



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

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

AGENDA

1. **MAG PUD, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini 6325 Perimeter Loop Road**
14-046AFDP **Minor Text Modifications (Approved 5 – 2)**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 1)
2. **Deer Run PUD, Subarea C-Cortona** **Dublin Road and Memorial Drive**
14-062FDP/FP **Final Development Plan/Final Plat (Tabled)**
3. **Ballantrae, Subarea S and Liggett Property** **Cosgray Road**
14-083INF **Informal Review (Discussion)**
4. **Millennium Office Park** **6025-6099 Frantz Road**
14-086AFDP/CU **Minor Text Modifications (Approved 7 – 0)**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)

The 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 Victoria Newell, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Amy Salay, and Todd Zimmerman. City representatives present were Gary Gunderman, Jennifer Readler, Alan Perkins, Claudia Husak, Jennifer Rauch, Devayani Puranik, Marie Downie, Nicki Martin, Dana McDaniel, Aaron Stanford, Kristin Yorke, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the August 21, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, abstain; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1)

Chair Ms. Amorose Groomes said there were four cases this evening and Case 4, Millennium Office Park was put on the consent agenda. The Chair determined the cases would be heard in the following order: Consent Case first, then case 2, 1, and 3. She briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. [The minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

1. MAG PUD, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini
14-046AFDP **6325 Perimeter Loop Road**
Amended Final Development Plan

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for demolition of the Land Rover showroom and the construction of a new 30,000-square-foot showroom for the Land Rover, Range Rover and Jaguar franchises; a sky bridge connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building; and associated site improvements at the southeast corner of the intersection of Perimeter Loop Road with Perimeter Drive with a text modification to decrease the pavement setbacks. The Commission is the final authority on this application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone who intends to address the Commission on this case.

Claudia Husak said this application will require the Commission to make two motions. She said there are three Minor Development Text Modifications proposed for this application. She provided a quick overview of what has since changed since the Commission last reviewed this application informally in June.

Ms. Husak explained the site was rezoned in 2010 to incorporate the entire MAG campus. She said it accommodates a multitude of auto franchises within the City. She said the zoning district is divided into two subareas, where Subarea B was created specifically for Audi and BMW/Mini and Subarea A on the west side includes the Lane Dealership building with several automotive brands such as Saab, Aston Martin, Bentley, Porsche, Volkswagen, and Volvo. She noted the existing Land Rover and Range Rover building to the north on the subarea map, which is about 7,500 square feet. She said within that Development Text, it was written to take that building as it existed into account.

Ms. Husak said the proposal includes the demolition of the existing 7,335-square-foot Land Rover building and replace it with a new 34,000-square-foot building to house the Land Rover, Range Rover, and Jaguar franchises and provide the connection between the new building and the existing main dealership building via a sky bridge across the pond. She said the sky bridge is intended as a showroom for the Lamborghini brand.

Ms. Husak reported Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is working with its design consultant and the City of Dublin to complete the plan design on the US33/I-270 interchange upgrade. She explained that ODOT is in the process of acquiring rights-of-way to align pavement setback requirements which will decrease due to the right-of-way takes. She said there are a lot of parcels within the City that will be impacted and MAG is included going as far west as the Crowne Kia site. She said Staff has been working with ODOT in determining zoning impact compliance of right-of-way takes in terms of sign location, setbacks, landscaping, and tree removal, etc. She said MAG has been informed that required right-of-way takes impact compliance with the pavement setbacks required in the development text.

Ms. Husak reported the taking of right-of-way will make the site non-compliant and Planning suggested the applicant request a minor modification to the development text that slightly decreases the pavement setback requirement from 60 feet to 50 feet to ensure zoning compliance. She added that ODOT has said the setback encroachment will be less than four feet but 10 feet is suggested to allow ODOT some flexibility but is concerned that 50 feet might not be enough so she now recommends 45 feet. She said one area impacted is in front of Volvo where the vehicle display area is designed with a unique finger-like arrangement along US33 at the southern boundary and the other is on the very eastern portion of the campus where again there is vehicle display fingers for BMW and Mini. She pointed out the black line to illustrate the existing right-of-way and the red line is the new right-of-way.

Amy Salay asked if there was a condition attached to that, which would state they are not allowed to change anything basically ODOT is doing the changing but MAG is not, now or in the future.

Ms. Husak clarified as in the site remains as approved and offered to tighten up the language for the text modification.

Ms. Husak said the pond that is located along the Perimeter Loop frontage is decreasing in size, which was discussed in June. She said the pond is increasing in depth to manage stormwater. She said the applicant at the building permit stage will also be required to demonstrate they area meeting quality and quantity for stormwater management. She reported the building increase in square footage would require some removal of parking. She said in June, the Commission was generally supportive of allowing a development text modification that provides less parking. She recommended the applicant provide parking spaces at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A as opposed to requiring an overall number for the site.

Ms. Husak said there was a lot of discussion in June about the elevations to evoke more of the MAG style/character, where the development text requires striking and modern architecture. She said building materials were discussed providing what is on the remainder of the campus, creating angles, sharp edges, and points of interest within the elevation. She reported that overall, the applicant has changed rooflines to create more of these angles; increased the glass along the front elevation to provide transparency; provided some horizontal metal accents; diminished the overall beige material originally proposed and only focusing that on the Jaguar entrance; and the stone water table is only one of the more rugged pieces within the Land Rover and Range Rover portion of the building. She presented some perspective drawings to show what that would look like.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing a lot of glass and metal for the sky bridge which serves as a showroom, suspended over the pond which requires concrete and metal support legs that extend to the ground. She presented an illustration which showed more industrial and modern materials for the front façade with floor to ceiling windows, corrugated metal and light and dark grey stucco for the rear, and a fiber cement rain screen with visible fasteners to provide a connecting element between the two portions and is the material used on the Audi service write-up area.

Ms. Husak said the proposal includes three wall signs on the north elevation. She explained the development text did not anticipate this new building and sky bridge and currently only permits one wall sign identifying a single brand on the north façade of the northernmost building in this Subarea, permitted at a height of 25 feet. She stated this proposal requests a 33.5-square-foot wall sign of the Land Rover oval logo and a 21.65-square-foot wall sign for the Range Rover franchise. She explained text limits the size of wall signs to 35 square feet. She reported that both signs are proposed along the metal accent band on the north elevation at a height of 23.2 feet. She said a third sign was proposed for above the entrance to the Jaguar showroom which has chrome letters and the chrome Jaguar logo, 35 square feet in size and at a height of 24 feet.

Ms. Husak said the proposed signs would require a development text modification. She said Planning suggests the applicant eliminate one of the three proposed wall signs and supports a development text modification to permit one additional wall sign at a size of 35 square feet and a height of 25 feet. She presented some images of the campus as it is proposed. She said the applicant is allowed a brand identification sign which is shown at most of the entrances to most of the dealership buildings but should be limited to 40 square feet. She said the plans call out a green metal material in this area near the Jaguar entrance but believes that is a mistake.

Ms. Husak stated the plans show the removal of 354 inches of healthy trees about six inches in diameter and 224.5 inches are shown to be replaced. She said Planning recommends additional areas where trees could be replaced, particularly in the detention basin.

Ms. Husak summarized the conditions for this proposal to be approved.

