City of Dublin
Office of the City Manager
5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090
Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

Memo

To: Members of Dublin City Council

From: Marsha I. Grigsby, City Manager

Date: October 9, 2014

Initiated By: Steve Langworthy, Director
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II

Re: Ordinance 100-14 – Rezoning Approximately 2.9 Acres, Located on the North Side of Perimeter Drive, Between the Intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive, From PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside PUD North, Subarea A3) to Facilitate the Development of a Coffee Shop with a Drive-thru. (Case 14-069Z/PDP/FDP)

Summary

Ordinance 100-14, a request for review and approval of a rezoning with preliminary development plan for 2.9 acres to modify the permitted uses of an existing development text, was introduced at the September 22, 2014 City Council meeting. Approval of the change would allow the development of a coffee shop with a drive-thru. The site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

First Reading Comments

Council members were concerned with the proposed stacking and circulation of the drive-thru and requested additional information regarding the stacking of other existing area drive-thrus. The following information was collected by Planning.

- The Wendy's restaurant located on Tuttle Crossing Boulevard in the City of Columbus was approved with eight stacking spaces as required by the Columbus Code (eight stacking spaces required for buildings with one order/pick-up window).

- In the City of Dublin, the Wendy's/Tim Horton's and the McDonald's on Perimeter Drive were approved prior to 2000. In 2000, the City of Dublin Zoning Code changed to include drive-thru stacking requirements. Prior to this Code change, Dublin used the stacking requirements from the Columbus Code.
    - Tim Horton's was approved with eight stacking spaces;
    - Wendy's was approved with 12 stacking spaces (six required for each window if the building has two order/pick-up windows).
    - McDonald's was also required to meet the eight-space stacking requirement from the Columbus Code and provided 14 stacking spaces with their final development plan in 1995, which was disapproved by the Planning and Zoning Commission due to concerns that the site was too small to accommodate the use. City Council overturned the Commission's disapproval on appeal by the applicant on August 7, 1995.

The applicant for Starbucks has provided graphics (attached to this memo) illustrating the 12 stacked vehicles (shown in blue) in the proposed drive-thru for Starbucks and an additional four vehicles (in red) all stacked within the site. Similar graphics include Tim Horton's and McDonald's on Perimeter Drive. Both graphics for these restaurants show that vehicles are forced to stack off-site at around 11 cars in the drive-thru and that any vehicles beyond that number are forced to stack off-site.

The applicant has also indicated a willingness to require employees of Starbucks to park in the northeastern parking aisle to avoid the potential for customers being blocked by additional stacking.

Recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this application at the August 21, 2014 meeting and recommended approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan by City Council with the conditions listed below.

All conditions recommended by the Commission related to the preliminary development plan have been incorporated with this submission. The applicant has also addressed Condition 2 of the final development plan as part of this submission. Condition 1 will be required to be met at the building permit stage. The conditional use conditions will be required to be met as they occur.

<u>Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Conditions</u>

1) That the applicant updates the traffic information provided to reflect more accurately the existing uses within the Planned District, subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

<u>Final Development Plan Conditions</u>

1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit;
2) That the evergreens screening the drive-thru be pulled back from the curb at least five feet and that a plant different from junipers be selected, subject to approval by Planning.

<u>Conditional Use</u>

1) That this approval is only applicable to a coffee shop.

<u>Additional City Council Condition</u>

1) That the coffee shop employees park in the parking spaces in the northeast portion of the site.

Recommendation

Planning recommends City Council approval of Ordinance 100-14 at the second reading/public hearing on October 13, 2014 with the additional condition regarding employee parking.


STARBUCKS
COFFEE


Tim Hortons

McDonald's

City of Dublin

Office of the City Manager
5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090
Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

Memo

To: Members of Dublin City Council

From: Marsha I. Grigsby, City Manager

Date: September 18, 2014

Initiated By: Steve Langworthy, Director
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II

Re: Ordinance 100-14 – Rezoning Approximately 2.9 Acres, Located on the North Side of Perimeter Drive, Between the Intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive, From PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside PCD North, Subarea A_3) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside PUD North, Subarea A_3) to Facilitate the Development of a Coffee Shop with a Drive-thru. (Case 14-069Z/PDP/FDP)

Summary

Ordinance 100-14 is a request for review and approval of a rezoning with preliminary development plan for 2.9 acres to modify the permitted uses of an existing development text. Approval of the change would allow the development of a retail building with restaurant spaces and associated patios. The site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

Background

The 24-acre Riverside PCD North was rezoned in 2004 to allow a mix of office, medical office, daycare, retail and restaurant in three Subareas. The PCD has been under development for several years and currently includes the Shoppes at Avery shopping center, Huntington National Bank, Champaign Bank, the Primrose School daycare and medical office buildings.

The subject parcel is in Subarea A3 of the PCD. City Council approved a rezoning in January 2013 for this subarea for a new 14,000-square-foot shopping center with 126 parking spaces, allowing retail and restaurant uses.

On June 6, 2014, the Planning and Zoning Commission commented informally on a request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru. Commissioners were concerned about the impacts of the proposal on parking, circulation, screening and potential noise, and suggested the applicant revise the development text to limit drive-thrus to certain uses.

Description

This is a request for review and recommendation to City Council of approval of a rezoning with preliminary development plan to revise the development text for Subarea A3 of the Riverside North Planned District to allow a drive-thru for a Starbucks coffee shop. Rezoning to a Planned Unit Development requires approval of a development text to serve as the zoning regulation for the development requirements noted.

The proposal is a request to rezone 2.9 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development District, Riverside PUD North, Subarea A3) to the same district -- but creating a new PUD with standards and regulations only applicable to this Subarea. No changes are proposed to Subareas A1 and A2.

Development Text

Use

This development text modifies the permitted uses for Subarea A3. A coffee shop is a permitted use within Subarea A3 of this Planned District; however, a drive-thru is explicitly prohibited in this Subarea. The revised permitted uses and prohibited use sections of the development text (Page 6) delete the drive-thru prohibition. Text has been added to permit one drive-thru as a conditional use in Subarea A3, including an allowance for a menu board sign.

Preliminary Development Plan

This use is to occupy the easternmost tenant space, converting the previously proposed patio area into a drive-thru window and lane. To accommodate the stacking spaces, the proposal eliminates an internal driveway into the site from the east side and 14 parking spaces.

The drive-thru is proposed to be accessed from the north driveway into the site with drive-thru circulation on the east side. A landscape island separates the drive-thru circulation from parking spaces. Pavement markings will indicate the intended traffic flow for the drive-thru.

The Commission previously expressed concerns regarding the potential for vehicles stacking beyond the 12 required stacking spaces. This proposal provides the 12 spaces; in the event stacking occurred beyond this point, the parking spaces that would be potentially blocked are relatively remote from the rest of the center.

Recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission

The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this application at the August 21, 2014 meeting and recommended approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan by City Council with the conditions listed below.

Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Conditions

1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Final Development Plan Conditions

1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit;
2) That the evergreens screening the drive-thru be pulled back from the curb at least 5 feet and that a plant different from junipers be selected, subject to approval by Planning.

Conditional Use

1) That this approval is only applicable to a coffee shop;

2) That should this drive-thru cease operating, the site will be required to be restored to pre-drive-thru conditions within one year of the close of business or a new conditional use application is approved by the Commission.

There was discussion at the Commission regarding development text language prohibiting fast food and how this would apply to this application. Ultimately, the Commissioners decided that a coffee shop is not considered fast food and the conditional use review provided sufficient oversight to evaluate each drive-thru request in the future.

All conditions recommended by the Commission related to the preliminary development plan have been incorporated with this submission. The applicant has also addressed Condition 2 of the final development plan as part of this submission. Condition 1 will be required to be met at the permit stage. The Conditional Use conditions will be required to be met as they occur.

Recommendation

Staff recommends City Council approval of Ordinance 100-14 at the second reading/public hearing on October 13, 2014.

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc. Form No. 30043

100-14

Ordinance No. _____ *Passed* _____, 20____

REZONING APPROXIMATELY 2.9 ACRES, LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PERIMETER DRIVE, BETWEEN THE INTERSECTIONS WITH AVERY MUIRFIELD DRIVE AND HOSPITAL DRIVE FROM PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (RIVERSIDE PCD NORTH, SUBAREA A3) TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (RIVERSIDE PUD NORTH, SUBAREA A3) TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COFFEE SHOP WITH A DRIVE-THRU. (CASE 14-069Z/PDP/FDP)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, _____ of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. The following described real estate, (see attached legal description), situated in the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, is hereby rezoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and shall be subject to regulations and procedures contained in Ordinance No. 21-70 (Chapter 153 of the Codified Ordinances), the City of Dublin Zoning Code and amendments thereto.

Section 2. The application, including the list of contiguous and affected property owners, and the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, are all incorporated into and made an official part of this Ordinance and said real estate shall be developed and used in accordance there within.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this _____ day of _____, 2014.

_____

Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

_____

Clerk of Council



City of Dublin

14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Final Development Plan/Conditional Use
Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 - The Perimeter Starbucks
6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

0 150 300
Feet

N

February 2009

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION APPLICATION

(Code Section 153.232)

CITY OF DUBLIN.

Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

I. PLEASE CHECK THE TYPE OF APPLICATION:

- ☐ Informal Review
- ☐ Concept Plan (Section 153.056(A)(1))
- ☑ Preliminary Development Plan / Rezoning (Section 153.053)
- ☑ Final Development Plan (Section 153.053(E))
- ☐ Amended Final Development Plan (Section 153.053(E))
- ☐ Standard District Rezoning (Section 153.018)
- ☐ Preliminary Plat (Section 152.015)
- ☐ Final Plat (Section 152.085)
- ☑ Conditional Use (Section 153.236)
- ☐ Corridor Development District (CDD) (Section 153.115)
- ☐ Corridor Development District (CDD) Sign (Section 153.115)
- ☐ Minor Subdivision
- ☐ Right-of-Way Encroachment
- ☐ Other (Please Specify): _____

Please utilize the applicable *Supplemental Application Requirements* sheet for additional submittal requirements that will need to accompany this application form.

II. PROPERTY INFORMATION: This section must be completed.

Property Address(es): 6510-6570 Perimeter Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017 (Reserve "B" of Avery Place)	
Tax ID/Parcel Number(s): 273-011309-00	Parcel Size(s) (Acres): 2.930
Existing Land Use/Development: Neighborhood support retail center	

IF APPLICABLE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:	
Proposed Land Use/Development:	Modification to existing development plan to provide for a small building appendage and drive through window on the East end of the existing building, as shown on the attached site plan and building elevation drawing.
Total acres affected by application: 2.930	

III. CURRENT PROPERTY OWNER(S): Please attach additional sheets if needed.

Name (Individual or Organization): Centre At Perimeter LLC	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 1533 Lake Shore Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43204	
Daytime Telephone: 614-488-4424	Fax: 614-488-0603
Email or Alternate Contact Information: paulg@daimlergroup.com	

RECEIVED
14-0692/PDP/FDP/CU
JUL 07 2014
CITY OF DUBLIN
PLANNING

FILE COPY

IV. APPLICANT(S): This is the person(s) who is submitting the application if different than the property owner(s) listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Centre At Perimeter LLC	**Applicant is also property owner:** yes ☑ no ☐
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.): c/o The Daimler Group, Inc.	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 1533 Lake Shore Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43204	
Daytime Telephone: 614-488-4424	**Fax:** 614-488-0603
Email or Alternate Contact Information: paulg@daimlergroup.com	

V. REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF APPLICANT / PROPERTY OWNER: This is the person(s) who is submitting the application on behalf of the applicant listed in part IV or property owner listed in part III. Please complete if applicable.

Name: Paul G. Ghidotti	
Organization (Owner, Developer, Contractor, etc.): The Daimler Group, Inc.	
Mailing Address: (Street, City, State, Zip Code) 1533 Lake Shore Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43204	
Daytime Telephone: 614-488-4424	**Fax:** 614-488-0603
Email or Alternate Contact Information: paulg@daimlergroup.com	

VI. AUTHORIZATION FOR OWNER'S APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE(S): If the applicant is not the property owner, this section must be completed and notarized.

I _____, the owner, hereby authorize _____ to act as my applicant or representative(s) in all matters pertaining to the processing and approval of this application, including modifying the project. I agree to be bound by all representations and agreements made by the designated representative.

Signature of Current Property Owner:	**Date:**

☐ Check this box if the Authorization for Owner's Applicant or Representative(s) is attached as a separate document

Subscribed and sworn before me this _____ day of _____, 20 _____

State of _____

Stamp or Seal

County of _____ Notary Public _____

VII. AUTHORIZATION TO VISIT THE PROPERTY: Site visits to the property by City representatives are essential to process this application. The Owner/Applicant, as noted below, hereby authorizes City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

I Paul G. Ghidotti ☒, the owner or authorized representative, hereby authorize City representatives to visit, photograph and post a notice on the property described in this application.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	**Date:** 7/3/14

VIII. UTILITY DISCLAIMER: The Owner/Applicant acknowledges the approval of this request for review by the Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission and/or Dublin City Council does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.

I Paul G. Ghidotti, the owner or authorized representative, acknowledge that approval of this request does not constitute a guarantee or binding commitment that the City of Dublin will be able to provide essential services such as water and sewer facilities when needed by said Owner/Applicant.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: 7/3/14

IX. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT: This section must be completed and notarized.

