



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long  
Range Planning  
5800 Still-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43015-1236

phone: 614.410.4600  
fax: 614.410.1717  
www.dublinohio.gov

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

### RECORD OF ACTION

**JUNE 5, 2014**

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

- |                      |                            |   |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| <b>3.</b>            | <b>U-Haul<br/>14-038CU</b> | <b>6419 Old Avery Road<br/>Conditional Use</b>  |
| Proposal:            |                            | This is a proposal for the use of an existing building as a retail space, warehouse and storage space for U-Haul, located on the south side of US 33, west of Avery Road. |
| Request:             |                            | Review and approval of a conditional use based on the previous zoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.  |
| Applicant:           |                            | Carlos Vizcarra, Amerco Real Estate Company.  |
| Planning Contact:    |                            | Gary P. Gunderman, Planning Manager.  |
| Contact Information: |                            | (614) 410-4683, ggunderman@dublin.oh.us   |

**MOTION:** Amy Salay moved to table this Conditional Use application at the request of the applicant. John Hardt seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** 7 - 0.

**RESULT:** This Conditional Use application was tabled.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Joseph Budde	Yes
Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

Gary Gunderman  
Planning Manager

because there are really nice landscape displays on the balance of the new buildings. She agreed with the comments regarding the back of the building should not be just screened with landscaping and the stone water table is not appropriate. She said the signs to be well done and meet Code. She said to explore with the staff the tree replacements and looked forward to a tree survey and suggestions of their horticulturist for the plants that are required reach maturity. She suggested that there is no limit to the informal review and if he would like to return with material options or proposals that the applicant was welcome to return for further comments.

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

**6419 Old Avery Road  
Conditional Use**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the "The following application is a request for the use of an existing building as a retail space, warehouse and storage space for U-Haul, located on the south side of US 33, west of Avery Road.

Gary Gunderman presented this application for a conditional use for U-Haul and proposed to utilize the Hilliard's Furniture store with their current location to the west along Old Avery Road. He said the plan divides the building and is looking to provide a showroom area with a nicer entrance with support facilities at the northern end with individual storage type units in a climate controlled area indicated for medical records. He said the last space will be general warehouse left as an open area.

Mr. Gunderman said the site was revised when the building was expanded in 2003 when the site improvements were brought up to Code at that time and there are few changes proposed to the site. He said the addition is a drive way connection relocating the dumpster and removing a few parking spaces to provide the second access. He said the proposed elevations of the building are unchanged except for re-painting the building.

Mr. Gunderman said the ditch line is not in good shape and the applicant will restore it to what it was intended and re-grade, they will be landscaping and replacing the existing signs and will meet Code. He said this site is within the Western Innovation District and does not anticipate the use of these types of storage facilities but does provide for uses previously permitted to be considered but as it was permitted and in this case it would have been permitted as a conditional use and therefore it is a conditional use within this district.

Mr. Gunderman said they recommend approval with no conditions.

Ms. Kramb asked if the signs shown on the renderings were to the height and size. Mr. Gunderman said they are not included because they had provided a draft that does not comply with Code. Ms. Kramb asked if the applicant has agreed to install the signs according to Code. Mr. Gunderman confirmed they will comply with Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicant.

Dean Haske, President of the U-Haul Company of Ohio, 2980 Morse Road, Columbus, Ohio, said they are willing to go along with the regulations regarding sign height and size and he agrees to do whatever it takes.

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

Mr. Taylor said the paint colors as indicated are beige and the doors facing the north elevation looks to be bright orange doors causes him concern because they are facing Avery Road. He asked if that color of orange was essential to this application or can they be changed to match the rest of the building.

Mr. Haske said the door color is essential to their business and could not change the color of the doors.

Mr. Taylor said that would be a sticking point for him and asked if the dumpster location is existing in front of the door or would there be a better location on site.

Mr. Gunderman said most of the other locations would get to be somewhat of an interference with the parking pattern, but thought they would be able to relocate it more appropriately.

Mr. Taylor said the dumpster should be pushed behind the front face of the building. He asked if the empty parking area to the right of the building was being used for a specific use of the operation of the business.

Mr. Gunderman said they need a few of the parking spaces to make the parking requirement, but the area to the right is excess and was part of the original main parking area of the previous business.

Mr. Taylor asked if the goal was to incorporate the color of U-Haul into the building or was the intent to paint the doors orange.

Mr. Haske said it is a U-Haul color.

Mr. Taylor asked if the color could be incorporated into the building a way that is more integrated into the architecture other than the doors, since there is going to be a new sign location if they could coordinate the location of the sign and the color to work together better with the logo.

Mr. Haske said at many of their locations they do a horizontal wave that would be breaking line of the gabled roof.

Ms. Salay said the garage doors are going to be facing SR33 and that would be a modification to the building.

Mr. Haske said the garage doors are placed on the façade as nonfunctional garage doors for display only as a feature of storage doors toward the road and would act as a sign identifying the U-Haul business.

Ms. Salay said she would like to see that element of the building eliminated as it is not an attractive part of the building and would not make any sense to have non-functional garage doors in a grassy area of the site. Ms. Krumb agreed.

Ms. Salay confirmed the proposed sign locations to be on the north and east elevations of the building. Mr. Gunderman agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not supportive of anything presented with this application.