The Chair invited the applicant to state his name and address for the record.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 165 N. 5th Street, set up samples for the Commission and thanked them for the opportunity to speak on behalf of MAG. He indicated that Jack Reynolds was also present to assist.

Mr. Parish said since the June meeting, he has tried to make Jaguar and Land Rover understand MAG as a campus and be given the opportunity to mold their prototype building into something significant on MAG's campus. He indicated he sent the June meeting minutes to them to review the Commission's comments and they gave him the opportunity to come up with something creative, thinking outside the box. However, he said, there are three sacred cows that must be adhered to: 1) Land Rover tower with the sloped roof; 2) Jaguar portico; and 3) the associated signs on each of those elements.

Mr. Parish started with the Land Rover sloped roof and tower as this was the most foreign element to the campus, creating a vernacular form in a contemporary way. He explained the long showroom body is a long bar with a low sloped pitched roof providing a very thin profile, much like BMW. He added he went from grade to roof with storefront, allowing heavy beam trusses to be visible, marrying the traditional and contemporary element from inside out. He said this gave purpose and scale to the Land Rover tower on the building elevation. He explained the Jaguar portico is the hinge-point to the three fragmented boxes that contain the new car delivery, the showroom, and the service reception area, providing organization and purpose on the site.

Mr. Parish addressed the comments from the June meeting, which spoke to the service area on the backside of the building and provided a design reminiscent of the original MAG building and also addressed comments made about the sky bridge. He explained that corrugated metal was used throughout the campus: as equipment screening up on the roof adjacent to the sky bridge; above each of the entrances into each one of the diamonds; and on the sky bridge. He explained his design for the ramp, windows and back elevation. He provided a story about how he was inspired to create the Lamborghini suspended showroom, based on a matchbox car display in a store. From a site standpoint, he addressed issues with the test track. He said he would like to relocate the one that exists, creating more of a forest around it, so the test drive was redesigned to simulate going through a rocky mountain which enhances the experience. He said this will also help screen the overhead doors on the service write-up, too.

Mr. Parish recalled a phone conversation with the owner of MAG (Jaguar/Land Rover) and he told him the history of when Land Rover came to Dublin when the tower and emblem were a hot button in 1997. Mr. Parish indicated that without that tower and emblem, Land Rover would have never come to Dublin. He said it has been discussed as to who can have wall signs and who cannot and explained that they have three brands, much like BMW and Mini. He said they want the right to be competitive in the market, being that BMW/Mini/Audi are of the same. Mr. Parish said he had told MAG that there is a difference between Subarea A and Subarea B for signs but MAG wanted Mr. Parish to show all three signs proposed and as they exist today per their corporate branding globally. He conveyed that each brand dealer must have a sign to be an authorized dealer for Jaguar, Land Rover, and Range Rover.

Mr. Parish said he reduced the text for the Jaguar sign so it was fall within the conformity of the square footage requirement. He said Jaguar is new to the campus and is expected to bring in \$20 million in annual revenue for a total between these two franchises of \$36 million annual revenue to the City and 10 additional employees. He said this design is more expensive but MAG believes this is an investment back into Dublin.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public that would like to comment with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Victoria Newell asked what color materials are proposed for Jaguar cylinder and confirmed the only green on the building is the Land Rover tower.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the Jaguar portion was stucco or manufactured panels. Mr. Parish said they do have an option for EIFS.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated all the effort Mr. Parish had put into the design of this building. She said she has always liked the sky bridge as it is really creative and a welcome addition to the building. She stated she is struggling with the Range Rover green element and requests for signage. She said she perceives that whole column, being highlighted in green, as the whole sign. She indicated she understands that is what the dealership is looking for but it stands out more than everything else on the campus that is a nice neutral gray palette. She said she finds the overhang awkward in proportion to the rest of the scale of the building. She indicated she was a lot more comfortable with the Jaguar component and the way that it is presented this time. She said she has not completely studied the test track but would appreciate an attempt at making it more integrated into the design of the building. She indicated she still struggles with the signs proposed.

Amy Kramb said she was ok with changing the setback because of the ODOT takes and agrees that a condition be written whereas MAG cannot alter the layout and extend their pavement 10 feet closer in those areas. Ms. Kramb indicated she was still supportive of the reduction in parking. She agreed that the Land Rover sign with the green looks like the whole space is the sign. She said she understands that is the color they want and would be more apt to give the applicant a sign for Land Rover and one for Range Rover if that whole tower was not green. She said she would prefer a brushed metal or something different. She asked that the Land Rover and Range Rover signs were reduced so combined, they would meet the 35-square-foot requirement and noted there is a smaller version in the ground sign. She indicated the height is what the text allows. She said she could be persuaded if the applicant wanted to change the text and remove the ground sign to have three wall signs; otherwise, two wall signs would be the limit. She believes there are options available to the applicant to achieve their logos, just smaller. She said the architecture looks better than the original proposal. She suggested if that green had to be used, she would prefer it be repeated somewhere else. She stated she likes the sky bridge over the water that is allowed to go right up to the building. She concluded her biggest concern was signage.

Todd Zimmerman asked about the Jaguar sign. Mr. Parish explained the individual letters would stand off. Mr. Zimmerman said he could live with the way the signs are now. He asked if Lamborghini would be coming in for a sign for the sky box. Mr. Parish reported that Lamborghini provided a proposal that was turned down. Mr. Zimmerman said he likes the architecture and understands how the test track can be better integrated to hide the doors, which would be an improvement he could support. He indicated he understands the setback is more for ODOT and is fine with a minor text modification. He said he can see how this proposal will blend into the existing buildings and campus.

Richard Taylor said he appreciated Mr. Parish's efforts trying to design a building where every occupant is an individual client. He said this proposal is better than the previous design and said the long low pitched slope roof better integrates into the building. He indicated he does not have a problem with parking or setbacks. He said the only thing that bothers him about that elevation is that symmetrically placed entryway, but that is his personal preference. He said the number or placement of the signs on the entire campus is not unattractive or inappropriate, but reviewing this in the context of all the other businesses in the City and especially the ones across the street from this that are also car dealerships and are restricted on signs for multiple brands. He stated he would be in support of two signs but not three as he has to consider other applicants that come in and hard to explain why MAG would get all the signs when someone else does not.

John Hardt said he is appreciative and sympathetic to the work Mr. Parish has done. He stated he had no trouble at all with the test track, especially if it is integrated into the landscape. He said the display by the

front door is out of place, effectively becoming a sign when they park cars on it, elevated into the air. He said there are no other dealerships in town that the Commission gives that courtesy. Mr. Hardt requested clarification when Mr. Parish was speaking of a new location.

Mr. Parish explained that both still exist in the new proposal. He said the test track is relocated but there is a Jaguar and a Land Rover display, and if there is a six-inch grade difference; it is like sitting up on a curb but would be happy to minimize it.

Mr. Hardt said he was ok with it as long as the height is measured in inches, less than 12 inches. He said the current one is every bit as tall as he is, which he has an issue with. He recalled a lot of discussion about the treatment of the edge of the pond the last time. He said with the current proposal, it seems to be primarily a concrete edge/the retaining wall. He asked if there was a system proposed/or already there today to maintain that water level both up and down.

Mr. Parish explained the current pond is regulated by a well in that area and there is a proposed fill way so it can and will keep it at a constant level. He said it obviously has to handle the stormwater and will bump up to handle that and if it exceeds, it goes over the spillway.