I Paul G. Ghidotti, the owner or authorized representative, have read and understand the contents of this application. The information contained in this application, attached exhibits and other information submitted is complete and in all respects true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of applicant or authorized representative:	Date: 7/3/14

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3rd day of July, 20[illegible]

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Notary Public

Stamp or Seal
JESSICA CORRIS
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 12-04-2018

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
Amount Received: 2940.00	Application No: 14-069	P&Z Date(s): 8·21·14	P&Z Action: Approved
Receipt No:	Map Zone:	Date Received: 7/7/14	Received By: CDH
City Council (First Reading): 9·22·14		City Council (Second Reading): 10-13-14	
City Council Action:		Ordinance Number: 100-14	
Type of Request: Final Dev. PLAN			
(N) S, E, W (Circle) Side of: Perimeter Drive			
(N) S, E, (W) (Circle) Side of Nearest Intersection: Avery-Muirfield Drive			
Distance from Nearest Intersection: 1,000'			
Existing Zoning District: PCD		Requested Zoning District:	
RIVERSIDE PCD - SUBAREA A3 - The Perimeter			

Centre at Perimeter LLC Application Statement:

Centre at Perimeter LLC ("Applicant") is fee owner of that certain 2.930 acre parcel of land, having property addresses 6510-6570 Perimeter Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017, and located within Subarea A_3 of the Riverside Dublin PCD (the "Property"). Pursuant to the Riverside Dublin PCD, the existing land use character for the Property, and the surrounding vicinity, is commercial.

Applicant proposes to provide for a conditional use and rezoning of the Property by making minor modifications to the existing permitted uses as set forth in the development text for Subarea A_3 of the Riverside Dublin PCD, so that Applicant may alter the east end of the Property's existing neighborhood retail building (the "Building") and adjacent parking lot in order to construct an approximately 229 square foot building appendage and an accompanying drive-thru (the "Proposed Development").

Applicant intends to construct the Proposed Development so as to lease the east endcap of the Building to a coffee shop user (the "Proposed User"), which is a use that is desired, but not currently available, in the vicinity. A coffee shop use in the Building is an amenity expected in a commercial area, and compliments the uses and hours of operation of the existing Building tenants, which currently consist of a sit-down pizza restaurant with store hours starting at 11:00 a.m. Monday-Saturday and at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, and a carry-out bakery currently operating Monday-Friday 9:00-6:00 and Saturday 10:00-6:00. Proposed User's current intended hours of operation are approximately 5:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., with 60% of Proposed User's daily revenue typically being earned before 9:00 a.m.

As part of the Proposed Development, Applicant proposes to close the Property's eastern access drive, so as to provide for a drive-thru lane with stacking for up to 12 cars. With sufficient space for stacking, there should be no drive-thru stacking that extends into the private roadways that surround the Property and therefore no negative impact to the surrounding properties.

September 26, 2012

DESCRIPTION OF R ESERVE "B" OF AVERY PLACE
ALONG PERIMETER DRIVE, WEST OF AVERY–MUIRFIELD DRIVE,
CITY OF DUBLIN, FRANKLIN CO., OHIO

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin in Virginia Military Survey 2999 and 3452 and being all of Reserve "B", as shown upon the plat entitled Avery Place, of record in Plat Book 104, Pages 94 & 95, said Reserve "B" being a portion of an original 24.335 acre tract of land conveyed to Avery Perimeter LLC, by deed of record in Instrument 200304020095677, all records referenced to the Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

containing 2.930 acres of land, more or less and being subject to all easements and restrictions of record and being all of P.N. 273-011309. Of said 2.930 acres, 2.210 acres is within Virginia Military Survey 2999 and 0.720 acre is within Virginia Military Survey 3452.

The above description was prepared by Kevin L. Baxter, Ohio Surveyor No. 7697, of C.F. Bird & R.J. Bull, Inc., Consulting Engineers & Surveyors, Columbus, Ohio, from an actual field survey performed under his supervision in September, 2004 and verified in September, 2012. Basis of bearings is the plat entitled Avery Place, of record in Plat Book 104, Pages 94 & 95, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

Kevin L. Baxter
Ohio Surveyor #7697

STATE OF OHIO
KEVIN L. BAXTER
S-7697
REGISTERED
SURVEYOR

12-066/Reserve-B

Proximity Report Results

1974487/7833861
The selection distance was 150 feet.
The selected parcel was 273-011309.

To view a table showing the 9 parcels within the displayed proximity, scroll down.

Get Report
Print Window
Back to Proximity Report



Image Date: Tue Jun 24 15:53:44 2014

Proximity Parcels

Hint: To copy this report to another program:
1. Hold down the left mouse buttton over the top-left corner of the area you want to get.
2. Drag the mouse to the bottom-left corner of the desired area.
3. Let go of the mouse button.
4. Select Edit Copy from the menu bar.
You can then Paste the report into another application.

Parcel	Owner Name	Address
273-012056	ANYTHING REALTY LLC	POST RD
273-011547	BRINDLES LLC	6600 PERIMETER DR
273-011309	CENTER AT PERIMERTER LLC	6510 PERIMETER DR
273-011305	CHAMPAIGN NATIONAL BANK	6400 PERIMETER DR
273-008208	DUBLIN OAKS LIMITED	7000 -090 HOSPITAL DR
273-012135	JEK MANAGEMENT LTD	6425 POST RD
273-011344	OSU EYE PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS LLC	6435 POST RD
273-011303	PMDM-AVERY LLC	6695 -755 AVERY MUIRFIELD DR
273-011306	TRIPLET ROSE HOLDING CO LLC	6415 POST RD

powered by MetaMAP

Proximity Report Results

2140502/1492309
The selection distance was **300 feet.**
The selected parcel was **273-011309.**

To view a table showing the **15 parcels** within the displayed proximity, scroll down.

Get Report
Print Window
Back to Proximity Report



Image Date: Tue Jun 24 16:13:25 2014

Proximity Parcels

Hint: To copy this report to another program:
1. Hold down the left mouse buttton over the top-left corner of the area you want to get.
2. Drag the mouse to the bottom-left corner of the desired area.
3. Let go of the mouse button.
4. Select Edit Copy from the menu bar.

You can then Paste the report into another application.

Parcel	Owner Name	Address
273-012056	ANYTHING REALTY LLC	POST RD
273-011547	BRINDLES LLC	6600 PERIMETER DR
273-011309	CENTER AT PERIMERTER LLC	6510 PERIMETER DR
273-011305	CHAMPAIGN NATIONAL BANK	6400 PERIMETER DR
273-004286	DUBLIN GERIATRIC CARE CO	6430 POST RD
273-008208	DUBLIN OAKS LIMITED	7000 -090 HOSPITAL DR
273-011304	HUNTINGTON NATIONAL BANK	6705 AVERY MUIRFIELD DR
273-012135	JEK MANAGEMENT LTD	6425 POST RD
273-000378	NORTHWEST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH PCA I	6488 POST RD
273-011780	OHIOHEALTH CORP	7450 HOSPITAL DR
273-011344	OSU EYE PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS LLC	6435 POST RD
273-012055	PERIMETER MOB LLC	6670 PERIMETER RD
273-011303	PMDM-AVERY LLC	6695 -755 AVERY MUIRFIELD DR
273-007471	PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUN	6400 POST RD
273-011306	TRIPLET ROSE HOLDING CO LLC	6415 POST RD

powered by MetaMAP

Subarea A - Post Road Related

For purposes of clearly defining and limiting uses that are permitted within Subarea A of the Riverside Dublin PCD, three separate subareas are established. Each of these subareas (referred to as subarea A_1, A_2, and A_3) is identified on the attached Exhibit A.