Ms. Krumb suggested removing the garage doors.

Mr. Taylor said he supports the conditional use aspect, but the fake garage doors makes that side of the building look worst and thought there is a way to get the sign on the building, but take the garage doors off creating a blank pallet to get the sign installed and get the orange color incorporated and will make the side of the building look better.

Ms. Newell said she could not support the garage doors facing SR33 and understands the desire to brand and orange is a U-Haul color if used on the building it needs to be integrated aesthetically and the proposal regarding signage does not pictorially comply with Code and she has several issues and is uncomfortable with this application.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees on the garage door issue and the orange color is not helping the applicant but the issue is that this community has gone through great lengths to minimize and hide garage doors, so putting them on to just show them off is something that he will not ever support. He said the signage providing it is brought into compliance with Code and trusts that staff can take care of that and he said he pulled it off the consent agenda that has nothing to do with what has been discussed. He said they had a previous application recently that was to rent more commercial trucks and in that case they had a lot of discussion and the applicant went through great lengths at their request to screen the trucks while being parked. He asked where they plan to park the trucks because existing conditions are that they are scattered throughout their existing facility to the west are they going to be left at that site or are they being moved to the new facility.

Mr. Haske said they are not going to the new facility at all, there will be cargo vans and pickup trucks parked there but the larger box trucks will stay on the storage facility.

Mr. Hardt said he is supportive of the use.

Ms. Readler said the review criteria is focused on the use and the architecture is something that is discussed.

Mr. Hardt said the use brings with it the parked trucks which they have held another applicant to a high standard and it is his preference to hold this site to the same standard in terms of screening trucks that have logos on the side of them.

Ms. Newell agreed and said the site sits lower than the grade of the road, so it is very difficult to see with some natural screening at the location and would like to see the spaces being used with stripping to indicate how it will be handled and the limitations.

Mr. Hardt said the other business was to designate specific parking spot of where their trucks would be parked versus customer parking with the truck parking areas being screened with landscaping.

Mr. Haske said he would be happy to do that as well.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he wanted to vote on the application as presented or if he would like to table the request and return with a revision.

Mr. Haske asked to be tabled to work out a plan that meets what the Commission is looking for.

Mr. Gunderman asked what type of screening they would compare to the last application. Ms. Amorose Groomes said there could be a landscape island which to create a drive entry with trees to soften the view and not use shrubs.

Mr. Gunderman asked for feedback regarding the orange wave incorporated to the building. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed that the applicant should incorporate the orange tastefully and appropriately into the building.

### **Motion and Vote**

Amy Salay move to table this Conditional Use application at the request of the applicant to revise the plans to reflect existing conditions correctly. John Hardt seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Taylor,

yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0.)

**4. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District-Riverside Neighborhood District  
14-039ADMC Zoning Code Amendment  
and**

**5. Zoning Map Amendment/Area Rezoning-Bridge Street District - Riverside  
Neighborhood District Zoning Map Amendment  
14-040Z**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following two cases will be heard together as they are related to one another but will require separate actions. She said the following applications are requests for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for modifications to the Zoning Code to establish a new Bridge Street District zoning district and related Code amendments for the Riverside Neighborhood District and for an area rezoning of 20 parcels for the BSD Riverside Neighborhood and BSC Public Districts in the Bridge Street District.

Rachel Ray said wanted to begin her presentation by briefly explaining how the zoning districts for the entire Bridge Street district were established. She said that Planning originally used the character districts included in the Vision Report for the Bridge Street District to generalize the land use character envisioned in different portions of the district. She said they envisioned from a form perspective the different types of building heights, massing and types of uses, which informed the proposed zoning districts. She explained once the zoning districts were created, Planning assigned zoning district designations to individual parcels throughout the entire Bridge Street District achieve the intent and overall objectives of the Bridge Street District Vision.

Ms. Ray said some of the zoning districts are special, such as the neighborhood districts. She referred to the Historic Residential Neighborhood, which was intended to carry over the existing zoning standards in effect prior to the Bridge Street District zoning, because there was no need to make any changes to the zoning regulations applicable to the residential properties in the Historic District. She pointed out the Historic Transition Neighborhood, which has some degree of consolidated property ownership. She stated that this area is important because of the transition into the Historic District.

Ms. Ray referred to the two neighborhood districts at each end of the District, which have the most significant opportunities for transformational placemaking for the Bridge Street District as the major mixed use centers of activity. She said the Neighborhood District graphics were created to guide the placemaking elements for each of these special zoning districts because there was an expectation that these properties would develop over time.

Ms. Ray said after the Area Rezoning and the Zoning Code Amendment was approved in 2012, the City began to focus at City Council's direction on the Scioto River Corridor toward the end of 2012. She said it began with the acquisition of key properties for the implementation of some key public improvements such as the planned roundabout at SR161 and Riverside Drive, and the relocation of Riverside Drive to create the riverfront park. She explained that around the same time, a development entity came forward that began to consolidate many of the properties within the Scioto River Corridor area which was a significant change from the property ownership pattern at the time of the area rezoning. She said that when the Area Rezoning initially went forward the property ownership was highly fragmented. She said the owners at the time were less interested in the significant mixed use development opportunities along the riverfront and that is why the existing zoning of BSC Office Residential and BSC Commercial was recommended at that time.