Mr. Hardt said this is obviously a PUD and there is development text that is agreed upon that allows for certain things to occur that often times are outside the bounds of Code but there are tradeoffs to allow for that. He said Code is the underlying foundation on any given site. He noted in this case, Code allows the wall signs, typically facing the highway, which gave him a comfort level for approving the BMW and Mini signs. Conversely, he said, Perimeter Drive has no wall signs anywhere. He stated the only way he would support this application would be if there was a holistic look of the campus. He said when the original project was approved, there was a very well done Master Sign Plan that described the collection of signs with high quality and purpose. He said since then, another building was added and the request for a sign was reasoned to be because this building was not anticipated at the time the Master Sign Plan was created. He indicated now there is a sky bridge and a third building we did not anticipate. He said in each case, the solution was to add more signs. He said that is a trend he grows increasingly uncomfortable with. He said if there was an attempt to go back and take a fresh look at everything, and anticipate, not only this project but what is coming next based on what we know today as compared to 1990. Mr. Hardt said Mr. Taylor referenced the "neighbors" across the street, he had the same concerns but is also concerned about this property and not altogether convinced, a year from now, Volvo or Porsche is not going to say we want a sign on our showroom, too.

Mr. Hardt summarized that the architecture and building is great, and fundamentally he does not have a problem with the project but signage he is not comfortable with.

Mr. Parish said the Code we are talking about was done in 2009, during the Volvo project. He said prior to any knowledge of BMW, Mini, Audi, rezoning that site developing new text for that site. He reported that he and Ms. Husak took pictures of all the signs and wrote the text to conform to the signs that were there. **He said the text was written based on existing conditions.**

Mr. Hardt said that was his point. He said we have existing conditions that evolve from individual projects and individual needs and continually revising the text to allow for those conditions to continue to exist.

Mr. Parish said the adjacent property is a PCD, part of the Commerce area, so it has stricter guidelines than what our PUD has, which is a fundamental difference. He said in 2004, when he first came with the first sign for Jaguar and Land Rover, Volvo was part of the brand, that building was approved with this signage (with a larger Jaguar leaper). He said revisions were made in 2010 and now we have a new body in 2014 but what has fundamentally changed in the Code that disallows this proposal.

Mr. Hardt said he believes it is time to create a careful, thoughtful, and comprehensive Master Sign Plan for the whole campus. He said it is not just the proposal in front of us that is of concern, it is the unknown of what comes next.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we have heard “we are done on this property”, no less than three times.

Mr. Hardt suggested a conversation with all the brands on the campus.

Mr. Parish said he would be happy to do that but where does that leave us today with this application and moving forward with this project.

Ms. Salay said she likes the changes. She said the “pile of rocks” does not belong and is happy the test track is going to be a drive through a forest. She said one thing that has not been said is in Dublin, it is more about identification and not advertising. She said signs are needed to find the dealership and there is a balance between a certain look with the leaper and the green for Land Rover, however, we balance that with our community standards. She agrees there is probably not a better location in Central Ohio for these dealerships. She indicated she is comfortable with Land Rover and Range Rover but if the green could be removed and back it with stone or something that matches would be preferable. She said great work has been done on this impressive, modern, architecture but all of the green comprises the sign. She noted when you look at the boards here it is easy to see ‘what does not belong’. She said a lot of times there is a choice between wall signs and ground signs, ground signs being much more directional in nature versus advertising. She indicated there is way more good here than bad and appreciates all the changes and material boards but she is just not comfortable with the green tower.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the architecture is fantastic, outstanding, and impressive. She is really impressed with the way the water treatment is up against the building. She believes this will be really cool at night with fantastic lighting options and is thrilled. She said her only concern is with the sign and not particularly the Jaguar sign. She said the ground sign graphics and colors were appropriate. She indicated she could get comfortable with both Land Rover and Range Rover being on there but the way this sign is treated with this small portion in green and then these letters mounted on this much muted color, if the tower were of a muted color, and these were imposed here, she could probably support this application tonight. She said she really appreciated how Mr. Parish integrated this element that they had to have, exceptionally well done. She said she likes the rooflines, glass, Lamborghini showplace but the only thing she is not thrilled about is this green tower as it stands in isolation. She noted she would not want to see any more green on this building. She said just as your client has pointed to the others, everyone else is going to point to you that comes in here after you and we have to have a good reason to defend the position that we took here this evening. She said what we see before us does not give us a very sound perspective to defend our decision.

Mr. Parish said the color green is very important to the brand.

The Chair said the green within the sign is probably palatable to the Commission but the green tower is not.

Mr. Parish said in this proposal the green element is a climax between the contemporary and the traditional design and heightens that experience.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the applicant could defend this all day from an architectural perspective and would probably be right because he an architect but to the Commission it is a sign.

Mr. Parish said the client is committed to bringing Jaguar to this campus and he is willing to remove existing signs on-site to get these wall signs specifically at the curb cut entrance on Bencher Drive and Perimeter Loop. He said he is willing to remove a 15-foot pylon sign that has every brand indicated along with MAG to get these brands here in Dublin.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said maybe it is appropriate to do an inventory and a vision of what we want to pass. She asked the applicant to look back and forward and come holistically with that. The Chair said she believes he could walk out of here tonight with approval on the building with no problem and the only exception she has heard strongly is this green tower and the only part of that is the greenness of the tower and not the signs themselves.

Mr. Parish said we are committed to our new brands coming out in 2016 so the clock is ticking on our side to make that happen.

Mr. Hardt said it is not uncommon at all for the Commission to review a project for its architecture and site layout approval that with a condition the signs have to come back later for approval.

Mr. Parish said the project does not move forward unless the signs are approved. He asked if there were additional compromises we could make here to get additional signs onsite.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission will give you the signs we just will not give you that architectural feature behind the signs.

Ms. Salay said for this proposal that is honestly a compromise.

Mr. Parish said he would like to pull the signs from the application for the Commission to vote on the building itself and will come back. He said there would have to be a caveat about the "greenness" of the building.

Ms. Newell said she loved the architecture of the building; it has a distinct color palette, and green is not one of those elements. She said she would not support the architecture of the building from the viewpoint of having green on the façade.

Ms. Salay said it belongs on the sign and not on the building like that.

Mr. Hardt said he could not guarantee any outcome but suggested the applicant ask for approval tonight of the architecture and the signs, minus the green; realizing that is a sacred cow, it potentially allows the applicant to get going. He explained there are a lot of weeks of construction and things that have to happen before that material goes on the building. He suggested the applicant use that time to come back with a revised Master Sign Plan after looking at the site holistically. He said at that point, it would just be an issue of materials.

Ms. Amorose Groomes interjected the color of the materials would be the issue.

Mr. Parish asked if the color green was pulled from the proposal, could a straw poll be taken.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said to have a condition that the green is not there to then come back with a Master Sign Plan, later.

Ms. Krumb suggested Mr. Parish could return to the client in the meantime and say that he successfully obtained three signs.

Mr. Hardt said his suggestion is predicated on the assumption that the applicant wants to put shovels in the ground.

Mr. Taylor said to be clear, according to Ms. Amorose Groomes, the applicant would still retain the green background in the oval.

Mr. Parish clarified the materials. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it could be the same materials, just a different finish; she said the commission is really talking about a color change.

Mr. Zimmerman said, as a non-architect, he offered the suggestion of lowering the sign for Land Rover and Range Rover, to the size that the green is a base.

