and the homeowners association had different philosophies. He said he was just trying to complete the project.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Mr. Newcomb if he would like the Commission to vote tonight or would like to table the application to have the opportunity to make any concessions.

Mr. Newcomb said that he would like the Commission to vote on the proposal.

Ms. Krumb asked why Unit #13 was being eliminated from the proposal.

Mr. Newcomb explained that it was based on concerns from an adjacent property owner.

Jennifer Readler pointed out that there was a provision in the final development plan review process that the Commission can request additional information or revisions and table the application without the applicant's consent.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that a decision was needed to be made as to whether or not additional information is needed.

Mr. Taylor said the only additional information that would have any impact him would be whatever the parties came up with between now and the next time meeting. He said he did not think there was any more technical information that would assist him in making a decision.

Ms. Krumb asked if the homeowners adjacent to these particular units have consented to the plan.

Ms. Noble-Flading said based on the testimony provided to the Commission, they had consented to the plan.

Mr. Newcomb said that he had spoken to the owners of Units #32, 30, 28, and 18 and they were in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Hardt said the only other technical information he would prefer was related to Unit #19. He stated that he would like to have grading plans for this unit. He stated that the plans show a walkout basement. He said if the grading plan was correct, the rear patio or side patio could not possibly be at the same elevation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that if Mr. Hardt felt he needed additional information before he voted, there should be a motion to table the request.

Motion #1 and Vote

Mr. Hardt moved to table this amended final development plan. Mr. Taylor seconded.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Kramb, no; Mr. Budde, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Mr. Taylor, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Table 2 – 4. Motion Failed)

Mr. Budde suggested a vote to approve this Amended Final Development Plan with the condition that Units #21 and #19 not be approved at this time, but they could come back in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there would a new application fee.

Ms. Readler explained that it could be tabled and no additional fee would be required.

Mr. Hardt commented that Units #19 and #21 were the ones he had the most concern about, so if the applicant was agreeable to the condition, he would make a motion that the Commission approve this application with the condition that the side patios on Units #19 and #21 be eliminated along with Unit #13.

Mr. Newcomb said he would rather have it tabled if the reason was that the Commission needed more information.

Mr. Hill said they would support moving forward with the proposal.

Mr. Hardt thanked Mr. Hill for his willingness to work with the Commission. He said he wanted it to be understood that once the Commission votes and approve this, even with the condition, they cannot ask for it to come back before the Commission. He said it would have to be done with the trust that the two parties would work the details out amongst themselves.

Mr. Hill said they had not seen any design details for Unit #19.

Mr. Hardt said that his point was that the Commission had not seen a rendering of the proposal. He asked if this was approved with the condition that the construction details and the configuration be worked out with staff approval, could the Commission formally or informally request that when such a proposal comes to staff to they may engage the homeowners association.

Ms. Readler said yes, staff could make a good faith effort to work with the homeowners association.

Motion #2 and Vote

Ms. Kramb moved and Mr. Budde seconded to approve this Amended Final Development Plan because it allows patios to the side of the single-family residential units and provides additional options for potential homeowners within the subarea, with three conditions:

- 1) That the option of outdoor patios be limited to either the rear or the side of the units, but not permitted to have patios in both locations and with the design and construction details subject to staff approval;
- 2) That the patio option for Lot #13 be eliminated from this proposal; and
- 3) That the developer and homeowners association meet and make a good faith effort to come to an agreement on the design and construction details for the patios.

Mr. Newcomb agreed with the conditions.

Mr. Budde seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.

4. NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Kroger Marketplace Centre – First Team 13-083CU

**3868 Hard Road
Conditional Use**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this Conditional Use application requesting the conversion of an existing 1,500-square-foot tenant space to a personal training facility located within Subarea 5A of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development District on the north side of Hard Road, west of the intersection with Sawmill Road. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in those intending to speak in regards to this application including Jackson Reynolds III, Smith and Hale, (37 West Broad Street, Suite 725, Columbus, Ohio), representing the applicant, Sawmill Hard Center LLC and City representatives.

Ms. Amorose Groomes determined that a staff presentation was not necessary for this consent item since the Commissioners had no comments or questions regarding the application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments regarding this application. [There was none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Conditional Use application because it complies with the applicable review criteria, with no conditions. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0.)

Communications

Steve Langworthy corrected the Administrative Report for the Commission liaison contacts. He said he also would be out of the office beginning a week from Friday, August 30th until Monday, September 16th. He said if they could not get ahold of Jennifer Rauch to contact Gary Gunderman.

