

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 17, 2014

AGENDA

1. **NE Quad, Subarea 3 - Wyandotte Woods Multi-Family
14-032INF** **Wyandotte Woods Blvd.
Informal (Discussion)**
2. **Woodlands at Ballantrae
13-103INF** **5638 Cosgray Road
Informal (Discussion)**
3. **U-Haul
14-038CU** **6419 Old Avery Road
Conditional Use (Postponed)**
4. **BSD Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – 4535 West Dublin-Granville Road
Coldwell Banker King Thompson
14-057MPR/MSP** **Minor Project Review/ Master Sign Plan Review (Postponed)**
5. **BSD Residential District – Tuller Flats Residential Development
14-008BPR** **4313 Tuller Road
Waiver (Disapproved)
Basic Development Plan (Approved)
Basic Site Plan Review (Approved)**

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, Victoria Newell, Amy Kramb, John Hardt and Todd Zimmerman. City representatives present were Steve Langworthy, Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Yazan Ashrawi, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Joanne Shelly, Devayani Puranik, Jeff Tyler, Barb Cox, Kristin Yorke, Dana McDaniel, Nikki Martin, Andrew Crozier, Logan Stang, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were no cases on the consent agenda this evening and was notified moments ago that the Coldwell Banker case was postponed and the UHaul case had been postponed prior to the meeting, per the applicant's request. The Chair determined the cases would be heard in the order of the published agenda. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

1. **NE Quad, Subarea 3 - Wyandotte Woods Multi-Family
14-032INF** **Wyandotte Woods Blvd.
Informal**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for informal feedback for a 120-unit multiple-family development to be located west of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, 1,000 feet north of the

intersection with Emerald Parkway within Subarea 3 of the Northeast Quadrant Planned Unit Development District.

Jennifer Rauch said this is an informal review for the second time through for this particular site which is located within the Wyandotte Woods Subdivision off the recently connected Wyandotte Woods Boulevard. She said the site is approximately 14 acres of undeveloped land. She said the applicant presented a site plan informally in May of this year which had one main entry drive with a secondary access to 3 four-story buildings with 40 units within each building and parking located behind the buildings. She said the intent of the proposal was to push the development as far to the south as possible to take advantage of some of the grade changes and provide a large open space buffer between this proposal and the single-family portion within Wyandotte Woods currently under construction.

Ms. Rauch said there is an existing stormwater pond located in the northeast corner of the site and the proposal includes a pool and club house in the northern open space. She said some of the comments that the Commission provided in May were related to the heights of the buildings and how the development fits within the entire existing neighborhood. She said there was discussion about covered parking and this portion of the proposal has since been removed. She said the applicant was encouraged to revise the proposed architecture to be more in line with the existing neighborhood and with additional attention to detail.

Ms. Rauch said they have revised the plans including a layout that looks similar to the previous proposal, but with larger and relocated stormwater facilities following the direction by staff to more accurately depict the needs for this development. She said the site plan also includes an area for deferred parking, should the Commission want the applicant to meet the parking now or at a later date. She said the Code requires 300 spaces for the 120 units proposed.

Ms. Rauch based on the concerns of the proposed building height some of the discussion on May by the Commissioners, the applicant has also included an option for 3-story buildings in a four-building layout. She said they would retain the single access off Wyandotte Woods Boulevard with the proposed buildings facing each other with a neighborhood type street running through the middle with parking proposed on either side. She said the parking to the north would be oriented toward the existing single-family homes and the club house will be within the trees. She said the new layout takes up more land on the property and impacts more trees. She said the applicant revised the architecture with a central building and added dormers to break up the massing of the roof, consistent gable and arch feature that is also replicated on the outdoor patio areas for each building. She said the other two building elevations show a similar rhythm and design as the central building without the main gable feature in the center. She said the materials will be brick and stone on all sides of the buildings. She said the applicant provide section drawings that show the proposed building height in context to the existing homes to the north. She said the proposed 4-story buildings exceed the text limitation on height by over 10 feet, but given the grade it takes up over the site it would be in line with the height of the single family that is adjacent to this project.

Ms. Rauch read the Discussion Questions:

- 1) Which site layout provides the best site design, including building layout, parking, and open space?
- 2) Would the Commission support a text modification to increase the building height?
- 3) Is the revised architectural concept more appropriate to the surrounding area?
- 4) Would the Commission support a lower parking ratio for this development than required by Code?
- 5) Other considerations by the Commission

Jason Kambitsis, AR Building Company, 310 Seven Fields Boulevard, Suite 350, Seven Fields, PA 16046, said they started with a staff meeting on April 3rd wanted to get any concerns and get initial feedback on

the design. He said they met with the HOA on April 15th, at the Fire Station on Hard Road and received valuable feedback. He said the following day they met again with staff to relay the information from the HOA meeting and received more feedback on the updated design. He said they met with the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 15th to informally get more information and feedback. He said when they completed the updates there was another staff review on June 19th and they returned for another HOA meeting on June 24th.

Mr. Kambitsis said the big things discussed were how can they meet the market in Dublin, how can they push the market within their building, how can they get higher rents and reach for luxury apartments with architecture and materials that were accepted and wanted in Dublin. He said they researched other development within Dublin to set a precedent of the direction they should be going in when developing their buildings, site layout and usable open space, as they are all add to the community. Mr. Kambitsis said they are proposing a parking ratio of 1.75 spaces per unit and wanted to keep it less than 2.5 spaces per unit.

Mr. Kambitsis said they are showing what a development within the Code could look like and noted the changes within the Planned Unit Development for height and parking. He showed a site plan of 4 buildings with 30 units each topping out at 35 feet with 2.5 spaces per unit of parking. He said the current zoning allows 120 units.

Mr. Kambitsis said they are looking to build a high quality development that meets the density of the zoning but also meets the character, feel and wants of Dublin. He said they want to create a development that has usable open space for the residents and the entire community.

Mr. Kambitsis said the Code does not talk about design, it shows in figure 18 some sort of guidance in an elevation but those are not stated in the PUD text. He said this figure does not show where they would like to go in terms of design and everything they heard it is not the preference of anyone else they have met with. He said if they went with the Code compliance plan they would create a lot more impervious surface, would have to build 25 percent larger ponds and would take up more than 25 percent of usable open space for parking and building footprints, not to mention the additional tree removal.

Mr. Kambitsis said the benefit of going 4 stories is they will build a better building with elevators, no breezeways, more dramatic view for the residents creating a higher market as expected, invest more into the facades of the buildings to follow the wants and needs of the community, and create much more usable open space with less foot print, and take the air conditioning units and put them on the building and not on the ground. He said they feel there is a lot of an added benefit to going to 4-story buildings.

Geoff Campbell, Rothschild Doyno Collaborative, Architecture and Urban Design Firm, Pittsburgh, PA, said they have been working with AR Building Company for about 15 years on their projects throughout the nation. He said when they look at the zoning text for this PUD Subarea 3, the multi-family zoning requirements stating that the architectural style and materials will be consistent with those as indicated in figure 18, and that the colors and materials should be coordinated with the surrounding architecture.

Mr. Campbell said the Code mentions stucco and brick and shows a style that is not relevant to the comments from the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said that he would like to understand is the Code something they need to use as a standard or because it was created in the 90's they should move on and base their elevations on the comments that were heard from the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that it is a site specific within the community. She said the piece of property that they are contemplating is in a very nice part of town that is surrounded by schools and single-family homes and they are asking for different architecture than expected in other more commercial districts of the community. She said they want to raise the bar to match the surrounding uses.

Mr. Taylor said they moved past that the last time they were here.

Mr. Campbell said he appreciates the comments. He said from the comments heard from the HOA were to increase quality, focus on materials, and on detailing. He said they heard not to use vinyl, do not stretch a one story building into a 4-story building and to look at Craughwell Village as an example of a good project that had gone through the process using a high level of details.