The Chair said she wanted to see what the applicant comes back with.

The Chair told the applicant she thought he could get an approval with the exception of the background color of this particular architectural element. She recommended that the applicant return with a Master Sign Plan to request approval. The applicant, Mr. Parish agreed.

While Ms. Husak was rewriting the conditions, Mr. Parish asked for clarification on the ground sign to be 40-inches as in the development text.

Ms. Husak clarified three wall signs have been requested. Ms. Amorose Groomes noted as proposed in the application.

Ms. Husak said she changed the first development text modification to state the following:

- 1) Decrease the pavement setback to 45 feet along US33/SR161 for the display areas impacted by ODOT right-of-way takes as part of the US33/I-270 interchange project;
- 2) Provide parking at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A; and
- 3) Permitting three wall signs in Subarea A as proposed as part of the Amended Final Development Plan (14-046AFDP).

Ms. Kramb requested that the applicant not be allowed to increase parking to meet the new setback or do anything different than what is on the Final Development Plan.

Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale said nobody can change it without first coming back to the PZC and requesting it so this appropriately reflects that. Ms. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Husak said the change to the conditions for the Amended Final Development Plan are as follows:

- 1) That the plans be revised to address building material inconsistencies on sheet 4.01;
- 2) That the applicant work with Planning to identify additional areas for replacement trees, prior to submitting for a building permit;
- 3) That the size of the brand identification sign be reduced to 40 inches; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the application to remove the green building materials from the application and replace the material with a material and color reflecting existing characteristics on campus.

The Chair called for two motions and two votes.

Ms. Newell asked for height limitations before voting. Ms. Husak responded, 24 feet is the height limit.

Ms. Newell asked what the standard height that is proposed in the City of Dublin. Ms. Husak responded, 15 feet.

Ms. Newell clarified that the development text was being modified where the limit is one sign at the 23 foot height and three signs are being proposed. She said she thought it was only fair for other businesses that are limited to 15 feet for height and is sorry for being a stick in the mud for signs for an otherwise beautiful project.

The Chair said when the applicant returns with the Master Sign Plan, all of those things would be up for discussion.

Ms. Newell clarified the text actually said they were allowed one wall sign so these two items are actually together in that because the applicant is asking for more signs, which she is willing to support but not willing to support going above that 15-foot sign regulation that the Commission is enforcing citywide.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was willing to let that go until the Commission sees the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Hardt said he remains uncomfortable with the signs.

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the three conditions as written. Mr. Parish said he did.

Ms. Husak said most of the Commission is ok with the signs as they are proposed today if the green goes away. She said she did not catch the 'coming back for a Master Sign Plan' portion of the discussion.

Mr. Hardt said he suggested if the applicant wanted to get the green back, they could come back and make an argument for a Master Sign Plan but there is nothing that says the applicant has to come back with a Master Sign Plan, although that is what he would like to see. He said if the client decides they can live without the green, it can be built as approved.

Mr. Parish said not necessarily because he still needs to submit material for the green.

Ms. Husak said the condition was written that the applicant select a material already existing on campus and it stands approved.

The Chair said she needed to take a quick straw poll. She said she was comfortable with what Ms. Husak stated. Mr. Hardt said he was not and the irony here is he is suggesting an approach that he does not support but he believes gets the votes. Ms. Kramb said she was ok with that because the whole tower will not appear as being the sign.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Minor Text Review with three conditions:

- 1) Decrease the pavement setback to 45 feet along US33/SR161 for the display areas impacted by ODOT right-of-way takes as part of the US33/I-270 interchange project;
- 2) Provide paring at a ratio of one space per service bay in Subarea A; and
- 3) Permitting three wall signs in Subarea A as proposed as part of the Amended Final Development Plan (14-046AFDP).

Brad Parish agreed to the conditions earlier. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Newell, no; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 5 – 2)

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the modified conditions for the Amended Final Development Plan. Brad Parish agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with four conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to address building material inconsistencies on sheet 4.01;

- 2) That the applicant work with Planning to identify additional areas for replacement trees, prior to submitting for a building permit;
- 3) That the size of the brand identification sign be reduced to 40 inches; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the application to remove the green building materials from the application and replace the material with a material and color reflecting existing characteristics on campus.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 1)

**2. Deer Run PUD, Subarea C-Cortona
14-062FDP/FP
Plat**

**Dublin Road and Memorial Drive
Final Development Plan/Final**

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request to plat and develop 37 single-family, cluster lots with 7.3 acres of open space and associated site improvements for Subarea C within the Deer Run Planned Unit Development, at the northeast corner of the intersection of Dublin Road and Memorial Drive. Three motions are required, one for the Development Text Modification, one for the Final Development Plan and one for the Final Plat. The Commission will forward their recommendation to City Council for the Final Plat.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone who intended to address the Commission on this case.

Marie Downie pointed out that there were some public comments that were provided to the Commission, prior to the meeting.

Ms. Downie presented the site and said the Rezoning, Preliminary Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat were approved by PZC and City Council in 2011, including a tree waiver due to the large number of trees planted by the owner. She said Subareas A and B have both been approved for Estate Lots. She said Subarea C was approved for cluster lots and is the first subarea in the Deer Run site to continue with the Final Development Plan and Final Plat.

Ms. Downie reported the applicant did arrange a public meeting with the surrounding Amberleigh neighbors a few weeks ago, however, there was zero attendance.

Ms. Downie stated the site is approximately 17.6 acres at Dublin Road and Memorial Drive, surrounded by PUD residential areas as well as the Amberleigh Community Park to the south. She said the proposed Final Development Plan includes 37 single-family lots, clustered behind two main tree preservation areas along Memorial Drive and Dublin Road to preserve the surrounding trees. She said there are 7.3 acres of open space proposed that will be owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. She explained that access is provided from Memorial Drive by Sapri Boulevard, a gated private drive aligned with the intersection of Autumnwood Way. She said the streets are all proposed to be private drives which was previously approved by City Council at the time of the rezoning. She said there were no internal sidewalks proposed, which was also approved at the time of the rezoning, however, there is a five-foot sidewalk proposed to the north of Memorial Drive and a four-foot path that connects Pesaro Way to the Amberleigh Community Park.

Ms. Downie reported that the text has specific requirements for each lot. She said there are four lots that are not meeting the minimum 120-foot lot depth or the 60-foot minimum lot width requirements and there is a text modification included in this application for those lots. She explained the minimum width and depth requirements are to ensure that houses will be able to fit on these lots, while providing space for other amenities. She reported the applicant has provided examples of lot configurations in

order to demonstrate that these lots have appropriate space; therefore, Staff is supportive of these four lots being as shown in the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Downie presented the 44 on-street parking spaces that are proposed in designated bump-outs, which are permitted, but not required. She said all units are required to have a two-car garage as well as two stacking spaces in the drive-way or auto-court. She said the Development Text specifies that 14 lots must contain side-loaded garages. She said Staff has clarified that auto-court garages specified in the text are considered to be side-loaded garages and can be used to meet these requirements.

Ms. Downie said Staff requested the applicant provide sample elevations to show how they are meeting the intent of the “Romantic Revival” style of architecture specified in the Development Text for this subarea. She said the text has requirements including four-sided architecture and front facades requiring a minimum of 20 percent to be brick or stone. She explained when rear or side facades are visible from the street; oriented on the street; or visible from a neighboring lot, the amount of brick and stone used is required to be proportional to the amount used on the front façade. She said there are specific lots that require additional architecture due to their orientation, which she included in the conditions.