Permitted Uses:

The following uses shall be permitted within each of Subarea A_1, A_2, and A_3, respectively:

Subarea A_1

a) Those uses listed in §153.026(A)--Suburban Office and Institutional District--of the Zoning Code.

b) Financial service organizations and financial institutions (conditional use for drive-thru bank); provided that all such organizations and institutions shall be located only in Subarea A between Avery-Muirfield Drive and the access drive within Subarea A which lines up with the western access to Avery Square (the Kroger center) to the south of Subarea A (the "Demarcation Line"). The Demarcation Line is depicted on the attached Exhibit A.

c) Daycare centers (including a preschool or any type of institution which provides education to toddlers and children up to the age of 13 years old).

Subarea A_2

a) Those uses listed in §153.026(A)--Suburban Office and Institutional District--of the Zoning Code.

b) Financial service organizations and financial institutions (conditional use for drive-thru bank; provided that any such drive-thru that might be contained within a structure located along Avery-Muirfield Drive shall be screened to the satisfaction of staff and consistent with the Master Plan (defined below)).

c) Coffee shops, cafés, ice cream shops, bakeries, or casual or fine dining eating and drinking establishments, specialty retail stores, bookstores, florists, stationary stores, gift/novelty shops; or stores providing goods and services which support office buildings or occupants of office buildings (e.g. copy shops, office supply/equipment sales, delivery service providers, etc.) Subarea A_2 shall contain no more than 11,000 square feet of area in total of those uses described in the preceding sentence. In addition, one eating or drinking establishment within the neighborhood retail center located within Subarea A_2 will be permitted to incorporate an outdoor seating area, along the pond between the building and Avery-Muirfield Drive, as part of such establishment; provided that such seating

area shall have a maximum square footage area no more than 15% of the interior space of such establishment.

Subarea A_3 (as revised through Ordinance 01-13, approved on January 28, 2013)

a) Those uses listed in §153.026(A)--suburban office and institutional district--of the Zoning Code.

b) Casual and fine dining, eating and drinking establishments not to exceed a total of 11,000 square feet, except as approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission; retail stores, bookstores, florists, stationary stores, gift/novelty shops; or stores providing goods and services which support office buildings or occupants of office buildings (e.g. copy shops, office supply/equipment sales, delivery service providers, etc.) or otherwise provide support retail services for nearby residential neighborhoods. ~~provided those establishments at no time include a drive-thru.~~

c) ~~c)~~ Outdoor Dining Areas with up to 2000 total sq. ft. of seating space within Subarea A-3 that can be allotted to the various tenants to be administratively approved by Land Use and Long Range Planning. Those outdoor dining areas shall employ complementary amenities (fences, tables, chairs, flower boxes) and must be of a black, wrought-iron design consistent with the patios which have been approved for the area. Outdoor speakers are prohibited. The proposed patio amenities shall be stored in a location that is not visible to the public when not in regular use unless the patio furniture is all-weather material, set up for use and not covered in any way, and weather conditions make the use of furniture possible.

d) One drive-thru may be permitted as a conditional use within Subarea A3, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.236.

Unless otherwise stated above, ~~Notwithstanding any of the uses listed above in any of Subareas A_1, A_2, or A_3,~~ none of the following uses shall be permitted anywhere within Subarea A at any time: (i) auto service; (ii) auto repair; (iii) gas station; (iv) tire store, (v) muffler or brake shop; (vi) car dealer or any other type of business which offers cars for sale or resale; (vii) car wash; or (viii) fast food restaurant (with or without a drive-through window). Furthermore, in the event any financial service organization or financial institution that is located along Avery-Muirfield Drive desires to change to a use other than that which is permitted under (a)-(c) of Subarea A_1, above, that new use shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Commission.

Density/Lot Coverage:

The density of each site shall not exceed 10,000 sf/acre. In addition, the total maximum lot coverage for all of Subarea A shall be equal to or less than 65% for the overall development and no individual site shall have a lot coverage greater than 70%.

Yard and Setback Requirements:

a) In 1988, the Riverside Dublin PCD text originally contemplated a large setback for Subarea A along its Post Road frontage. In an effort to reallocate setbacks and associated green space areas to reflect the nature and character of how all of the neighboring uses have since been developed as commercial/institutional uses and to adequately reflect the transitional nature of Subarea A from those same surroundings, it is desirable to adjust and increase certain setbacks within Subarea A (see attached Table A). The main goal of this reallocation is to treat the Avery-Muirfield Drive frontage with special attention. As a result, a substantial parking and building setback shall be created along Avery-Muirfield Drive and within that setback a large pond with two fountains and a cascading waterfall shall be constructed to more appropriately reflect the gateway nature of Subarea A in a manner that is complimentary to its environs. With this reallocation of setbacks, the following setbacks for Post Road, Avery-Muirfield Drive, and Perimeter Drive are created:

	Building Setback	Pavement Setback
Avery-Muirfield Drive	85'	75'
Perimeter Drive	40'[1]	20'[1]
Post Road (east)[2]	100'	40'
Post Road (west)[3]	100'	70'

b) Side yard setbacks shall be 15' for pavement and 25' for buildings. However, in order to promote prudent planning and to encourage the location (or relocation) of green space to more desirable areas, the planning commission may permit pavement setbacks (and rear yard pavement setbacks defined in (c), below) to be reduced to less than 15' (and even to a zero lot line situation wherein parking lots of adjoining properties would be shared). Notwithstanding the foregoing, the neighborhood retail center proposed at the northeast corner of Subarea A which is a single structure which is located in both Subarea A_1 and A_2 shall be permitted to straddle the Subarea A_1/A_2 line.

c) Subject to (b), above, rear yard setbacks shall be 25' for pavement and buildings.

[1] Which is consistent with the current required setbacks less the additional right-of-way grant required.
[2] Between Avery-Muirfield Drive and the Demarcation Line.
[3] Between the Demarcation Line and the western boundary of Subarea A.

d) Total ground covered by all buildings shall not exceed 25% of the total lot area.

Parking and Loading:

a) Size, ratio, and type of parking and loading facility shall be regulated by Dublin Code Chapter [153.200].

b) All sites within Subarea A shall comply with the City of Dublin exterior lighting guidelines and will utilize "shoe-box" light fixtures with pole heights not greater than 28 feet from the grade of the parking lot.