Mr. Campbell said he visited Craughwell Village looking at the materials, brick, stone, wood shingles, HVAC units on the roof, the mix of materials, the dormers, and the existing precedents as part of the context. He said they went back to the drawing board to adapt the amenities, the porches, and scales of building plans. He said they came up with a plan and submitted to staff and their comments were roof expanse too massive, windows needed to be vertically centered and proportionately sized, need a better material relationship, and to provide more perpendicular elements to break the planes of the façade.

Mr. Campbell showed revised elevations investing more in the front façade of the buildings that will be visible from the street. He said they incorporated elements from Craughwell Village having a central gable, arched openings that accented the center, providing balconies, using a mix of stone and brick with a strong stone base. He said the roof tops will have all the HVAC systems and will be completely invisible from the front and hidden in the gable. Mr. Campbell asked if the architecture was consistent with what the Commission was expecting.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said they will hold off on their comments until they hear public comment.

Mr. Campbell said the next item they reviewed was the height and from the comments they felt there was support for 4 stories as an option because it provided more open space. He said they are going about 12.5 feet above what Code permits with the grade sloping about 12 feet.

Mr. Kambitsis said the parking has an effect on the open space and the surrounding community. He said they want to make sure that when people come and live in this community that they can park without searching for available parking. He said they had talked about going from 2.5 to 1.75 parking spaces with analysis from other communities that they built, own, and run. He said one sister community is Cranberry Community which is very similar community to Dublin. He showed examples of other communities that have similar parking ratios. He said they have never had anyone leave their community due to parking. He said just from experience the ratio of 1.75 is the best for their community but they do have the space to expand parking to 2.5 parking spaces per unit if needed.

Mr. Campbell showed the site plan and tree survey that was done in 2010 showing all the existing trees on the site and said that they are dedicated to meet the Code in tree replacement. He said they have identified 9 legacy trees that are greater than 24 inches in diameter, the current site plan does not impact 5 of them located in the south of the site. He said the current site plan does impact trees 1, 2, 3, and 4. He said they are doing their best effort not to impact those trees by possibly moving the center building back a little to retain trees 1 and 2 on the survey. He said trees 3 and 4 will be impacted by the site plan and wondered if that is a situation that will hold this project or something that could be replaced if they are able to maintain the other 7 legacy trees.

Mr. Campbell said the HOA had concerns about the detention pond location near the stadium on the adjacent site and they propose changing the pond to a dry retention pond for a better solution. He said the northern pond is serving the single-family homes and would double in size with this development. He said they are working to understand how to increase the pond while being sensitive way to maximize the open space as much as possible.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said there are a few signatures on the sign-up sheet and will begin with those and then anyone else that would like to speak to this application will have the opportunity.

Kathy Harter, Trustee at Wyandotte Woods, 7825 Holiston Court, thanked the developer for meeting with them, they have met twice and appreciate their time. She said they have been emailing neighbors to get feedback related to this development. She said the area has established a character of heavy tree coverage and foliage at the entrances of other neighborhoods and businesses. She said they were looking at all the development in downtown Columbus and noticed they are moving in the direction of using natural materials that really carries the City and would be preferred in this part of Dublin. She said this development should fit in with the surrounding community. She said the 120 units seem like a lot of units and was not sure what the name of the community will be and she wondered what impact there might be to the school district. She said they have been experiencing housing construction and the trucks coming through the development and hoped that the truck traffic utilizes the back entrance. She said the football field is light and neighbors are concerned that the field is used all year round and wondered what impact the parking lots of this project will have when lighting is complete for safety concerns.

Jerry Kosicki, 4313 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak to these plans and said getting this development is very important for the neighborhood. He said he appreciates the quality building standards, designs, and the use of natural materials, land use guidelines, and the character of the residential neighborhood. He said they understand this site was zoned for multi-family a long time ago and are very aware of the need for reasonably priced housing, current market demand for rental units, and the desire to develop this property. He said he is not opposed to any of these goals. He said he and everyone else in his neighborhood would be more comfortable if they were considering a condominium project. He said they would like to see as many trees retained as possible and this property developed in an environmentally responsible way. He said at the last meeting he criticized the plans because of covered parking solutions, inadequate off-street parking, height of the buildings, and the overall appearance of the building materials and architecture. He said the new plans are only a step ahead of the previous plan. He said the 4-story buildings are too large and would be largest buildings within the City except for North and South Terraza Court at Tartan West that he can see. He said buildings that are built to a standard that can be creditably converted to condos at a future point might be a better long term investment and fit the community. He said the proposed buildings are too tall, too massive and do not fit the neighborhood. He said the new plans do not provide any type of covered parking with garages or parking structure and was informed that renters do not care about covered parking by the developer. He said it seems that covered parking is an integral part of the proposals at Bridge Street that is targeting empty nesters and young professionals. He said he is fearful that their neighborhood will be saddled with overly large buildings that are inferior to those proposed in Bridge Street. He said this development will generate substantial traffic and this should be handled where it does not burden on the neighborhood and hopes that if traffic is sent west on Wyandotte Boulevard that traffic calming measures and enforcement will be forth coming.

Brett Page, 7638 Kelly Drive, said to his knowledge the extra height at Craughwell Village was approved because of being within a highly commercial area which does not compare to this neighborhood. He said this development is not a minor height change and he feels it should be a zoning and not a minor text change and adding 12 feet is not a minor change. He said the developer has indicated that they own the land and he does not believe that to be true and would like the ownership confirmed. He said one of the selling points of AR Building Company is that they keep the development they build and if they do not own the land how they can be sure that they will retain the property is questionable. He said if they do not own it they are just waiting to see what they can develop before the purchase the land. He said he does not think they have increased the quality of materials. He said the bottom line is that there are lighting rod issues regarding this development regarding the Code, quality, and what is appropriate for their back yards. He said developers that have not purchased the property but are waiting to see what they can potentially get prior to the purchase of the property.

Jennifer Readler said it is common to have an owner sign an application to have a representative who is pursuing zoning for feasibility.

Kim Smith, 4385 Wyandotte Woods, said this is her first meeting. She said she questioned this being a luxury apartment development with only providing 8-foot ceilings and debates over what type of quality materials are being proposed. She said if this is a project for empty nesters it will not attract them because of the lack of covered parking spots. She said some of the points that have been made are not in agreement with what is being proposed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone else that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Krumb said she had sent an email requesting the height of the apartments that are near the High School.

Ms. Rauch said Subarea 3 is the site being discussed, Subareas 6A & 6B has units that are 30 feet, 6 inches to the top of the gable and Subarea 4 has a maximum height to the peak of the gable 35 feet. She said Craughwell Village has a height of 38 feet.

Mr. Taylor said this plan is a big improvement as far as the exterior. He had some concerns about the roof pitch, the dormers on the roof pitch with a hip roof at two different roof pitches and the front to back roof pitch is lower than the roof pitches on the sides and it looks like 8/12. He said he believes that the dormers are going to hurt the project and he would prefer not to see the dormers because the lower pitched roofs because you see a lot more side wall on the dormer. He said they are trying to play down the height of the building. He said he hopes when they see the detailed plans that they will see more detail of materials and more texture and building materials with brick coursing and bands and sills and headers to give the building some texture.

Mr. Taylor said the fencing hiding the HVAC units on the roofs is going to attract more attention and should be screened with a different solid material. He said the entrance at the east side should find a way to make that a right hand turn only and to work with staff to make sure it is a right turn. He said the building should be pushed more to the south and he appreciates the green space between the building and the parking. He said he is okay with building height because they are getting better architecture. He said the materials should be full dimensioned brick. He appreciated the idea to allow for future parking and initially having less parking because they are encouraging less cars. He said it is always difficult to add a building and building type that is different than the surrounding area, but this is the future of Dublin as an infill community. He said this is an appropriate use of the property and overall they have done a good job bringing the quality level up and preserving as much open space as possible and is in favor of the project.