Ms. Downie said during the rezoning, the applicant provided an architecture appendix to illustrate common characteristics of the “Romantic Revival” style. She said Planning has been working with the applicant regarding the consistency and the fine detailing such as the water table, shutters, and transom windows. She said the exact details of the architecture will continue to be refined in order to ensure appropriate detailing is provided before the submission of building permits. In addition to the approval during building permits, she said the architecture will be reviewed by a design committee.

Ms. Downie said Sapri Boulevard will be the only entrance into Subarea C and is proposed to be gated. She showed five decorative six-foot tall columns with “Craftsman Style” light fixtures consistent with the Dublin Road entrance. She explained three of the columns will be incorporated with the gate. She added the remaining two columns are located on either sides of Sapri Boulevard, south of the proposed gate along Memorial Drive and each will contain identical 1.8-square-foot signs, which are significantly less than the 20 square feet permitted. She said Staff has requested additional landscaping around the service structures at the entry to ensure that it will not be visible from Memorial Drive.

Ms. Downie said the proposed Final Plat includes the “0–10-foot” Required Build Zone, easements, and all setbacks. She said Staff has asked the applicant to: revise Note ‘A’ regarding front setbacks to clearly state a “0-10-foot Required Build Zone”; to make technical changes prior to the submission for City Council; and that the labels of the reserves be consistent with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Downie said there is a Minor Text Modification requested to permit Lots 1, 19, 33, and 37 to have lot sizes that are smaller than permitted by the development text. She said these lots will be as shown in the Final Development Plan. She said Planning is recommending approval of this Minor Text Modification due to the fact the applicant has provided sample lot configurations that demonstrate adequate space for homes to fit on these lots.

Ms. Downie said Planning is also recommending approval of the Final Development Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant adjust the labels of the reserves to be consistent in both the Final Development Plan and the Final Plat prior to the review of Final Plat by City Council;
- 2) That the applicant continue to refine the architectural details prior to the submission of building permits to ensure the appropriate detailing is provided that meets the text and the overall design theme of the community, subject to approval by Planning;
- 3) That lots 1-8, 11-13, 18-20, 29-37 provide additional architectural details, as outlined in the Development Text; and

- 4) That the applicant provides screening of the proposed service structures located at the entry along Memorial Drive, subject to approval by Planning.

Ms. Downie said the proposal complies with the Final Plat review criteria and approval of this request is recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal;
- 2) That the plat be updated to include "0-10-foot Required Build Zone" in Note 'A' under front yard setbacks; and
- 3) That the applicant adjusts the labels of the reserves to be consistent in both the Final Development Plan and the Final Plat.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward and state his name and address for the record.

Mike Close, 7360 Bellaire Avenue, Dublin, Ohio, said he represents Vince Romanelli, who will be the developer of these lots. He stated they are willing to meet all four conditions including the condition of willing to work out the architectural details with Staff prior to the issuing of building permits. He offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the general public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Todd Zimmerman said all the questions he had were answered in the Staff Report.

Amy Kramb said she assumed these units would have patios. Ms. Downie said patios were permitted by text to encroach into the rear yard setback by 10 feet.

Mr. Close said there are not going to be big backyards here.

Ms. Kramb was specifically concerned with the two lots on the corners and wanted to confirm the patios are permitted now so patios are not requested later.

Ms. Downie clarified that many of the lots included in the text modification are corner lots, which makes what would be a rear yard actually a side yard that requires five-foot setbacks.

Ms. Kramb commented on the architectural drawings showing the side elevations. She said they seemed plain with very small windows and needed more detail.

Victoria Newell said she had the exact same comment in regards to the side elevation. She said she would like to see the stone come up higher in elevation and have more architectural detail as she did not believe it was meeting the intent of the Code.

Amy Salay said she really likes that architectural style but is not comfortable with the other material besides brick or stone.

Steve Jones, Romanelli & Hughes Building Company, 5545 Harlem Road, said brick will be a minor material, much more stone and stucco would be used, and there will be some use of cementitious siding.

Ms. Salay said the illustrations appear to have too much stucco and would prefer to see more stone. She said she liked the photographs that were presented, but they show facades that are almost all stone with stucco as an accent instead of the primary building material. She agreed that the windows were small but does not know what the interior spaces are and admitted that landscaping makes a huge

difference. She asked the applicant if they considered losing a lot or two and spreading the lots out a little bit so there were no abnormally small lots. She said it is one thing to have one lot like that but there are four and a couple of them are located prominently.

Mr. Close said this was addressed during the Preliminary Plan and Rezoning. He said he thought they started with 43 lots and lost six lots.

Ms. Salay said the lots are going to be awkward unless the homeowners do not spend anytime outside. She said they are already small lots and the way the homes are configured is going to be awkward.

Mr. Close said this is similar to a subdivision right off of Fishinger Road. He said they have smaller lots and are very popular with empty nesters since they are low maintenance.

Ms. Salay said it is going to be a very interesting little neighborhood as she likes the architecture.

John Hardt inquired about the service structures mentioned in the presentation located up near the entrance. He said he presumed that one of them is the water meter for the fire hydrants instead of an underground pit.

Jeff Strung, EMH&T, said there is an underground water pit and there is a "hot box", 28 inches tall above grade that is the back flow preventer meter, which is just to the north of that.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the back flow preventer is for the underground irrigation system. Mr. Strung clarified it is for the water line involved in underground irrigation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked where the controller would be housed. Mr. Strung replied it is in the underground pit.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with Ms. Salay. He said when this project came through and the Preliminary Development Plan was approved it was for 37 lots of a certain dimension. He said he was not supportive of relieving that dimension right here on day one. He said he is not sure what has to be done, if a lot has to be lost, or property lines finagled, but the change in the text that is being requested is something he is not terribly supportive of and believes those lot dimensions were agreed upon for a reason. He said Lots 1 and 37 appear to be loaded off the main entry drive, which is mostly boulevard except where it is broken to allow access to those houses. He said he is not a fan of that configuration and would love to see that revisited. He said with all the homeowners coming in and out on that main boulevard drive through the gate, it does not seem to be an appropriate place to have a driveway.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed the side elevations, in particular, are lacking a lot. He said the images that are in the Architecture Appendix show some outstanding architecture and does not believe the black line drawings the Commission was provided reflect the same quality. He said some of these lots have significant side elevations that are exposed to the street and need a considerable amount of work with regards to the architecture. He said the text requires four-sided architecture and he does not believe the applicant has met those criteria.

Richard Taylor said he had similar concerns about the lot sizes. He asked Ms. Husak if she recalled if the issue of these four lots not meeting the requirements came up in the preliminary or is this the first time the Commission has addressed that and if they discussed the need to vary from the original requirement.

Ms. Husak said those four lots were shown like this. She said Lot 1 could be argued it meets requirements based on where the 60-foot width is required to be measured at the building line. She said the lot does not have two, 60-foot lines at the front and the rear. She said due to the other lot

configurations, there is always an issue of where that building line sits in terms of the road. She said she did not believe those details were available at the time of the Preliminary Development Plan.

Ms. Kramb said she remembered discussions about Lots 19 and 33 specifically during the Preliminary Development Plan. She recalled they had talked about sidewalks and how it would take much of the space.