Circulation:

Circulation within Subarea A and access to and from the adjacent publicly-dedicated streets shall be provided for in accordance with the approved development plan for Subarea A set forth in the Master Plan (defined below). Subarea A shall have no direct access onto Avery-Muirfield Drive.

Offsite Infrastructure:

In order to promote improved traffic efficiency on Post Road, Avery-Muirfield Drive, and Perimeter Drive proximate to Subarea A and in accordance with the November 20, 2003 letter from the City of Dublin (attached Exhibit B), all of the following shall occur to the satisfaction of the City of Dublin:

a) Right-of-Ways.

(i) An additional 15' of right-of-way shall be granted to Dublin along the west side of Avery-Muirfield Drive.

(ii) An additional 10' of right-of-way shall be granted to Dublin along the north side of Perimeter Drive up to the point at which the existing right-of-way is 100'.

b) Road/Infrastructure Improvements.

(i) Payment of the proportionate cost (as determined by the City of Dublin) for the improvements associated with the addition of an east bound left turn lane on Post Road (west of Avery-Muirfield Drive) which proportionate costs relate to additional traffic which will be generated by Subarea A as a result of the Post Road access.

(ii) Payment of all costs associated with the addition of a left turn lane from Post Road into Subarea A at the single access point on Post Road. The applicant shall attempt to coordinate completion of these improvements with those required of the church property on the north side of Post Road.

(iii) Payment of 25% of the cost associated with any future traffic controls installed at the third intersection on Perimeter Drive (west of Avery-Muirfield Drive) if, and when, such traffic control is warranted.

Waste and Refuse:

All waste and refuse shall be contained and fully screened from view by a solid wall or fence as required by the Dublin Code.

Fences:

Other than as required for any daycare center located within Subarea A_1, no fences shall be permitted on any site unless otherwise approved by staff or otherwise required for screening service areas, mechanical units, etc.

Storage and Equipment:

a) No materials, supplies, equipment or products shall be stored or permitted to remain on any portion of a parcel outside a permitted structure. Mechanical equipment or other utility hardware on roof, ground or buildings shall be screened from public view with materials harmonious with the building as required by the Dublin Code.

Landscaping:

a) Landscaping shall be according to the Dublin Landscape Code Chapter [153.130-153.139]. In addition, landscaping treatment along Post Road shall be provided within the Post Road setback and shall include a grass mound with a mixture of ornamental, evergreen, and shade trees. The mound shall be contoured, natural, and undulating in appearance and shall be broken up into sections of varying lengths between 130' and 150' in length and with varying heights ranging from three and a half feet to six feet in height. Landscape plantings shall be in accordance with the Master Plan described in (c), below, and sample elevations are included as attached Exhibit C.

b) In addition, landscaping along Perimeter Drive shall include a three and a half foot contoured, landscaped mound with street trees planted 50' on center within the right-of-way and planted within five feet of the right-of-way line.

c) In order to appropriately transition the institutional and residential uses to the north of Subarea A with the fast food and strip center retail development to the south of Subarea A, Subarea A will incorporate a large pond (with an appearance similar to The Preserve at the southeast corner of Frantz Road and Tuttle Crossing

Boulevard) fronting along Avery-Muirfield Drive with a higher reflective pond that will include a cascading water fall feature. This pond will be "well-fed" in the manner approved by the City of Dublin. In addition, the pond will contain fountains at the north and south ends along Avery-Muirfield. This frontage treatment will provide for an appropriate gateway feature for vehicular traffic as it moves from the residential development to the north south towards the SR33/161 interchange. This overall landscaping plan for Subarea A will be consistent with the Comprehensive Site Master Plan prepared by Faris Planning & Design and approved by the Planning Commission (the "Master Plan").

Traffic Calming:

Along the private, internal, east-west street that runs parallel to Post Road and Perimeter Drive, traffic calming measures (e.g. textured pavement, raised tables, etc.) acceptable to the City of Dublin shall be installed to slow the movement of traffic at the intersection of the driveway that provides access from the Subarea A to Post Road.

Architecture:

Generally:

The architectural design of all buildings within Subarea A shall be traditional in look and feel and will be finished with natural materials. The particular architecture for all buildings within Subarea A that will contain uses other than those permitted in §153.026(A) (the "Non-Office Uses") shall be consistent with, or complimentary to, the style of architecture of those submitted as "conceptual" with this application (i.e. the small neighborhood retail center and The Huntington Bank branch). The intent of the foregoing is that these commercial structures have a residential feel and flare similar in design and feel to the Perimeter Center development. The architectural design of all uses within Subarea A permitted under §153.026(A) (the "Office Uses") shall be consistent with the office buildings proximate to Subarea A along Perimeter Drive and Post Road. In addition to the foregoing, the following guidelines shall be followed:

Height:

1) No Non-Office Uses shall have a height in excess of 28' as measured by the Dublin Code (i.e. for pitched or hipped roofs, such a measurement shall be made to the mean height of such roof). No Office Uses shall have a height in excess of 35' as measured by the Dublin Code (i.e. for pitched or hipped roofs, such a measurement shall be made to the mean height of such roof).

Color Palette:

1) Earth tones and muted/natural tones shall be required on all structures within Subarea A so as to be consistent with those earth tone and muted/natural colors of nearby structures. In addition, storefront colors for the neighborhood retail center shall be selected from a palette of colors approved by the planning commission as part of the development plan approval for that neighborhood center.

Materials:

1) Warm tone brick, stone or synthetic stone, cedar siding and trim, and engineered wood composite material (e.g. hardi-plank or smartside siding and trim).

2) Specifically for Non-Office Uses, windows shall be residential in character (where appropriate for the particular type of commercial use). Windows should include mullions and muntins to reduce large expanses of glass areas. However, "store-front" glass is acceptable and appropriate in service-oriented areas for Non-Office Uses.

Roof:

1) All buildings shall have a pitched or sloped roof (whether hipped or gabled). However, for Office Uses, this requirement may be satisfied by partial roofs, towers, or pagodas--similar to that utilized at The Preserve. In addition and regardless of whether a building is an Office-Use or a Non-Office Use, each such roof may provide open areas to house and permit the functionality of mechanical and other typical roof top equipment.

2) All structures shall contain roofing material consisting of dimensional asphalt shingles, cedar shakes or shingles, or slate (whether synthetic or authentic slate), all of which shall be in a color and style deemed appropriate by the planning commission as compatible with the neighboring buildings.

3) The use of dormers, vertical vents, and other architectural treatments which interrupt vast expanses of roof are encouraged for roofs on Non-Office Use structures.

Scale:

1) All structures within Subarea A should be of a size and character complimentary with the existing nearby structures.

2) Structures should be designed to harmonize with the Master Plan.

3) Each Non-Office Use building must use articulated building elements, including, but not limited to porticoes, dormers, recesses, and other such elements to help break up the mass and bring each such building into a more residential character.