Mr. Hardt said they have made some progress in the architecture, the elimination of the covered parking for aesthetic reasons is an improvement. He thanked the applicant for the continued communication to the neighbors and mitigating as many concerns as they can. He said he remains open to 4-story buildings because it keeps parking and buildings from the existing homes, creates more green space and tree preservation. He said the only reason he is willing to consider 4 stories on this site is because of the topography. He said 4-story buildings with elevators make better neighbors than three story buildings with breezeways. He said he would be more comfortable if this was a development text modification that was forwarded to City Council for further review. He asked what the signature material is on the building with the large centered gable.

Mr. Campbell said they are looking at a manufactured stone.

Mr. Hardt thought stone was most appropriate. He said the gable in the aerial perspective is a parapet gable that extends past the roof line and is not appropriate because it makes the façade look more massive than necessary. He asked that they change to an ordinary gable that stops below roof line at the break and freeze boards. He said the elevations have come a long way and asked for detail on the

railings on the porches and suggested they be a permanent material of vinyl or PVC or something appropriate with the trim of the building. He said the undersides of the balconies are intended to be closed.

Mr. Hardt said site details regarding emergency access in the northwest corner needs to be addressed having a dead-end into someone's back yard in not appropriate and should be wrapped into the parking lot to downplay the emergency access drive and look at pervious pavement.

Mr. Hardt said the landmark trees should be preserved and saving 7 of the 9 is a good attempt to preservation.

Mr. Hardt said the dumpsters locations should be identified and kept from the residents.

Mr. Zimmerman said he can support the project and the text modification only because of the topography of the site. He said the architecture is appropriate and agrees with the lower parking ratio with authority provided to the City to enforce the construction of additional parking if needed. He said the open space on the north side should have a playground for the community to enjoy something and provide the best buffer they can do between this development and the single-family homes in trees and plantings. He said the pool and clubhouse should also be screened.

Ms. Kramb said the height is okay with the topography and would like to see line of site drawings from the other side with topography lines. She said she does not like the four buildings and is willing to have taller three buildings and would like to see the center building moved south to preserve trees 1 and 2. She said she understands there may be two landmark trees lost and replaced on site. She said they should provide more buffers around the club house and pool area for noise control. She said she does not agree with a playground and thought this development should be kept a quiet community especially with the park across the street. She agreed with removing the dormers on the roofline to minimize the roof. She said the emergency access issue can be solved with the street being curved south into the parking lot. She said they should have wet ponds in the southeast corner and not dry detention because that corner already gets really wet.

Ms. Newell said she appreciates the improvement in the designs and would like the fine details in that building to be carried out with the character through all of the components. She said she does like the dormers. She said she is uncomfortable with the height of the building. She said this is a beautiful site with a grove of trees and they want as much green space preserved and this is the first application that has preserved the largest area of green space in a way that is much more pleasant to the surrounding residents. She said there are some unique things about the site that gives merit for going 4 stories to preserve that much more of this site. She said the wet pond is a better amenity for the neighbors and should be treated as an amenity and made a nice feature, incorporated into the site. She said the entry street with on-street parking should have permeable pavers to help with stormwater runoff and also provides an amenity for the residents and gives a residential feel. She said they should make sure there is parking for visitors and she said she is not a supporter of reducing the parking ratio, but could support if there is a plan for future parking if needed. She said the emergency access could have a structured base below turf without any pavement across and should appear as a natural entrance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant for working with the residents and incorporating their comments and hoped they continue to in the future. She said the 3 versus 4 stories is a challenge because of the zoning in place but would be supportive because of the topography and open space. She said to preserve as much of the green space and be sensitive to the neighbors as much as possible. She said the benefit of the three building layout outweighs the cost of the 4-story nature of the structures. She said the building height is deferred to staff to address. She said to continue the quality of the materials in terms of windows, balcony treatments, doors and anything that can increase the quality will be appreciated. She said she supports the lower parking ratio with a plan in place for future parking if

needed. She said buildings served by elevators are a nicer building than a buildings serviced by stairs. She said Craughwell Village was an illustration that they wanted to point them to for high quality not necessarily duplicity. She said to feel some freedom to be creative even if it is not like Craughwell but equal in quality.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that everything built on this site would be curb and gutter. She said the worst example of a dry pond in the City is near this site at Scioto High School and she is only supportive of a wet pond of a living breathing eco system and not a place for stagnant water. She said they should use permeable pavement wherever possible to down play the entrance egress to minimize the traffic to filter out to Wyandotte Woods. She said for this site saving 7 of 9 landmark trees is a good effort and she agrees that the tree replacement should be sensitively placed for the neighbors.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant had any questions.

Mr. Kambitsis asked if there is a comfort level to proceed to a final application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed.

Mr. Kambitsis said there were several comments regarding covered parking and they are working on potentially providing garages on site. He said there is a calculation used to determine how many per unit and thought 30 or 40 garages might be estimated. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there does not require any motions or votes for this application and moved to the next informal application.

**2. Woodlands at Ballantrae
13-103INF**

**5638 Cosgray Road
Informal**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a potential rezoning of 17.7 acres to allow detached condominium units where attached units were previously approved on the west side of Marmion Drive, north of the Rings Road extension (Churchman Road).

Claudia Husak said she was filling in for Tammy Noble-Flading.. She said the application is about Subarea R, which is one of the subareas within the Ballantrae development. She presented the site and explained the City's intent to extend Rings Road which will become Churchman Road. She highlighted the site in yellow, pointing out the northern portion in Subarea R and said the southern portion has developed thus far with just two approved buildings left to be built. She presented the Final Development Plan that was approved in 2004 for the entire development. She said the applicant is proposing to change the design from attached to detached on the northern portion shown in red. She explained this area was approved based on the FDP for 21 buildings and a total of 80 condominium units that were a mix of 3 and 4-unit buildings. She presented the approved elevations and how it translates into reality where there is a lot of siding and stone used in more of a Cape Cod type of design with some large dormers and porches. She said the color scheme is generally light with most of the units containing 2-car garages.

Ms. Husak said the applicant was before the Commission in December 2013 with a proposal as shown on the screen that shows 72 detached condominium units in a layout that emulated more of a single-family arrangement with homes in the general style that Ryan Homes had been building at the Estates of Scioto on Sawmill Road. She reported there were concerns from adjacent residents within the Woodlands of Ballantrae as well as Ballantrae as a whole. She said the Commission shared many of those concerns regarding the mass, scale, and height of the buildings with the predominance of the two-story design that close to one another creating a walled up feeling with the lack of preservation of open space. She indicated there was some desire to simplify the architecture to make it more in line of what the existing Woodlands of Ballantrae architecture in terms of color and materials.

Ms. Husak said the applicant's revised proposal addresses some of the comments by the Commission and adjacent residents. Most significantly, she said the applicant is changing the type of unit proposed with a more ranch or 1.5-story, empty-nester geared design with first floor master bedrooms. She reported there was a reduction of units to 64, which created a little more open space. She said there are some areas where units are clustered more and have been staggered to create open views into the golf course and allow for landscaping. She explained the central road and pond already exist on the site which was planned for the attached units. She said the applicant has provided an elevation as an example of architectural design intent for the units to which they are requesting feedback. She said the applicant would also like comments on the variety number of units to the types of units being proposed.

Ms. Husak read allowed the Discussion Questions:

- 1) Does the redesign of the site appropriately respond to the Commission's comments?
- 2) is the proposed architecture appropriate for Ballantrae Golf Community?
- 3) Do the proposed elevations effectively create an architectural theme for the Woodlands of Ballantrae?
- 4) Other comments from the Commission?

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to speak.