Mr. Taylor said they discussed that the other two corner lots would be tight, but does not recall discussing that they would vary from the required lot sizes.

Ms. Kramb recalls how they discussed it would be hard to measure and remembers removing lots from the original plan.

Mr. Taylor stated he did not think the applicant needs to lose any more lots to bring those into compliance but does not understand why the Commission would accept lots that do not meet the requirements at the start. He indicated usually exceptions come when a house will not fit on a lot at a later date. He said it seems like it would be a minor reshuffling of some of these lots to the east to gain what is needed.

Mr. Taylor said there are five lots that have significant side elevations and he realizes the drawings do not represent these specific houses, but those side elevations need to be as spectacular as the front because they are essentially fronts of those houses. He said he does not see anything that comes close to meeting the standard that was set in the preliminary approval when they looked at the photographs of the examples of "Romantic Revival" homes. He said not only is it the details, but it is the massing. He said he was concerned about some of the roof pitches proposed. He said the text also calls for 'custom homes' and the applicants has been building this floor plan for 30 years. He emphasized the applicant has a long way to go on the architecture. He said Mr. Close mentioned Stonegate and that was something the Commission talked about as an example and used as a reference for these houses three years ago, and those for the most part are pretty extraordinarily well done homes. He emphasized that the homes in this application do not meet that standard.

Mr. Taylor concluded that he cannot support this and does not believe that the changes that need to happen are not ready to be addressed by Staff yet. He said when the Commission talked about this property originally, the Commission agreed it was probably the last premier piece of undeveloped land left in Dublin and that was their motivation to ensure the homes were beyond spectacular. He said that was certainly the strong impression he was left with at the preliminary stage. He reiterated he was disappointed in what was proposed and does not believe it looks spectacular at all. He said he would like to see something along the lines of Stonegate and the "Romantic Revival" examples shown.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Lots 1 and 37 should not have the drives loaded off of the boulevard. She said she has more concerns with Lots 19 and 33 being on prominent corners. She said she would really like to see something placed on those lots that was better. She said if the Commission is going to deviate from the lot size, she would like a really good reason to do that. She requested something more imaginative so she could possibly be persuaded to say the Commission justified the relief from the lot size requirements. She said the images the Commission was shown were really great, but said she did not like the drawings they received. She did not know if that was because they were one-dimensional or if the architecture really is not as good as they were hoping it would be. She emphasized she would like to see more work on the architectural component and would like to see the architecture discussed more in the public realm than just between the applicant and Staff.

Ms. Kramb said she agrees that the drives coming off of the boulevard need to be off the north end, instead. Ms. Amorose Groomes clarified the point for the applicant. She said the cars coming in off of the boulevard will have higher speeds and bring significantly more traffic.

The Chair said there were three motions and three votes before them.

Mr. Close said the difficulty with this project, when dedicating more than 40 percent of the value to open space, is that there are constrictions on what can be done. He said 37 lots is about where the applicant can make this happen. He estimated Romanelli & Hughes Building Company have 40 percent of the lots already reserved and understands architecture can be a matter of taste, but with those comments in mind, he asked the Commission to table this application.

The Chair said to provide clear direction, the Commission is not necessarily asking the applicant to lose any lots, but maybe reconfigure the way the structure might be set on the lot.

Mr. Close said the reality is these homes are going to be \$700,000 and up as they are proposed now. He said if they lose another lot, then economics stop working.

The Chair said that was not the request of the body here.

Mr. Close said they can fix the driveways and look into the architecture.

Ms. Kramb said she was fine with the number of lots as this is what the Commission decided upon in the Preliminary Development Plan so she expected these would be tight.

Mr. Close said he understood what was said about side elevations.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was not as much the lots themselves as it is the setting of the structures on the lots, what we have seen, and what we might like to see.

The Chair asked if there was a motion on the floor to table this application.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to **table** this application for a Final Development Plan and Final Plat. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

3. Ballantrae, Subarea S and Liggett Property 14-083INF

Cosgray Road Informal Review

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for a potential residential development of 141 residences consisting of with detached condominiums and single family lots on approximately 49 acres, east of Cosgray Road and the Conrail railroad tracks.

Devayani Puranik said this is an informal review for Ballantrae Subarea S and Liggett property for residential development. She presented the site, which is located east of Cosgray Road, north of Rings Road, east of CSC railroad tracks and a Cosgray Rings Road connector is proposed along eastern property line of Churchman Road. She showed where the Links at Ballantrae are located east of Churchman Road consisting of a multi-family development and where the Woodlands at Ballantrae are further east. She explained that all the parcels along the southwest corner of the property are within Washington Township, Village of Amlin, outside of Rings Road.

Ms. Puranik said the character of these areas is large lot residential with some limited commercial activity along Rings Road. She said the northern portion of the property is zoned PLR-Planned Low Density Residential, Ballantrae Subarea S and a 70-unit condominium development is approved as part

of that PUD, and the lower portion is zoned R-Rural. She said the applicant is processing a parallel application to annex the southwest corner of the site from Washington Township.

Ms. Puranik presented the existing conditions showing: the site still being farmed as seen from Woodlands at Ballantrae; the view of some mature tree rows along the railroad tracks from the southwest corner; and the view of the road south in the township that is essentially used as an alley by the village residents.

Ms. Puranik presented the Community Plan (future land use plan) that recommends Mixed Residential Medium Density land use that is five units per acre. She said the areas are anticipated to have greater walkability and pedestrian orientation at a village scale and are part of the Southwest Area Plan. She said the Village of Amlin has a unique and quaint character that should be protected as adjacent development occurs and future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area. She indicated the Plan also shows linkages from the site toward east to Churchman Road and from the development south to Rings Road for easy access to Village Center.

Ms. Puranik presented the proposed site plan that showed three entrances off of Churchman Road, one of which is a continuation of Marmion Drive through the Woodlands at Ballantrae. She explained the total site is 51 acres of which 4.6 acres are for Churchman Road. She said the proposal consists of 47 single-family lots within the northern section of the site and 94 detached condominium lots within the southern section. She stated that density is 3.01 units per acre. She said the setback along Churchman Road is 200 feet, along the railroad tracks is 100 feet, and 30 – 50 feet is proposed along the southern property line. She said a total of 14 acres of open space is provided, which includes the existing tree cover.

Ms. Puranik said the first discussion point relates to the layout of the site. She said since the Community Plan is recommending: mixed residential, medium density, more walkable/pedestrian friendly, and should integrate the single-family lots with condominium units as opposed to two separate isolated sections for single-family and condominium units. She said the plan also talks about integrating open space as part of the development and having the connectivity of pedestrian links.

Ms. Puranik noted the second discussion question, which refers to the character of the western and southern setback. She said the Commission recently approved 100-foot setbacks from the railroad tracks, which included the buffer that is a combination of mound/fences and landscaping. Regarding the southern setback, she said the Plan recommends that The Village of Amlin's unique and quaint character should be protected as adjacent development occurs, and future residential development in the area should provide adequate separation with open space to visually define a clear transition between traditional neighborhood design and the surrounding area.