Wall Articulation/Fenestration:

1) In addition to using building elements to articulate the building mass, individual walls must be articulated with fenestration, pattern, or structural expression equally on all sides of each structure.

2) With the exception to enclosed service corridors, all buildings shall have the same degree of exterior finish on all sides. Other than for necessary service areas, blank facades on the "rear" of any building will not be permitted, however, articulating such facades with recesses, fenestration, fences, pilasters, etc. is encouraged.

3) The amount of fenestration should be balanced with the amount of solid facade.

Signage and Graphics:

All signs shall comply with the Dublin Sign Code -- [Section 153.150]. In the event of any conflict between the Dublin Sign Code and this text, this text shall control.

a) Materials and Landscaping:

1) All monument signs with a base located within Subarea A shall have an appearance consistent with, or compatible to, that depicted on Table C attached hereto.

2) All monument signs shall have landscaping around the base of the sign as required by the Dublin Code.

b) Dimensions of Sign:

1) Maximum area of sign face: 50 square feet per face, with a limit of no more than two faces per sign.

2) Area of sign base (if any) shall not exceed area of sign face. The base shall not be included in the overall area permitted for the sign face.

3) Maximum overall height: 8'-0" above top of adjacent street curb. Signs located on grass mounds shall maintain conformance to 8'-0" maximum height above top of adjacent curb.

c) Sign Graphics:

1) Graphic identification shall be limited to the site user's name, logo, and street number.

2) The area of graphic images such as logos shall not exceed 20% of the sign face.

3) Street numbers shall be located in the lower corner of the sign face or base nearest the right-of-way.

4) The maximum height of any letter or number shall be 16".

d) Quantity:

No more than one ground sign shall be permitted on any one lot devoted to one specific use or user; except that for buildings or uses having frontage on two or more public rights-of-way, two ground signs are permitted. In the event any lot qualifies for two ground signs, those signs shall comply with the Dublin Sign Code and shall consist of no more than 66.67 square feet in the aggregate.

e) Illumination:

All monument signs shall be non-illuminated or feature internally illuminated graphics or back-lit graphics.

f) Setbacks:

The setback for all signage shall be no less than eight feet from the right-of-way of any site consistent with the Dublin Code.

g) Traffic/Directional:

All traffic and directional signage shall conform to Section 153.152 of the Dublin Zoning Code.

h) Sign Location:

Other than approved as part of the neighborhood retail center as described below, no sign shall be painted or posted on the surface of any building, wall, or fence (i.e. all signage other than for the neighborhood retail center shall be monument signs). No wall murals shall be allowed. No roof signs shall be permitted, nor shall any sign extend higher than the building.

i) Window Signage:

Other than described below relating to the neighborhood retail center, no sign shall be applied to any windows for the purpose of outdoor or exterior advertising.

j) Neighborhood Retail Center:

All of the following signage standards shall relate specifically to the neighborhood retail center that will be situated west of the pond located along the west side of Avery-Muirfield Drive, the following signage criteria is established:

1) Each tenant store front within the retail center shall only have the right to install wall signage consistent with that depicted in the attached Table B and only along the east and west elevations of the retail center.

2) All such signs shall not exceed a placement height of 15 feet.

3) Each tenant store front sign shall be limited to one wall sign and one projecting sign along the western elevation of the retail center and one wall sign only along the eastern elevation of the retail center. Such wall signs shall be in accordance with Table B. The color of the wall sign and the projecting sign for each user shall be the same.

4) The background color of wall signs and projecting signs shall be selected from a palette of trim colors approved by the planning commission as part of the development plan approval process.

5) For purposes of aiding the public with locating a particular use within this center, each user shall be allowed to apply temporary signage to the east elevation of the retail center consistent with the Dublin Signage Code.

6) In addition to the wall signs which may be located on the east and west sides of the retail center as described in 3, above, the occupant located at the north end of the retail center (i.e. Tenant 7) shall have the right to locate one monument sign along Avery-Muirfield Drive which identifies only that occupant provided that such monument sign complies with all of items (a) - (i), above, and provided further that that occupant (Tenant 7) is limited to a total amount of signage of no more than 66.67 square feet. That monument sign shall be located as noted on Table C .

7) No projection signage located along the west elevation of the retail center shall be illuminated.

8) Wall signs located along the east and west elevations of the retail center should be externally lit by "goose-neck" light fixtures.

Signage and Graphics Applicable only to Subarea A_3 (as revised as part of Ordinance 01-13, January 28, 2013)

All of the following signage standards shall apply to the neighborhood retail building on Perimeter Drive (located within Subarea A_3) as generally depicted on the attached Exhibit D.

A. Types of Signs. Permitted sign types include single-sided, wall-mounted, tenant "panel" signs, and wall-mounted, projecting "blade" signs. Window signs, other than informational window signs, of any type are prohibited.

B. Number and Location. All signs shall be architecturally integrated into the building façade generally in the location depicted on the attached Table D. Tenants occupying space within the building shall have the right to install one wall-mounted (panel) sign on the north building façade, one on the south building façade, and one projecting (blade) sign on the north building façade.

C. Mounting Height. No sign shall be permitted to exceed 15' in height to the top of the sign measured from established grade. The projecting (blade) signs on the north façade shall be a minimum of eight feet in height to the bottom of the sign from established grade.

D. Design and Fabrication. Creativity with signage is encouraged. However, the following must be adhered to:

1. Wall-mounted Tenant Signs.
   a. *Maximum Size*. The maximum height for all wall-mounted tenant sign panels shall be no more than 24" tall. The maximum width for all wall-mounted tenant sign panels shall be no more than 120". The maximum height for text/graphics within said wall-mounted sign panels shall be no more than 16". The maximum width for text/graphics within said wall-mounted sign panels shall be no more than 96".
   b. *Additional Specifications*:
      i. Sign Panel = Single Faced, 1.5" thick wood or high density urethane with surface applied text/graphics and routered 1" wide perimeter detail.
      ii. Installation = Sign panels to be surface-mounted to wall with 5/16" Hilti style expanding anchors. No mounting hardware shall be visible on sign face.

2. Approved Signage Shapes. The shape of the wall-mounted sign panels on the north and south facades of the building shall be generally in a rectangular shape and shall have matching ends containing one of the shapes depicted in Table D.

3. Wall-mounted Projecting (Blade) Signs.
   a. *Maximum Size*. The maximum height for all wall-mounted projecting (blade) sign panels shall be no more than 27". The maximum width for all blade sign panels shall be no more than 36".
   b. *Additional Specifications:*

i. Sign Panel = Double-faced, 2" thick wood or high density urethane with surface-applied text/graphics & routered 1" wide perimeter detail.

ii. Hanging Bracket = 1-1/2" x 1-1/2" square steel tube and wall flange assembly with fabricated 1/4" aluminum scroll and finial cap. Bracket and hardware shall be painted in Matte Black finish.

iii. Installation = Bracket installed perpendicular to wall w/ 3/8" Hilti style expanding anchors. Signs shall be suspended beneath the brackets with ½" eye-bolts.

c. *Projecting (Blade) Signage Shapes:* The shape of the projecting (blade) signage on the north façade of the building shall be generally in one of the four shapes depicted in Table D.