Randall Woodings, Kontogiannis Associates - Architects & Planners, Columbus, Ohio, said in December when Ryan Homes came in and initiated some discussions on this site they were marketing this project to families. He said after listening to comments from neighbors and staff they asked for guidance. He told them to listen to the Commission comments, meet with the neighbors and homeowner's groups, which they have done. He indicated they decided to go back to a lifestyle community that will market to seniors and empty-nesters. He said they have considered more open space with more open views. He said they are at 64 units and are asking for feedback to see if they are headed in the right direction. He said the architecture that Ryan had proposed, they are no longer using any of that plan. He said 1-story to 1.5 stories is being considered with no more than three bedrooms in any of the units and all will include first floor master bedrooms. He said they have decided to theme it to look a little bit more like the neighbors in terms of stone, siding, and detailing. He indicated they are fine with one color or if two are used, they will be very close in hue. In closing, he said he wanted feedback on the revised plans.

Patrick O'Brien, 5646 Marmion Drive, said he is exactly across the street from one of the units. He said the existing building on the south side of Marmion Drive had available guest parking to the south of it. He said across from that are proposed labeled units 29, 30, 31, and 32 but there is no guest parking all along that strip. He indicated it is obvious that if you are visiting one of the new units, the only parking you can see is what is associated with the pre-existing units. He is requesting guest parking for units 29 – 32. He said Ryan has been particularly good in working with the residents. He said the resident's number one objective was to get to the genuine empty-nester lifestyle situation to be compatible with what exists. He said they appreciate that change. He said they have a valuation concern as the pre-existing run 1900 - 2500 square feet and the new units will be smaller. He said if the price per square foot were going to be the same, then the new units would be coming out in the low \$250's, which would be a large detriment to all the current owners. After speaking with Ryan, he was told they were getting closer to \$170 as an entry price. He said public price will state more like \$300, which the current residents would be happy with. He thanked the Commission for protecting their interests as Ballantrae residents.

Scott Hendrick, 5737 Ballantrae Circle, right across the pond. He said he had been a resident of Dublin for 17 years and works in Marysville. He said his first main concern is while there may have been several meetings on this, he lives right across the pond and stands to be very affected and this is the first time he learned of this effort and feels fairly unprepared to process this and discuss it with the Commission. He asked if there has been enough notification around. He reported they moved to this property about

five years ago, when the plans were to have approximately 21 buildings; and 64 units sounds really crowded and will not look like the other condominiums and is concerned with the overall appearance and is asking if that is going to impact their property value. He indicated when he viewed this project online, he was concerned about the landscaping and hopes they will see high standards. He said he did not fully understand what the siding would look like as most of their homes have stucco material. He asked the Commission to consider the characteristics and make sure they are consistent with the surrounding area. He referred to the map that showed the area behind the units where there appears to be a lot of green space, right on the golf course and again asked the Commission to consider how that should look and be maintained.

Ms. Amorose Groomes questioned the timing of the notice requirements.

Ms. Husak said this area was notified people within 150 feet of the development for this type of application. She said she needs to review the lists to verify whether Mr. Hendricks falls within the buffer. She said this is an informal so before there is a shovel in the ground, it would come to the Commission and again, people would be notified. She said it might be helpful if this gentleman could leave his address on the sign in sheet and staff will add him to the list for the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said in light of having ponds and golf courses in the back, maybe the notification area should be expanded.

Ms. Husak said the HOA is also usually notified.

Ms. Amorose Groomes emphasized the need for increasing the zone for notification when a golf course is involved; at least touching the adjacent property owners on the opposite side of the golf course. She said the good news is, it is an informal review and they are not making any decisions tonight.

Laura Nelson, 6948 Ballantrae Loop, and said it was located just a little bit down the street from this development. She said Ballantrae Place comes around and turns into Ballantrae Loop and where they all live on the circles termed the estates, is supposed to be the most exclusive portion of the neighborhood. She said the houses are larger and cost more. She said they were like the tenth family to move in, almost 12 years ago. She said this project is a huge concern as all of the neighborhoods are unique and have their own pocket park or little park that is shared with the neighbors. She said she did not attend the annual meeting and has never received or heard anything about it except through a neighbor that invited me to come tonight and said nobody around her knows this is going on.

Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified the area the applicant resides.

Ms. Nelson said she was concerned with the character they are proposing with no special parks or green space which makes them concerned about how their property values will be impacted and what it will do on the community as a whole. She thought this was unusual for lots on a golf course. She emphasized how she would love if the notification was expanded outside of that 150-foot mark because that only impacts a few people.

Patrick Henthorne, 6655 Baronscourt Loop, said is really on the other side of the subdivision. He attested to the meetings that have been going on and is current president of the Master Association. He said it was brought up at the annual meeting and trying to figure out ways to share communication. He said it was great that this was an informal process and recognized the progress since December. He indicated the residents had an expectation that the development would continue to be condominiums as originally planned and if a plan was changed, the application as presented today is much more in line with the original development text, targeting the empty-nesters. He indicated they are pleased that the fourth bedroom option had been removed and decreasing the size of the majority of the units to 1.5 stories. He

stated there is a lot of information available on the web. He commended the applicants for the progress and looks forward to the feedback from the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes requested the proposed discussion questions be posted:

- 1) Does the redesign of the site appropriately respond to the Commission's comments?
- 2) Is the proposed architecture appropriate for Ballantrae Golf Community?
- 3) Do the proposed elevations effectively create an architectural theme for the Woodlands of Ballantrae?
- 4) Other comments from the Commission?

Amy Kramb said her concerns from last time of the architecture and the 2-story has been addressed; she did not want to see the Estates of Scioto here. She indicated the new design will attract the empty-nesters. She said she was still concerned with the proximity of the buildings to each other and the property lines; they appear to go right to the setback lines. She inquired about the possibility of patios. She said she was generally ok with the layout because it is very similar to the original layout and asked if the old approved plan included in their packet next time. She stated she was concerned there is not enough extra parking and really is no parking for the units on the south end. She wants to make sure there is enough circulation for sidewalks as there appears to be some on exterior but nothing on the interior, especially around the pond. There is no way to access that as open space. She wants a variety with at least three different styles and prefers multiple colors, not a whole row of the same thing. She felt like this was going in the right direction.

Todd Zimmerman said he likes the layout but questioned the two court areas and asked if the fire department had been approached about the access.

Ms. Husak said Alan Perkins is in a lot of their meetings and is even present tonight. She said they are comfortable with the details provided at this point but more geometry will come into play at the next stage. He recognized the tight pattern.

Mr. Zimmerman said the architecture was appropriate because it is similar to the Woodlands of Ballantrae in terms of colors, stone patterns, and such. He noted the half-moon window on the rear elevation on the three-season room is very dated but transoms are fine. He said the setbacks established in this development should be in pretty close to the same setbacks since day one.

Ms. Husak confirmed that was correct and not changes were proposed.

Mr. Zimmerman commented on the lack of parking for guests and understood the resident's comments across the street from units 32 – 29. He asked if it was a public street.

Ms. Husak said Marmion is a public street.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if people could technically park on that street.

Ms. Husak said just being a public street does not necessarily allow for that and would need to know more of the width.

John Hardt said he was not here for the December meeting. He said it appears to have come a long way and appreciates the progress the applicant has made and attempts to stay engaged with the residents. He stated the architecture seems appropriate for Ballantrae in general and likes the fairly nice detail around the windows and hopes the details survive and not lost in translation. He said he was grateful to see an overall reduction in units but parking is inadequate. He stated he was hesitant and uncomfortable in changing the development pattern of the subarea after the fact. He said other developers have come in and he tends to not be supportive and when they come back with this, it is possible the applicant may

not get his support on that basis alone. He said he is sensitive to the expectations of the neighbors as they have bought their properties in here and not sure he is comfortable “hitting the reset button” this far into the development of Ballantrae.

Richard Taylor said this was an improvement over what they saw the last time. He said he likes these but details need to be worked out. He said there are a couple of areas that are somewhat clustered and asked if more could be created to concentrate more green space. He said his biggest concern about this proposal was the environment and space between these units and hopes that this is addressed in some detail as they go along. He suggested reducing the number of units on the site or creating shared driveways that cut down on the number of curb cuts. He said he agreed with Mr. Zimmerman’s comments about some of the details being “dated”, especially for the facades facing the golf course. He inquired about the chimney tops and requested not to see the typical metal chimney termination for metal fireplaces. He pointed out some windows and stone walls that do not show a header and the shutters do not match the height of the window opening.