Ms. Puranik said the third discussion question relates to the street connectivity. She said entrances are provided along Churchman Road and if this project were to move forward, another connection would be necessary around the western setback. She explained that Engineering recommended that all right angle turns be avoided and to rework the network around the central gazebo area. She said Planning and Engineering is recommending public streets for the entire development for simplifying maintenance responsibilities. She added the stormwater detention pond will have to be reworked to provide adequate distance between Churchman Road and the ponds. She said the Southwest Plan illustrates connection from the site to Rings Road to the south and a pedestrian connection might be beneficial for the residents of proposed development to walk to Village Center as envisioned development occurs.

Ms. Puranik addressed the fourth discussion question and presented the proposed architecture for single-family homes. She said the elevations are two-story homes with porches, garages with arches, and dormers and the materials are stone and cementitious siding. She said detailing reflects village

character and most of the elevations have front loaded garages while there is an auto-court access option. She presented the proposed architecture for the detached condominiums. She said they are a story and a half ranch style with the majority of the elevations having front loaded garages. Again, she said the detailing reflects village character like the single-family homes and material treatments are consistent creating rhythmic patterns.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the applicant was present and would like to add to the presentation.

Paul Coppel, co-owner of Schottenstein Homes, said this was their first venture in the City of Dublin, although not new to the area. He said Schottenstein Homes is named after his partner, Steve and their genesis is MI Homes as Steve was COO for that organization for many years. He reported that they have one project currently in the Dublin school district but not in the City of Dublin. He said between the current four projects, they plan to close between 90 and 100 homes this year. He said their intention with this project is to do something that satisfies the existing neighborhoods in Ballantrae. He indicated they have had meetings with the leadership of the two Ballantrae Homeowner's Associations. He said Linda Menerey would go over the plan and respond to some of the concerns along with Jack Reynolds and George Acock.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, said one thing this plan achieves is connectivity through Churchman Road, the pedestrian ways, and open space. She said they have extensive buffers and corrected Ms. Puranik's statement about setbacks; the setback off of Churchman Road and the railroad track is actually 100 feet. She said there is a varied setback along the Amlin alley, from 30 – 50 feet. She said they took into account all the surrounding areas. She highlighted the single family homes in the north portion, which follow the typical Dublin style and in the lower, condominium area they made the transition to what was happening in the Amlin neighborhood. Ms. Menerey said she believes they can work within the stormwater ponds and wanted to keep those along the frontage as a design amenity to give recognition to this particular area. She noted that most of the houses front Churchman Road, with a large setback providing green space.

George Acock, Acock Associates Architects, Columbus, Ohio said he resides in Granville, Ohio. He said they are trying to provide affordable housing in a way that is consistent with the architecture that has been built in small towns. He said in the 50s & 60s, when TV and air conditioning appeared on the scene, things changed. He said people pulled their car into the garage that was the first element you saw, living in the family room in the back of the house, and porches were removed. He said they are trying to bring porches back and soften the power of a 16-foot garage door in appropriate scale to what he considers regional architecture that is very simple, mostly wood houses with 15-foot front setbacks. He said this will provide a neighborhood feel to promote engagement amongst neighbors; it will feel like a community. He said they have designed simple materials and proportions including standard windows and details that have been around for a long time, proving to be charming.

Mr. Coppel showed samples of the plot plans of the two varying kind of products, pointing out the single- family elevations and the condominiums. He said they have deemphasized the garage and added porches in all of them. He said their target market for these condominiums is obviously mature adults or empty nesters, and that the markets for those now are detached units and not attached units. He stated many of the people that respond to this analysis do side-yard outdoor living whereas we think it is better to have rear-yard outdoor living in those detached units. He said they are trying to provide a little different architecture than Ballantrae but be very compatible with no exposed foundations and using all natural materials.

The Chair invited public comment from anyone that would like to speak on behalf of this application. [Hearing none.]

Richard Taylor asked for clarification on the different plans.

Mr. Acock noted the first ones they were working on and said they will use those but it is the same type of style and floor plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the last four elevations are the same. Mr. Taylor confirmed they were all single-family units.

Ms. Menerey clarified that some of the elevations were mislabeled. She pointed out, some were condominiums, one that could be both elevations, and there are a couple that are the single-family style.

Mr. Taylor said at some future date with an update to this proposal, he would like to see for the detached condominium units maybe show a few of those in context because they are not going to sit isolated the way the elevations are currently shown. He would like to see how 7 – 10 units would play together on streetscape.

Ms. Menerey presented a line drawing that reflects what Mr. Taylor requested. Mr. Taylor said it gave him a whole different prospective.

Ms. Menerey presented the single-family board.

Mr. Taylor said he appreciated the small town perspective. He stated in the overall site plan he sees some contradictions to what Mr. Acock said about the small town arrangement. For example, he said, in the center of the attached condominiums, there is a really tiny green space with a gazebo and this should be much larger. He said he was a little confused about the reason for the big setback off of Churchman Road, which put all of that green space, the pods, and everything on the outskirts of this development, which further isolates it from the rest of the community. He said bringing those things into the middle, make them amenities for the whole neighborhood to enjoy and allow this development to push out to the borders a little bit more and possibly engage more fully with the communities next door. He said the existing grove of trees looks like it is remaining untouched. He asked if there was some way to rearrange the street network to run along the borders of that grove to provide an amenity for all instead of as a backyard for a few. He said there is a grove of trees in the middle of Brandon Way neighborhood and the streets run on several sides of that and is heavily used by the residents. He indicated the paths are very informal as they are not paved. He concluded he liked the concept and the density that is being proposed that is less than what is allowed, but believes the applicant could go further in making this more village- like and using the green spaces and amenities that are accessible to everyone as opposed to pushing to the perimeter and isolate the whole community.

John Hardt said he agreed with Mr. Taylor as the fundamentals are headed in the right direction. He said he appreciates that the density is less than what is allowed. He noted on the drawings received in their packet there is a space across from the proposed road, where the road appears to pass within a few feet of the drive-way of the development on the other side and he wondered if that was accurate or not. He said if it is he suggests Churchman Road not to be straight. He said that is an oddity that needs to be resolved.

Mr. Hardt addressed the discussion questions. He said he agrees with the applicant that he does not think it makes sense to integrate the single-family homes and condominiums with each other but he said it does make a lot of sense to connect them to the different areas not only to each other but to things outside this development getting more connectivity to the streets.

Mr. Hardt inquired about the 30-foot setback to the south and asked if the whole area should be oriented so that the pattern of development and the streets respect the layout of Amlin. He said the residents of Amlin may think that is a horrible idea but he thought there is an opportunity to take the charm that is already there and expand on it rather than turning your back to it.

Mr. Hardt said the level of detail they are looking at for architecture is heading in the right direction. He is concerned that when seen all together, there are a lot of different variations of detached condominiums that all have the same rooflines. He encouraged the applicant to mix the rooflines up and get the massing a little bit different; varying the material is not going to be sufficient.

Mr. Hardt said the western setback along Cosgray Road should more or less match what is north on Cosgray Road to the balance of Ballantrae. He said the south 100-foot setback that is the railroad track, is appropriate, generally. He indicated he assumed the trees that were there today would be protected, maintained, and augmented.