Further, such projecting (blade) signage may incorporate and include the logo of the business operating within the building or an iconic representation of the nature of the business or the primary good or service sold or provided to the public by that business.

4. Menu Boards

a. If a drive-thru is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in accordance with this development text, the use is permitted one (1) menu board sign in addition to the other signs permitted in this development text.

b. The menu board shall not exceed 32 square feet in size and must be approved as part of the final development plan.

~~4.~~5. Lettering, Logos and Secondary Images

a. Lettering. All sign lettering is to be centered in relation to the height and width of the sign. The actual signage text/lettering shall consist of surface mounted, raised lettering (as individual letters containing the name of the business operation) and shall be adhered to the wood sign board. The height and placement of all sign lettering must comply with the requirements specified in this text.

b. Logos and Secondary Images are permitted in accordance with Code Section 153.158(C)(2).

~~5.~~6. Color. The background color for all signs shall be in accordance with that approved as part of the final development plan presented to the Planning Commission or as otherwise approved by the Planning Staff. No more than three colors in total are permitted for each sign including the color of the background of the wood sign. A corporate trademark or symbol used as a logo or secondary image shall not be limited in the number of colors used, but shall be considered as one of the three permissible colors. The selected color scheme of each tenant must be consistent for each of the tenant's signs.

~~6.~~7. Sign Illumination. Wall-mounted signs shall be illuminated by linear fluorescent track lighting fixtures as depicted and described in Table D. Projecting (blade) signage shall not be separately illuminated from the building.

CITY OF DUBLIN, OHIO
ZONING DOCUMENTS
FOR
PERIMETER RETAIL
2014



LOCATION MAP
NO SCALE

PROPERTY OWNER
CENTER AT PERIMERTER, LLC.
1533 LAKE SHORE DRIVE
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43204
CONTACT: PAUL GHIDOTTI, VICE PRESIDENT
PHONE: 614-488-4424
FAX: 614-488-0503
EMAIL: PAULG@DAIMLERGROUP.COM

DEVELOPER
THE DAIMLER GROUP, INC.
1533 LAKE SHORE DRIVE
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43204
CONTACT: PAUL GHIDOTTI, VICE PRESIDENT
PHONE: 614-488-4424
FAX: 614-488-0503
EMAIL: PAULG@DAIMLERGROUP.COM

ENGINEER
C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.
2875 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE ROAD
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43235
CONTACT: ANDREW GARDNER, P.E.
PHONE: 614-761-1661
FAX: 614-761-1328
EMAIL: AGARDNER@BIRDBULL.COM

ARCHITECT
BEAN ARCHITECT
4400 NORTH HIGH STREET, SUITE 401
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43214
CONTACT: CARTER BEAN
PHONE: 614-262-2326
FAX: 614-262-2326
EMAIL: CARTER@BEANARCHITECT.COM

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
KLA STUDIOS
CONTACT: BRENT KING
PHONE: 614-530-5273
EMAIL: BKING@KLA-STUDIOS.COM



INDEX MAP
SCALE: 1" = 100'

SHEET INDEX

C1.1	TITLE SHEET
C1.2	REGIONAL CONTEXT MAP
C1.3	VICINITY MAP
C1.4	EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DEMOLITION PLAN
C1.5	PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
C1.6	FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
C1.7	GRADING AND STORM SEWER PLAN
C1.8	STAKING AND DIMENSION PLAN
C1.9	UTILITY PLAN
A0-01	LANDSCAPE PLAN
A0-02	ENLARGEMENT PLAN
A0-03	SPECIFICATIONS - PLANTS
A0-04	SPECIFICATIONS - TURF/GRASSES
A2.1	BUILDING ELEVATION

OHIO Utilities Protection SERVICE
Call Before You Dig
800-362-2764 or 8-1-1
www.oups.org

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 COVER SHEET.dwg 07/07/2014

Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2875 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph (614) 761-1661
Fax (614) 761-1328
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER ROAD
DUBLIN, OHIO

TITLE SHEET

SCALE 1" = 100'		JOB NO. 14-066	C1.1
DWN SG	CKD AAG	DATE 07/07/14	



SCALE: 1" = 200'

0 200 400 600

GRAPHIC SCALE

Bird+Bull

C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2175 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph. (614) 761-1661
Fax. (614) 761-1928
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

REGIONAL CONTEXT MAP

SCALE: 1" = 200'			JOB NO. 14-066	C1.2
DWN: BG	CKD: AAG	DATE: 07/07/2014		

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 REGIONAL CONTEXT MAP.dwg 07/07/2014



Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.L. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2675 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph (614) 761-1666
Fax (614) 761-1558
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER SHOPS
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

VICINITY MAP

SCALE 1" = 60'		JOB NO. 14-066	C1.3
DWN SG	CKD AAG	DATE 07/07/2014	

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 VICINITY MAP.dwg 07/07/2014



Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2175 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43228
Ph (614) 761-1661
Fax (614) 761-1929
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DEMOLITION PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'		ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22" x 34"	
		JOB NO. 14-066	C1.4
DWN SG	CKD AAG	DATE 07/07/2014	

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan.dwg 07/07/2014



DEVELOPMENT DATA

ZONING:

PROPERTY OWNER:	CENTER AT PERIMERTER, LLC
PROPERTY USE:	SHOPPING CENTER
EXISTING ZONING:	PCD (PLANNED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT)
ADJACENT ZONING NORTH:	PCD
ADJACENT ZONING SOUTH:	PUD
ADJACENT ZONING EAST:	PCD
ADJACENT ZONING WEST:	PCD

SITE LAYOUT DATA:

TOTAL SITE AREA:	2.930 ACRES
PRIVATE STREET AREA WITHIN PARCEL:	0.29 ACRES
TOTAL SITE AREA (EXCLUDING PRIVATE STREET)	2.64 ACRES
EX. VEHICULAR USE AREA:	1.165 AC. (50,760 S.F.) (44%)
PROP. VEHICULAR USE AREA:	1.159 AC. (50,472 S.F.) (44%)
EX BUILDING AREA:	0.328 ACRES (14,677 S.F.) (12%)
PROP. BUILDING AREA:	0.342 ACRES (14,906 S.F.) (13%)
EX SITE IMPERVIOUS AREA:	1.49 AC. (64,904 S.F.) (0.56%)
PROP. SITE IMPERVIOUS AREA:	1.47 AC. (63,853 S.F.) (0.56%)

(NOTE % AREAS ARE BASED ONSITE AREA, EXCLUDING EXISTING PRIVATE STREETS)