Victoria Newell said she appreciated the reduction in unit count but is concerned with a lot of the properties appearing to be right on the setbacks and agreed with Ms. Kramb that the possibility of patios needs to be addressed. She said she was comfortable with the simplicity and the color palette because it is consistent with the previous development that was started here. She said she was equally concerned with changing mid-stream but recognizes the applicant is trying to respond to the previous development. She said the structures have the potential to have a really nice cottage feel and encouraged the applicant to pay careful attention to the details of the building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes expressed her concerns about guest parking and is looking forward to seeing the details on the driveways to accommodate two cars. She said she was most uncomfortable with the back to backs and the tightness of streets and would like to see some more creativity. She said they are not to the level of landscaping details yet but will look for great execution of landscaping. She said it may be appropriate to do a wing wall to kind of screen the entries. She said the architecture does seem appropriate for Ballantrae but details to be worked out. She liked the simple and narrow color palettes for residential units of this proximity; easier on the eye when they blend together.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant to take a few moments to decide if they had any further questions for the Commission.

Mr. Woodings asked if less curb cuts are desirable.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if curb cuts were eliminated is the car stacking ability cut to which Mr. Woodings said no as there would still be two cars and two car stacking.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said for close proximity like this, a strong case could be made for shared driveways.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there is to be no vote or action this evening. She asked the neighbors that were not notified to leave their information with Ms. Husak before they leave to understand where the gaps are in our notification system.

**3. U-Haul
14-038CU**

**6419 Old Avery Road
Conditional Use (Postponed)**

This application was postponed at the request of the applicant prior to the meeting.

**4. BSD Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – 4535 West Dublin-Granville Road
Coldwell Banker King Thompson
14-057MPR/MSP Minor Project Review/ Master Sign Plan Review (Postponed)**

This application was postponed at the request of the applicant prior to the meeting.

**5. BSD Residential District – Tuller Flats Residential Development 4313 Tuller Road
14-008BPR Basic Development Plan/Basic Site Plan Review**

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a multiple-family residential development consisting of 386 apartment units within 25 three-story apartment buildings, a community clubhouse, and associated streets and open spaces on approximately 21.2 acres on the south side of Tuller Road, east of the intersection with Tuller Ridge Drive.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission in regards to this application.

Jennifer Rauch said before she starts with her portion of the presentation, she asked Darren Meyer with MKSK to give context regarding the Greenway Concept with his group. She said this was presented to City Council and received support for the John Shields Parkway concept. She thought it would be beneficial to have the Commission see a quick overview of that concept and how this proposal could potentially fit into that concept.

Darren Meyer said over the past several months, concurrent with the studies the Casto team has been doing on Tuller properties, MKSK was asked by the City to prepare some recommendations for the character of the streets within the Bridge Street District (BSD). He said the product of that study is as each of the pieces of the street grid are brought online to accompany private development the goal is to ensure the design and detailing of those works toward a greater vision for the public realm within a district.

Mr. Meyer said John Shields Parkway is a significant frontage road for the Tuller properties and is unique because of the greenway and its implications. He presented slides that showed John Shields Parkway and the location of the Tuller Flat proposal. He noted the future connection to both the east and west side of the Scioto River at the build out of the District. He said it was a well-conceived feature of the BSD to capture all areas of the District and bring them into the heart of Dublin. He said how that is done is part of the study. He highlighted the walking shed circles on the map to show a 10-minute walk equals ½ mile. He explained the loop from John Shields Parkway, Shawnee Falls Drive, Rock Cress, Park Avenue, and Village Parkway is the area they want to focus to create a comfortable, safe and memorable walk for pedestrians or cyclists along that route.

Mr. Meyer said they looked at four principles to provide a framework, for both the private and public realm. He said the architecture used in this study is not reflective of any development scheme and is solely used for the purposes to demonstrate principles of the greenway and the corridor. He said the first principle is framing the edges. He said in an urban setting, frontage on green space and on streets is fundamental. He said existing development bordering a lot of edges of these potential redevelopment properties needs to be worked in. He said the second principle is creating a public way. He said the setback from the street itself creates the green and for it not to feel like a large front yard for the units, it is important to have a public way, clearly designated. He said the third principle was anchoring the experience, because John Shields Parkway is long, variety needs to be incorporated to provide places to pause and rest. He said the fourth principle was how to engage the street and open spaces to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Meyer indicated the feedback from Council was presented to the Casto team. He stated with the context of the principles he reviewed, revisions to the site plans are well integrated into the corridor. He said the loop allows for a significant stretch of John Shields Parkway to be addressed and make a great first step forward for the BSD.

Ms. Rauch presented the Casto proposal that has been reviewed by the ART and their recommendations and conditions are included in the Planning Report. She said the revised proposal, incorporates an additional 3.5 acres of Sycamore Ridge Park.

Ms. Rauch reviewed what was shown as part of the initial informal review by the Planning Commission and highlighted the changes. She said John Shields Parkway was located further south than the current proposal and how future development could be incorporated as part of future phases, including the greenway concept along John Shields Parkway. She reported staff had concerns about the connectivity of streets.

Ms. Rauch said the revised proposal shows more detail and the linear greenway concept along John Shields Parkway and how the more western portion is included. She said John Shields Parkway had been altered to frame the street. She said the proposal incorporates the division of residential core and future phases can ensure a mix of uses, especially as they move east and with the redevelopment of Dublin Village Center. She indicated this significantly revised proposal also shows how the development fits in overall Bridge Street Corridor and with the overall greenway concept. She stated it pays attention to details; shows a wider variety of architecture, incorporates trees, and deals with parking throughout site. She reported the proposal includes: 386 units in 25 buildings, pool clubhouse, variable width greenway along John Shields Parkway, two larger open spaces (Village Green North and Village Green South), a dog park that was relocated to the southern portion, and additional street connections to continue the street grid. She said parking for the buildings is incorporated under the building, on the surface, and on the street.

Ms. Rauch stated the ART's main comments during review were the continuation of the grid, lots and blocks, and block size and access. She said Block G exceeds the Code maximum block length (± 800 feet) along John Shields Parkway for which the applicant has requested a Waiver. She reported the ART is recommending disapproval of the Waiver request and recommends an additional street connection between Buildings C and D be provided with the Development Plan Review submittal. She noted the streetscapes along McCune Avenue to be modified from a yield street to a neighborhood street to permit on-street parking on both sides. She said the ART's biggest discussion related to the open spaces. She said the Code for this application requires 1.8 acres of open space and the applicant is providing 4.7 acres that includes the variable width of the greenway in addition to the large open spaces. She said they asked the applicant to investigate whether additional development could be accommodated given the large scale that does not fit into the urban context. She said the applicant has indicated a desire for a significant open space as an amenity for their residents. She noted the other adjacent green spaces in that area of the proximity of the proposal of 12 acres on Riverside Drive and Scioto Park.

Ms. Rauch presented the previously proposed architecture as well as the revised. She noted the architecture is more contemporary with parapet flat roofs. She said the ART encouraged the applicant to look at this single-story building as a key amenity and making it more in line with the architecture of the rest of the development.

Ms. Rauch said four motions are required:

Motion #1: Development Plan Waiver that the ART is recommending disapproval~

- 1) Maximum Block length (Block 'G') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block 'G' from 500 feet to ± 800 feet.

Motion #2: Basic Development Plan that the ART has recommended approval with six conditions:

- 1) That the street section for McCune Avenue be revised to a typical section for a Neighborhood Street acceptable to Engineering;
- 2) That an additional street connection within Block 'G' between Buildings 'C' and 'D' be incorporated as part of the Development Plan Review submittal to continue the street network (if the Waiver is disapproved);
- 3) That a mid-block pedestrianway will be required (if the Waiver is disapproved) within Block 'G', as the proposed block exceeds the 400-foot requirement;
- 4) That Buildings 24 - 26 should be moved as far south as possible to maximize the width of the proposed greenway and to at least meet the minimum Code requirement for greenway width to provide continuity of the greenway from the west and the east;
- 5) That the applicant investigate whether additional development could be incorporated and the scale of Village Green North be sized to be more in character with the desired urban environment; and
- 6) That the applicant addresses Engineering's comments referenced in the attached memo, as applicable to the Development Plan Review.