Commission Roundtable

Ms. Amorose Groomes referred to the email sent to the Commissioners yesterday about going before City Council and asking for their blessing to look at the Bridge Street Corridor Code. She said she had asked them to identify some things that they would like to look at and review. She said she did not want to

discuss those things tonight, she just wanted to know what it was that they want to look at because it was premature to discuss them without having a great deal of information and some research done. She said that they certainly wanted to give staff what it is that they want to look at and so they can bring forward the changes that they are interested in seeing as they pertain to these subjects, and then perhaps bring forward the information of the discussions the Commission had pertaining to those sections when they were initially looking at the Code, and then the Commission would come forth with some recommendations for the changes that they would like to see made.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said wanted to take bites of it and feel like they have thoroughly processed those and send them forward and keep taking additional bites until the Commission feels like they have accomplished all the tasks they were setting out to do.

Mr. Taylor said in the interest of being brief and keeping the categories of things that they want to look at broad so that they all as a group can decide how deep they want to dig, his top three sections of the Code that he would like to look at are Section 62 – Building Types; Section 65 – Site Development Standards; and Section 66 – Review and Approval.

Mr. Hardt said most of his comments were technical updates which he thought staff was already looking into. He said his three primary things that he had concerns about that he would want to delve into are Street Types and how details are handled in general; Building Types, particularly some of the architectural prescriptive solutions; and the Review and Approval procedures.

Ms. Kramb said first on her list was Street Types because there was nothing in the Code that defined Street Types, and there was going to be a guide that would go with the Code. She said she wanted to find out how and if the guide is working or what is being used. She said they were told by an applicant that certain things were prescribed in that street, such as on street parking on both sides. Ms. Kramb said she could not find that in the Code. She wanted information on how we are deciding what those standards are and if that relates to the application guide or whatever there is that the Commissioners do not know about. She said likewise, the Street Types fell into the typical street elements, the bicycle paths, the on street parking and that kind of things. She said she too had the Approval and Review procedures on her list. She said she had the Lots and Blocks on her list and the tables they set forth with the specific...they shall be ___ many feet... She said she would like to revisit those specific numbers again to see how valid they were.

Mr. Budde recollected that the Commission had two cases before them and now they were going to undertake this endeavor. He said he felt like he would like to have more experience before they do this. He said he had nothing that he would like to revisit.

Mr. Fishman agreed that the Commission should take this piece by piece. He said he had problems with the Administrative Approval because he thought they were putting a terrific burden on Planning for them and he hated the surprises when they deviate for an approval. He said he would like to look at what should be approved administratively and what should not. He said he agreed that the Streets Types and Building Types should be looked at closely to make sure that they come up with something that they do not deviate.

Ms. Kramb added that she would like to see a list of all the Administrative Approvals, including those in the Historic Section that goes to the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Planning also to think about what they wanted the Commission to revisit. She asked how many cases had the Administrative Review Board had within the District.

Ms. Ray said it was approximately to 50 or 60 cases. She said a memo with the information was being prepared for City Council, and it could be forwarded to the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said that would be great. She said that the Commission wants to hear the things that staff wants to have them review also. She said everybody will have to work hard on the things they want to do and they will be brought collectively together to start.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning would try to separate the technical, cleanup items.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she did not want to wait until they are done to forward things.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said she would like to look at the Street Types, Site Development Standards, and the Review Process.

Ms. Amorose Grooms suggested identifying some for phase 1. She said if there were technical clarifications to send to City Council, she did not think it would generate much discussion or heartburn on Code reference sections.

Mr. Hardt said with Code, the devil is in the details and he thought changing part of it and sending it on to City Council while the Commission is still working on other parts might not work best.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they could talk further about that.

Mr. Taylor noted that there were five votes for Review and Approval, four for Street Types, and a tie between Building Types and Site Development Standards. He suggested they might take them in that order.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said agreed. She asked if Mr. Langworthy had any thoughts or anything to add to the list.

Mr. Langworthy said he had thought a lot about the idea of having lists from Planning and the Commission, and said he would see how many of those fell together. He said he was intrigued about that because he thought the Commission would have a better sense of seeing the forest and Planning has a better sense of seeing the trees and how important the trees come together. He said that may be interesting.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked Mr. Langworthy to meet with Planning and discuss the list. She said if he wanted to begin bringing technical things, she did not necessarily disagree with Mr. Hardt, but she did not know that technical things are going to unravel the sweater, so if they are Code references, typos, and those sorts of things, the Commission would go ahead with those at Mr. Langworthy's earliest convenience.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked what would be the best way to do this, if the Commission wanted at the September 5, Commission Roundtable to start discussing this; take them one at a time beginning at the top, or assign several of them to different "mini-chairs".