Amy Salay agreed about providing access to the woods and perhaps having a bike path available to everyone. She indicated she is concerned about the proximity of the railroad tracks because the sounds of the train horns can be so loud and interruptive into family life. She suggests as development continues, the Commission consider a railroad quiet zone. She said she would like to see the green by the gazebo expanded. She is not in favor of any private streets; she wants Dublin standard public streets. She said single-family units and condominiums should be mixed. She said she loved the architecture, the detail, the idea of the village, but wants to make sure the front porches are actually deep enough to be useful. She indicated some of the front porches in Dublin neighborhoods are so narrow you can barely fit a chair. She questioned the term "affordable". She would like to see a limit on the use of cementitious siding and prefers the mix of Hardieplank and stone. She said all lap siding might be preferable to some prospective residents because it would be less expensive than all stone. She asked if Churchman Road has to be straight because it looks strange here. She said she is pleased that the applicant has met with the neighbors.

Todd Zimmerman said it is nice to see the decrease in density from five units per acre to three units per acre. He addressed the discussion questions:

- 1) He asked if integration could be changed slightly without giving up the density ratio or green space.
- 2) He said he is all for the mounds, evergreens, or whatever if it is possible to keep the mature trees but is really not a fan of fencing as it is not natural and becomes a maintenance issue down the road.
- 3) He would like to see public streets for both projects.
- 4) He likes the architecture and housing stock, something that Dublin does not have.
- 5) He would like to see a matrix of the detached condominiums so we could have a good mix of variation for the 94 condominium units at the end. He suggested working with Staff to achieve this variety.

Amy Krumb said the two products do not need to be integrated, there needs to be more connectivity. She said her biggest issue was having useable open space. She noted the wonderful tree grove that only the 15 lots that back up to it will see. She said with the ponds up front, she thinks access may be limited. She said when the applicant comes back, she wants to see the sidewalks; walking paths; bike paths; how residents will be able to get around the site; and how the residents would be able to get down to Rings Road to use the open space. She does not like the southern end how it backs up to Amlin. She suggested a better transition or treatment there than putting up a bunch of vegetation and starting this new development. She said the architecture was going in the right direction, and she was generally supportive of the concept, density, and location.

Victoria Newell said the two products do not have to be intermixed in terms of integration but she would like to see the pedestrian connections intermixed and developed little further. She would like the green space at the gazebo larger. She said the sites along Amlin should be treated sensitively. She questioned the setbacks and the buffer along the railroad tracks.

Ms. Menerey explained it was a hand-drawn sketch that Ms. Newell was referring to which was not to scale and would ensure the 100-foot setback by the railroad tracks.

Ms. Newell continued, for developing the internal green space, the setback off of Churchman Road can be reduced. She said she really liked the porches.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she admittedly did not drive through the site so she does not know what the back of the adjacent properties look like. She indicated the alleyway does need to integrate into something that was not going to add value. She said she wanted to drive through the site before making much of a statement at the next step. She stated she agreed with everything that had been said by her fellow Commissioners and appreciates the use of materials and the historical perspective on the architecture. She indicated 'what is old should become new again' in most situations and seems appropriate here.

The Chair said she would give the applicant time to respond if there were any questions or needed clarification.

Mr. Coppel said he just had one question on the land plan. He said he thought there was a consensus of the Commission that the setback be reduced along Churchman Road.

The Chair said for the point of clarity, what she thought the applicant heard this Commission say was that they wanted a larger, useable green space that would be consistent with the type of architecture shown and are willing to give some other green spaces to accommodate that. She said she also heard from several of her fellow Commissioners there was an opportunity to interact with the grove of trees, either by relocating the street or by putting a bike path through there.

The Chair called for public comment from anyone that wanted to address this Commission with regards to this application.

Patrick O'Brien, 5646 Marmion Drive, said he resided exactly across the street from Churchman Road as proposed. He said the Woodlands of Ballantrae residents have been very comfortable with this project on a whole because of the existence of this 100-foot buffer along Churchman Road. He said they have attached housing and this is 147 units to contrast with the existing 64 units. He said the green space and water effects are significant and aesthetically and functionally isolating the Woodlands from whatever the applicant has in this project, which we know is not going to be attached like the existing product. He said the idea of converting some of that buffer space into the gazebo type area is very nice in terms of just that project on its own but it does not necessarily reflect the entrance of people on the other side of the street. He said there needs to be a balancing of interests when that is redesigned.

Don Seager, 6890 Foresthaven Loop, said he was a resident of Woodlands of Ballantrae and was on the Woodland's and Ballantrae's Boards. He reported they liked the 100-foot setback and do not want to see that changed. He said he agreed to put a bike path through the grove of trees but would not want a street to mess up the trees. He suggested that Amlin not be integrated as they are not cute little houses. He said he agreed with making the streets larger as there are issues with private streets. He emphasized the setback is what they like.

The Chair said for the point of clarity, the Commission does not necessarily want to put something through these woods, just provide access to the perimeter of them.

Ms. Newell said she wanted to clarify an earlier comment; she did not want to see a wall of landscaping not treated sensitively and should not be one big wall between this project and Amlin but rather a nice amenity.

**4. Millennium Office Park
14-086AFDP/CU**

**6025-6099 Frantz Road
Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

The Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for Conditional use for a beauty salon in the Millennium Office Planned Unit Development that allows uses in the Suburban Office District. This application also includes an Amended Final Development Plan application for parking revisions in the approved development text. The site consists of two parcels and is 8.3 acres on the west side of Frantz Road approximately 765 feet south of Metro Place South.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

The Chair noted that Tammy Noble-Flading was not in attendance and Claudia Husak would fill in. She said there were three motions and three votes for this application.

The Chair verified that there was nobody present from the general public that would like to speak with respect to this case.

The Chair called for the first motion that was for a Minor Text Modification.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval of the Minor Text Modifications. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Hardt seconded, to recommend approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend **approval** of the Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed.

Claudia Husak said the developer and applicant for Riviera filed their revisions to the application today that they brought to the Commission in early June with the intent and eligibility to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission October 9, 2014. She said Staff should be able to achieve getting all the other cases on the October 2nd agenda.

Ms. Husak said for the two special PZC meetings that the Commission had set aside, October 21st and 29th; she has decided to put the review of the Code on the agenda for the 29th. She said Bridge Park/Crawford Hoying was working on two applications: 1) Development Plan for Phase 1; and 2) Basic Site Plan for their Blocks B and C. She said they had originally targeted the October 9th meeting for that review but prefer not to be on the same agenda as Riviera, which is expected to be televised. She asked the Commission if they would be okay if the two BSD applications were reviewed at the October 21st meeting. She said she would prefer not to have a Special Meeting for Riviera just because the public is thinking of PZC meetings on a Thursday; the Chair said that was fine. Ms. Husak said Staff always envisioned the BSD might need Special Meetings due to the busy schedule that the Code imposes upon them. She said some of the residents and Staff have met with on-going communications about Riviera and Staff anticipates the residents are planning to also have a package to the PZC. She said the

residents know what Staff's deadlines are for packet distributions and so the Commission should expect two packets, one from Staff and one from the community but it will come through Staff.

Mr. Hardt said the Riviera site is sizable and not particularly accessible. He said he has never been on the property. He asked Staff if they could work out some kind of methodology the Commission members can use individually to give them access to the site. He said being able to show up and ask for a golf cart would be preferable. Ms. Husak said she thought that was possible if they do not all go together. Mr. Hardt said he personally wants to go out and soak in the sites by himself and without cooperation, he is not sure how that happens. Ms. Husak said she would reach out to Riviera.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed. Ms. Kramb said she cannot attend the November 13th meeting as she will be out-of-town. The Chair said without anything further the meeting is adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on October 29, 2014.