Motion #3: Basic Site Plan that the ART has recommended approval with four conditions:

- 1) That the 3.5 acres located within Block 'G' be rezoned from BSC Public District to BSC Residential District;
- 2) That the proposed greenway fronting Buildings 24 - 26 be increased to meet at least the minimum dimension of 30 feet for a greenway;
- 3) That the plans be revised to incorporate stormwater management system details and calculations that meet the Stormwater Design Manual; and
- 4) That the applicant addresses Engineering's comments as attached to this report.

Motion #4: The required reviewing body for the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to come forward.

Aaron Underhill, 8000 Walton Parkway, Suite 260, New Albany, Ohio, said he was very pleased to present a revised plan. He said the staff report was well done to provide the Commission with the background but thought there were a few things worth going through. He introduced Linda Menerey, planner, and Joe Sullivan, architect, and representatives from Casto.

Mr. Underhill said they received positive responses from the Commission at the Informal Review in January. He said City Council had a strategic planning meeting during that same timeframe that included a big economic component for projects in BSD. He said Council was shown the architecture at the time and provided an overview to gain a greater understanding of the proposal. He said the site is zoned and Council would not normally see the proposal other than at the economic development agreement stage. He said clearly, Council did not like the architecture and sought redesign but generally they were supportive of the proposal. He said they worked with staff on the architecture and Darren Meyer at MKSK for the greenway. He indicated as a result, they have a much better plan.

Mr. Underhill said there was a varied width greenway that was presented to City Council on a high level. He said they tried to create the edge to greenway that Mr. Meyer spoke of, on what was previous parkland and what the parcels the City owns. He said their large green is an important amenity and will provide a break for edge and an opportunity for activity to serve this community as well as the larger community. He said they do not want to put buildings where a large green space is planned as it would then not feel like a public space. He said bringing the clubhouse into the green space area would also not feel like a civic use and would be the wrong thing to do. He said those changes would require an additional road and create difficulty with connectivity. He said they agreed to continue to accommodate the dog park. He showed a perspective of the parkland area and provided a flavor of the buildings. He

said Joe Sullivan can speak to the architecture in greater detail if there are questions. He said to make the architecture more diverse they have added more brick and some is painted. He said he heard loud and clear from Council that traditional architecture needed to be balanced with contemporary and Mr. Sullivan wrapped the windows around corners to create more interest at the intersections. He said there are other opportunities for mixed-use in future phases and adjacent properties. He reported Mr. Sullivan ran work units down John Shields Parkway. He said staff wants more stories to the clubhouse but his group likes the single-story to create diversity and could in the future present opportunities for a coffee shop or ice cream shop.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the general public to speak with respect to this case. [There were none.] She invited Commission comments.

Richard Taylor had a question for Darren Meyer. He said he was right on target with the principles on John Shields Parkway but there is nothing active going on in the greenway. He said this is essentially, 100 percent residential. He said his understanding of how these parks and greenways are actually activated is there has to be reasons for people to be moving to them or through them at different times of the day for different reasons. He said the target market they hope to attract is not going to be here during the day. He said the “eyes on the street” does not apply. He sees people on the greenway after work or the weekends but not during the day. He does not see this as a destination or a place where activity is going to happen. He noted the largest successful urban spaces, going right to the top of the list, is Bryant Park in New York City. He said it works because people are passing through that area for a variety of reasons because there is always something going on. He asked what he is missing.

Mr. Meyer said Mr. Taylor’s observations were correct. He asked him to compare this to Riverside Park; they are two totally different characters. He said Riverside Park has the basic criteria for success that has to be active. He said parks in residential areas are a blend of active and passive and a park that is empty is not a great benefit to the neighborhood. He said given the density of residential space there is the potential to have anchors at either end, not knowing how Dublin Village Center is being redeveloped. He confirmed Mr. Taylor is not off base with his observations; the character of this green will be more passive but not a detriment to the neighborhood.

Mr. Underhill said the green spaces proposed are not to suggest the area needs to stay passive, and Casto knows additional work needs to be done with the programming. He said they plan on swapping this with the City and hopes they will have an influence and hopes it would be an active environment.

Mr. Taylor said hope is great but there are things you need to make it that way. He said putting climbing walls and swingsets in there does not make it an active environment. He understands he has been the one harping on mixed-use and there are a number of reasons for that. He said a big green open space is nice but is not connected and he cannot anticipate how it might be used and does not see the public using it. He said everyone that passes by will not be passing through it.

Mr. Underhill said he understands there are more steps in this process and wants the opportunity to present more details. He said so far, they were trying to nail down the basics.

Mr. Taylor said he respects Mr. Meyer’s efforts.

John Hardt had question for Mr. Meyer. He said tonight was the first he had heard the term “variable width” greenway and asked what the minimum width is of the greenway intended and how far the buildings have to go to achieve that. Ms. Rauch answered 30 feet is the minimum per Code.

Mr. Meyer said they reviewed alternatives for the three buildings at the southwest corner of the proposal. He said this is an interesting jigsaw puzzle to fit new development within existing development. He said

this is a tough area and having some edge versus missing teeth helps support the goal of the greenway concept along John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Hardt questioned the buildings are 30 feet from what and how far do the buildings have to be moved to get them where we want them to be.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, New Albany, explained as they do not have an exact dimension there and on the south side, part of the bike path comes out of the right-of-way there. She said they estimate having 25 feet off the back of the bike path to the face of the building, then the building with a little apron on the back of it, and a drive-aisle, and estimates approximately 15 feet to the property line to play in there. She said an aerial photo shows evergreens and street trees along the Sycamore Ridge development. She said there is room but there is no an exact number at this point.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested starting with the Development Plan.

Mr. Taylor recognized the improvements and said he liked the buildings on the outside and likes them better. He said he appreciates the overall arrangement of "Lego pieces" on the site are more organized. He said mixed-use is important and should be considered. He said the areas that are 100 percent residential that will include three neighborhoods and is going to be difficult to call that walkable. He used the example of a resident in one area needing to go to the store with underground parking for a gallon of milk is not going to walk or bike there due to the long distance, that person is going to drive a car. He said until it is on paper, to codify and vote on it does not mean much. He has trouble liking the direction this has begun to go. He said he is okay with a primary residential area but there is always the sprinkling of the other stuff in there. He said he is not a fan of the dog park and would not like a bedroom window looking out on to one. He believes this should be reserved for something in the future. He said if the Village Green North is for the public, it needs to be clearly designated. He said he cannot support the three orphan buildings 24 - 26 and not allowing a road through there. He concluded there has been a lot of progress made but he is not ready to support this proposal tonight.

Mr. Hardt complimented the applicant on the architecture and appreciated the variety of living units, because it is a critical element. He began his comments on the Site Plan and noted the two blocks that are the best part of the whole project. He said having residential streets fronted with residential buildings with the parking tucked behind them with just a couple of access points is exactly what he envisioned for the BSC and said the density is phenomenal in that location. He said he struggles with rest of the site. He said the Village Green North of three acres of green space is a donut hole and the last thing they need for a walkable neighborhood. He said small pocket parks are preferred for short respite because large green spaces are being created down the street. He said Village Green South is ideal for some relief, someday to incorporate some other uses. He understands mixed-use is not required and not viable today but would like some indication of how mixed-use could be accommodated in the future. He stated he had a tremendous amount of trouble with those three orphan buildings at the far west.