Mr. Hardt said he thought that was fundamentally a good way to approach it with staff helping with research and information, but he thought before anyone can be a committee chair and dive into this, they probably have to have a dialogue about what exactly each of the Commissioners want to discuss.

Ms. Amorose Grooms requested that the Commissioners come to the next meeting with their concerns were on the Code sections on the list.

Mr. Taylor asked if the purpose would be to establish the protocol and agenda.

Ms. Amorose Grooms added ...and what specifically in the Code sections they would like to review, so that some directive can be given to staff as to what information the Commission needs and what input they need from staff and where their perspective is on these issues that are being discussed.

Mr. Gunderman asked that at the next regular meeting the Commission would have some discussion to round out how to proceed.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they would start discussing about what specifically about the Review Process, Street Types, and so on and so forth that they wanted to discuss Code Sections 066, 061, 062, and 065 at the next meeting. She said she did not think they wanted to go through them word by word and strike words, but identifies the general themes in the particular Code section that they would like to see addressed.

Mr. Taylor asked if special meeting dates would be set on September 5th.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said once they know how much information they have to cover, they can start to say long they thought that it might take to discuss those in light of the Commission schedule, and they would ask Planning to talk generally about upcoming case loads. She said that might spur additional meetings. She said when the Commission began this conversation, they committed that they would meet as often as necessary to expedite it in a timely fashion. She said that they originally talked about trying to keep their Thursdays free.

Mr. Hardt said that if the next time it is discussed is September 5th, by the time they arrive at that night, September 12, a date currently open will no longer be available.

Mr. Hardt said that they had previously discussed setting Special Meetings on September 12th and 26th.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if the Commission could meet in the Council Planning Room.

Mr. Gunderman said he thought they could do that.

Ms. Amorose Grooms reviewed the upcoming Commission meetings to be September 5th, a Special Meeting, September 12th, and regular meeting on September 19th, and another Special Meeting on September 26st. She said if any of the meetings needed to be cancelled because they were ahead of schedule, they would make those decisions at that time.

Mr. Fishman asked that staff include in the Meeting Packet the four sections and any comments they had about each one of the sections.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked that a lead for this project be assigned for the Commission to work closely in the absences of Ms. Husak and Mr. Langworthy.

Mr. Langworthy said that it would be a team effort.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said at whatever point Planning had their list ready, the Commission would welcome that. She said they would want to have it ready at the next meeting.

Mr. Fishman requested a separate packet that would include anything that Planning had to add that the Commission could talk and think about the four Code sections.

Mr. Langworthy agreed to do that.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if there was anything else to discuss.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that in the newsletter, there was a blurb about changes to the email and a comment that if they had interest in that started in their email box, they should save it. He asked for clarification on what exactly was happening and what was going away and what was not. He said it seemed that if they downloaded or archived emails and saved it, they were putting information on their personal devices, which was exactly what they were told not to do. He said he had emails that he did not need immediately, but he had filed them in a folder because he thought it might be useful to him some day.

Ms. Readler suggested that IT be contacted to see if there was a way to download the information from the account onto City.

Mr. Gunderman said ideally, what they would like to do is let the Commissioners pull out whatever items they were concerned about, and then see if there was a way to get those into the City directory. He said that staff would have to look into it to see how that can be facilitated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested there could be a holistic backup and send everything that everyone had back to their original destination.

Mr. Gunderman said that IT seems to have passed by that bend in the road and they are no longer on that page.

Mr. Hardt said he found it hard to believe that the entirety of the City staff is going to lose all their previous emails.

Ms. Noble-Flading said that IT had told Planning that when they switched over to Outlook, they programmed all of the City email accounts to switch over, and they simply did not include the Commission and Board members. She said IT explained that essentially, that was going to be burdensome to redo the entire list and include all the Commission and Board members. She said that they was not sure how many and what emails would be pertinent. IT asked if Commission and Board members had something in their email account that they wanted to keep, that the member do that using whatever means they want. Ms. Noble-Flading said that IT is anticipating switching over to Outlook in three weeks.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Legal Department could let IT know the problem of doing what the members are being asked because they were told exactly not to do that. She said it needs to be worked out. She asked if they could comingle the emails on their personal devices or not.

Mr. Hardt said within his City of Dublin inbox, he had a folder with a couple of hundred emails at the most that he would prefer not to download on his private personal device for all the right reasons. He requested that IT somehow retrieve that out of the old server, and transport it into the new server. He would appreciate it if someone would report back to him if that was possible or not. He said he did not want to lose it or download it.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if that was a pliable solution, let the Commissioners know and they all would create a folder for information that they want to be kept in it, and they will come up with a common name, like 'Save Me,' and go forward from there.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any additional comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 19, 2013.