Mr. Hardt said when the Bridge Street Corridor was first being discussed there were a couple of big ideas; one being the creation of Riverside Park along with a goal to have Bridge Street Corridor be part of a string of pearls through the City. He said the greenway and the connections across the river, and the connections through Indian Run and future connections to the OCLC site, were discussed regarding the connectivity through the City all the way to Glacier Ridge Metro Park. He said he cannot support this Site Plan with those three orphan buildings in that location. He said he loves the architecture but there are issues with the Site Plan.

Todd Zimmerman said he liked the Village Green North and if we lose it, build on it, it cannot be taken back. He said with the mass of people this area is going to attract, it would be nice to have a village green and compared it loosely to Central Park in New York City. He said if that is your only green, it needs a concept for a place to go, whether it be basketball courts, tennis courts, etc. He said he was

intrigued by the architecture, it pulls you and he likes that as he is walking along, having something really neat to look at. He concluded he wanted the parks to stay.

Amy Kramb said she liked the architecture and for the most part, likes the site layout north of John Shields Parkway and does not like anything south of John Shields Parkway. She said buildings 24, 25, and 26 should be removed and hold that space for “something” later to shield those existing buildings. She wants mixed-use on the south side of John Shields Parkway instead of all residential. She said she really likes Village Green North and envisions it like the oval on campus. She said the clubhouse needs to be two to three stories tall and an opportunity to have a coffee shop, restaurant, or bar on the bottom floor and exercise on the second floor. She believes the applicant is failing in criteria in building and open space citing and BSD mixed-use.

Victoria Newell said she appreciated how hard the applicant is working on this project and wants to see it go forward. She said she liked the mix of more traditional elements along with a contemporary building and liked Village Green North and the layout of buildings around it. She said she struggles with Village Green South. She believes each Commissioner has their own vision of the Bridge Street Corridor and it is a little different for all of them.

Ms. Newell described a visit she had with her daughter in Michigan when she took her to Birmingham. She recognized a lot of elements in Birmingham that is being envisioned for mixed-use in BSD and described a specific event and time spent on a very active village green.

Ms. Newell said she struggles with buildings 24, 25, and 26 and not sure she is a fan of open village green space, agreeing with Ms. Kramb that it needs a building there. She said she was a huge dog lover with three large dogs of her own but does not visit dog parks because they not done very well. She said if a great dog park could be incorporated, she still is not sure this is the right location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant for their persistence, efforts, and response to the Commission comments. She said she agreed with Mr. Taylor that this is a very large residential block with nothing to do, and nowhere to go within that block unless you are visiting someone else’s residence. She does not see many people walking from this area down to the pedestrian bridge that may be manageable for the walk there but not be able to walk back due to the steep hill. She said the development is too large and at nearly 400 units is too many to feel walkable and urban. She said you could check the box on dense but not on walkable or urban.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if it were just to the north of John Shields Parkway, she might be able to support this application as she does not like south of John Shields Parkway. She understands the difficulty with what already exists. She said the Commission talks a lot about the problems they create and then try to solve them. She suggested maybe taking a step back. She said it is far too many units; there is no mixed use; and nothing to get mixed-use east of here. She said the residential component could get a whole lot bigger and at some point they have to say they will hold true to their vision of walkable urbanism. She said when there is this many units by the same person with maybe three different floor plans, she believes it would attract a lot of the same people when a mixture of people is what they want to make the neighborhoods feel more balanced. She said nothing has been done to capture any of the trips of the individuals that will live in this area. She said the number of jobs they have talked about in the District in Crawford Hoying was 30,000 square feet for commercial space, which is not much. She said everything she has read, they need to capture trips and there needs to be balance to these districts. She said if everyone needs to get into their car to go to everything they need to do, they do not work. She said there is nothing to do here in a short walk and there are no assurances there are going to be anything within a short walk, but instead created gridlock. She said with this many apartment units we are a Polaris in the making.

Ms. Amorose Groomes summarized her comments and stated we need to hold true to our lots and blocks and not grant a Waiver, the street system is consistent with the BSD network map, there is no walkable urbanism, buildings and open spaces are appropriately sited north of John Shields Parkway but not south, and consistency with Bridge Street District Community Plan, vision principles and other documents have not been met. She concluded there are at least three of the review criteria that have not been met. She quoted from the vision statement "creating places that embody Dublin's commitment to the community extending the historic area's urban design quality in terms of buildings, framing, tree-lined streets and a sense of variety, and design that honors human scale in its details and articulation." She said an apartment complex on this scale is not on a human scale any longer. She said this scale is unsuitable for human scale because it requires you to depend on your car to do most anything that you might want to do such as getting a cup of coffee, visiting a drycleaner or sandwich shop. She said she cannot support this application on this basis.

Steve Langworthy said the two major things he heard with respect to the Basic Site Plan, were the locations of the three buildings to west and the overall size of the Village Greens.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought it was not just the three buildings. Ms. Kramb asked for clarification of the Site Plan that refers to where the buildings and where the streets and blocks are located. Mr. Langworthy answered the Basic Development Plan talks about the lots and blocks, which includes the Waiver that is recommended as disapproval. He said the Basic Site Plan addressed the buildings and spaces.

Ms. Kramb said several of the Commissioners were not happy with the building and spaces for anything south of John Shields Parkway. Mr. Langworthy asked if they mean no buildings at all. Ms. Kramb said they were not happy with the way the buildings are located on the south side. Ms. Kramb said she was fairly comfortable with everything north but not comfortable with almost anything to the south and three of them agree.

Mr. Langworthy said the Waiver request for the block was in front of the Commission and said staff was asking for an intervening grid. He said if that were disapproved, the lot would be put in place regardless of the building design around it. He said once that street was put in place, that lot/block would be approvable in the Development Plan, especially if the Commission is okay with the overall street design, street layout, block layout, and not the buildings.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they cannot be comfortable with the street design if they do not know the frame for the streetscape, given the dimensions we are locked into by the existing apartments that this is abutting.

Ms. Kramb stated she could not approve a Waiver at this point. She did not want to require a street at this point because they do not know for sure what would go in that location.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said a block has to make sense. Ms. Kramb said she might approve a Waiver for a longer block if she knew what was going to be built. She did not want to approve it based on what the applicant was showing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said for the sake of clarity, it is not just buildings 24, 25, & 26; for her it is 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and the Village Green South.

Mr. Langworthy said they would get to that; he just wanted to get to the overall street layout.

Mr. Taylor said he could approve the streets as they are laid out but not approve the Waiver. Ms. Kramb said she was okay with the streets and disapproval of the Waiver.

Ms. Kramb said as far as the conditions she does not agree with number two because they do not know what they are going to do with buildings C and D. She said likewise, the pedestrian crossing, because they do not know what they are going to do with those buildings. She said for condition four she does not want the buildings there to begin with, let alone move them back. She said conditions 2, 3, and 4 to her would not apply at all.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the direction of the Commission was they are not in favor of approving a Waiver tonight but that would not preclude them from approving a Waiver in the future if they were compelled to do so.

Ms. Kramb confirmed with the Basic Development Plan, they are not approving location of buildings. Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified that they are not approving anything past the curb. Mr. Langworthy said the only reason building numbers were shown was to provide a frame of reference of approximately where the buildings might go.

Mr. Hardt asked if they were talking about the Basic Site Plan or the Basic Development Plan. Ms. Kramb said the Development Plan is the streets. Mr. Hardt said for the Basic Site Plan, one of the criteria is that the buildings and open spaces are appropriately sited and buildings are included in that. He said that is where his discomfort elevates.

Mr. Langworthy said in order to know the siting of the buildings we have to know where the streets are and what we are saying is that if the Waiver was not approved, the Basic Development Plan could be approved.

Ms. Kramb asked if they were alluding to the fact that they are allowed to put a building there. Mr. Langworthy said no, that does not commit the Commission to approving a building there. He said the Basic Site Plan actually does not commit you either, it only gives an indication and that the Final Site Plan would do that. He said all this is saying is there is a street there, and then at a future time, if the buildings were located they would have to be appropriately located with respect to that street. Ms. Kramb then questioned the open space. She said there is a question of the size, and then again on the south side, she does not want that open space.

Ms. Readler said that would be reviewed as part of the Development Plan. Mr. Langworthy said that already meets the block size requirement. Ms. Kramb confirmed the block size is ok whether it is empty or has a building on it, we are not approving and Mr. Langworthy concurred.

Victoria Newell said she was perfectly fine with the Village Green North but asked if there was a condition in there to resize it. She said she is only uncomfortable with Village Green South. Ms. Kramb said if the block is there it does not matter if there is a building there or not so they could remove condition number five. Ms. Newell said, if you felt the need to make it conditional with regards to the size of the Village Green North, if several of us were uncomfortable with Village Green South, would not that be listed as a condition? The reply was yes.

Mr. Underhill said they will drop their Waiver request so objectively they are meeting the Code. He said the buildings on the south side of John Shields Parkway on the City's current parkland, is where the term dog park came from. He said the existing park was designated as a dog park by the City, but Casto does not care if it is a dog park. He said if they want to designate the Village Green South as future commercial, Casto would do that if the City is on board. He said putting the units on the City's piece was not their idea and came about through discussions with the City's consultant. He asked if there was another solution, they are open to it. He said from an economical view, they need to have a critical mass of units to help pay for the infrastructure. He said if some of the units needed to move into the Village Green North in order to get them the number of units they needed they are certainly willing to

investigate that. He indicated they needed a way home tonight so they can continue working on the proposal.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Underhill, if they walked out of here without the Waiver, and with the street locations as they are shown, and nothing else is guaranteed, is that enough for you to move ahead.

Kolby Turnock, Casto, 250 City Center Drive, Columbus, Ohio, said it is great if they can get somewhere on the streets but the fear they have for the overall development, is that they are not going to get past the mixed-use issue. He said it is not a requirement in their zoning and they do not intend to do it on this site. He said they believe they have achieved a lot and provided a product that will help integrate some of that. He said there is a lot of opportunity on the other areas along John Shields Parkway to introduce mixed use. He said they have gone through all these reviews, worked with the consultants, done what the City has asked them to do, come with a plan that has addressed some of the Commission's issues, and now they are hearing a series of new issues to address. He said Casto would like to have it clearly spelled out what this Commission is disapproving.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Turnock what he heard that was new tonight. Mr. Turnock replied the green space was one topic because the last time the proposal was before the Commission, green space was a focal point and Casto was told by the Commission they did not like the little pocket parks. Ms. Amorose Groomes interjected the Commission was very supportive. Ms. Krumb said three or four people said they loved your work with the green space.

Mr. Turnock asked the Commission again to clearly say what they are disapproving and why. He stated there are certainly issues they are still willing to work on. He contends it is a great plan and it is only going to get better.

Mr. Taylor indicated the Commission has consistently said they are not asking you to build retail, but to identify a place where it could happen. He said the applicant is clearly okay with putting in a dog park here, if we change the words to future commercial, would that be considered. Mr. Turnock said that is what they want to make clear. He said that was a City-driven initiative. Mr. Turnock said he would have to ask the City if they were willing to waive a future dog park in exchange for future commercial. He said if they said yes, the applicant would be ok with it.

Mr. Taylor said for now to move forward, he would disapprove the Waiver, vote for street layout as proposed, and the dog park gets re-labeled for future commercial and there could be a condition on that. He said he did not think the applicant had issues beyond what happens with those three orphan buildings.

Mr. Underhill asked for clarification on the number of the buildings. Mr. Taylor said he did not have a problem with the number of buildings but rather not having the street connection and squeezing of the greenway. Mr. Underhill said they agreed to drop the Waiver. Mr. Taylor said someone on the Commission said when you come back before the Commission you could request a new Waiver based on our new design.

Mr. Underhill said he wanted to get back to the Commission with more details. He said they have been at this for 10 months now, spent a lot of money, they have a contract they have extended and extended and need to show progress in order to keep moving with it and if they could get something tonight they would work with, they will continue working on this project. He said the question is how to get there.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Brock Architects, 309 South Fourth Street, Columbus, Ohio, said this has been a really difficult process. He said he appreciates the feedback but feels like they are designing to a very broad number of clients because they are getting input from many directions. He said a very significant

number of hours have been spent trying to get to something they believe could be wonderful for Dublin so they hope it does not get derailed on what he considers to be minor issues in the big picture.

Mr. Sullivan said they can try to plan from a philosophical standpoint of turning this current suburban site to urban but ultimately the marketplace makes all the decisions. He contends this development is clearly organized in an urban context. He commended the Commission and the City with the Bridge Street District vision but said we have to walk before we can run. He said the solution today is not what it can be in the future and that is why Village Green North is important as it is more civic in nature. He said he could see a farmer's market in that space. He said they can invigorate that park but not today until we get the residents there. He asked the Commission not to turn this down because it does not work economically today. He said they cannot ignore existing conditions. He said he heard from Council that it has to be about a "sense of place". He said if this does not happen, in his opinion, it puts the whole Bridge Street Corridor in jeopardy. He indicated they can make some adjustments and establish some conditions.

Ms. Readler stated the applicant has requested a short recess. Ms. Amorose Groomes resumed the meeting.

Mr. Underhill said the applicant is trying to get their hands around the process. He said if they drop the Waiver request they would like to get a little more with Basic Site Plan, even if they are broad conditions they can work with. He said they would designate the proposed dog park for future commercial. He said Casto does retail well all over the country so if there is a market for it, they will do it.

Mr. Taylor said with that parcel being empty, it is possible, and that is all the Commission is asking.

Mr. Underhill addressed the buildings as you go west on the City's land, (24 – 26) will be considered to be moved. He said the applicant needs to keep the density relatively the same for economic reasons. He said if they have a general consensus and can make a good faith effort to put those as a broad condition. He said they are pretty adamant the Village Green should stay the way it is.

Mr. Taylor said he lost the thread on the Waiver. Mr. Underhill confirmed they do not need the Waiver. Ms. Husak said since it is part of the application, they still need a vote on the Waiver where everyone agrees the vote is disapproval and Ms. Readler agreed that a submittal requires a decision. Mr. Hardt asked if disapproving the Waiver now prevents them from approving the same Waiver at a later date. Ms. Husak answered that would not be the case.

Mr. Underhill said they were ready to work on conditions.

Ms. Rauch read through the revisions to the conditions and confirmed the Commission would need to vote on the Development Plan Waiver, the Basic Development Plan, the Basic Site Plan, and the required reviewing body.

Several of the members questioned exactly what each motion and vote would entail and requested clarification on the process.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion, Ms. Krumb seconded, to recommend disapproval of the following Development Plan Waiver:

- 1) Maximum Block length (Block 'G') – Code Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) – To increase the maximum permitted block length for Block 'G' from 500 feet to ±800 feet.

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Basic Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) The street section for McCune Avenue be revised to a typical section for a Neighborhood Street acceptable to Engineering;
- 2) The applicant work with staff regarding the building and open space layout to reflect the Commission's discussion;
- 3) The applicant addresses Engineering's comments referenced in the attached memo, as applicable to the Development Plan Review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if they agreed to the two conditions. Mr. Underhill agreed. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Basic Site Plan with three conditions:

- 1) The plans be revised to incorporate stormwater management system details and calculation that meet the Stormwater Design Manual;
- 2) The applicant addresses Engineering's comments as attached to this report; and
- 3) The applicant work with staff regarding building and open space layout to reflect the Commission's discussion.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if they agreed to the three conditions as written. Mr. Underhill agreed. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, no; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 4 – 2)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made the motion, Ms. Kramb seconded, to require the Planning and Zoning Commission to be the Required Reviewing Body for the Development Plan and Site Plan Review. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was some unfinished business that the minutes from June 5, 2014, needed to be approved. After the edits were discussed, she approved the minutes as amended. There was no formal motion and vote.

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed. [There were none.]

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 21, 2014.