AISLE WIDTH:	22'
PARKING SETBACK:	15' (INTERNAL ROADS) 20' (PERIMETER DRIVE)
BUILDING SETBACK:	25' (INTERNAL ROADS) 40' (PERIMETER DRIVE)
STANDARD PARKING STALL:	9' X 19'
TOTAL PARKING SPACES REQUIRED: (1 SPACE PER 150 S.F.)	99 SPACES
TOTAL PARKING SPACES:	111 SPACES (WITH 5 HC SPACES)

SIGNATURES

PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL DATE _____ DATE

COUNCIL APPROVAL DATE _____ DATE

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION SECRETARY _____ DATE

PROPERTY OWNER / APPLICANT _____ DATE

Bird+Bull
C.P. BIRD & B.L. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2975 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph: (614) 761-1641
Fax: (614) 761-1328
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'				ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22" x 34" JOB NO.	
DWN SG	CKD AAG	DATE: 07/07/2014		14-066	C1.5

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Preliminary Development Plan.dwg 07/07/2014



SCALE 1" = 30'

0 30 60 90

GRAPHIC SCALE

DEVELOPMENT DATA

ZONING:

PROPERTY OWNER:	CENTER AT PERIMERTER, LLC
PROPERTY USE:	SHOPPING CENTER
EXISTING ZONING:	PCD (PLANNED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT)
ADJACENT ZONING NORTH:	PCD
ADJACENT ZONING SOUTH:	PUD
ADJACENT ZONING EAST:	PCD
ADJACENT ZONING WEST:	PCD

SITE LAYOUT DATA:

TOTAL SITE AREA:	2.930 ACRES
PRIVATE STREET AREA WITHIN PARCEL:	0.29 ACRES
TOTAL SITE AREA (EXCLUDING PRIVATE STREET)	2.64 ACRES
EX. VEHICULAR USE AREA:	1.165 AC. (50,760 S.F.) (44%)
PROP. VEHICULAR USE AREA:	1.159 AC. (50,472 S.F.) (44%)
EX BUILDING AREA:	0.328 ACRES (14,677 S.F.) (12%)
PROP. BUILDING AREA:	0.342 ACRES (14,906 S.F.) (13%)
EX SITE IMPERVIOUS AREA:	1.49 AC. (64,904 S.F.) (0.56%)
PROP. SITE IMPERVIOUS AREA.	1.47 AC. (63,853 S.F.) (0.56%)
REDUCTION IN IMPERVIOUS AREA:	0.02 AC. (1,051 S.F.)

(NOTE % AREAS ARE BASED ONSITE AREA, EXCLUDING EXISTING PRIVATE STREETS)

AISLE WIDTH:	22'
PARKING SETBACK:	15' (INTERNAL ROADS) 20' (PERIMETER DRIVE)
BUILDING SETBACK:	25' (INTERNAL ROADS) 40' (PERIMETER DRIVE)
STANDARD PARKING STALL:	9' X 19'
TOTAL PARKING SPACES REQUIRED: (1 SPACE PER 150 S.F.)	99 SPACES
TOTAL PARKING SPACES:	111 SPACES (WITH 5 HC SPACES)

SIGNATURES

PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL DATE _____ DATE

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION SECRETARY _____ DATE

PROPERTY OWNER _____ DATE

APPLICANT _____ DATE

Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.L. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2835 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph. (614) 761-1961
Fax (614) 761-1328
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'			ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22" x 34"
DWN: SG	CKD: AAG	DATE: 07/07/2014	JOB NO. 14-066

C1.6

H:\jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Final Development Plan.dwg 07/07/2014



1. ITEM 448 1-1/4" HOT MIXED, HOT LAID ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE I PG 64-22
2. ITEM 448 1-3/4" HOT MIXED, HOT LAID ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE COURSE, TYPE 2 PG 64-22
3. ITEM 304 8" AGGREGATE BASE (COMPACTED IN TWO EQUAL LAYERS)
4. COMPACTED SUBGRADE

LEGEND

↑ LANE ARROW

— 24" STOP BAR

CODED NOTES

- (A) PROPOSED CONCRETE CURB PER DETAIL (THIS SHEET)
- (B) WHITE 4" CHANNELIZING LINE FOR PARKING STALL
- (C) WHITE CHANNELIZING LINE
- (D) WHITE TRAVERSE STRIPING FOR CROSSWALKS
- (E) PROPOSED DRIVE THRU MENU BOARD
- (F) PROPOSED " DO NOT ENTER" SIGN
- (G) PROPOSED STARBUCKS DIRECTIONAL SIGN

Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.L. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2875 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph. (614) 761-1661
Fax (614) 761-1328
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

STAKING AND DIMENSION PLAN

SCALE 1" = 30'			ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22" x 34"
DWN. SG	CKD. AAG	DATE 07/07/2014	JOB NO. 14-066

C1.8

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Preliminary Site Dimension Plan.dwg 07/07/2014



CODED NOTES

(A) EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE TO BE ADJUSTED TO GRADE.

LEGEND

- EXISTING CONTOUR
- EXISTING STORM MANHOLE
- PROPOSED STORM MANHOLE
- EXISTING CATCH BASIN
- PROPOSED CATCH BASIN
- PROPOSED STORMWATER PONDING AREAS
- PERMANENT PAVEMENT REPLACEMENT
- EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE
- PROPOSED SANITARY MANHOLE
- EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
- PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT
- EXISTING VALVE
- PROPOSED VALVE
- LIMITS OF PROPOSED CONCRETE

(1) EX. MANHOLE
TC = 922.82
15" E= W @ 917.09
12" S @ 917.15

(2) EX. MANHOLE
TC = 923.50
12" N. @ 917.55
12" S. @ 917.80

(3) EX. MANHOLE
TC = 923.50
12"N. @ 917.55 W/4" ORIFICE PLATE
18" W @ 917.65
12" S. @ 917.90

(4) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 922.80
18" E = 918.05
18" W = 918.10

(5) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 923.30
18" E = 918.35
18" W @ 918.35

(6) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 922.70
15" E = 918.70
12" SW = 918.90

(7) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 922.80
12" NE @ 919.20
12" SE @ 919.35

(8) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 923.50
12" NW @ 920.30

(9) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 922.80
12" N. @ 918.85
12" SW @ 918.10

(10) EX. CATCH BASIN
TC = 923.70
12" NE @ 919.66

(11) PROP. WATER QUALITY UNIT
TC = 923.50
CONTECH CDS-2025 OR
APPROVED EQUAL.

Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2835 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43235
Ph. (614) 761-1641
Fax. (614) 761-1328
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

GRADING AND STORM SEWER PLAN

SCALE 1" = 30'			ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22"x 34"
DWN SG	CKD AAG	DATE 07/07/2014	JOB NO. 14-066

C1.7

H:\Jobs\2014\066\CAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Grading Plan.dwg 07/07/2014



LEGEND

- EXISTING STORM MANHOLE
- PROPOSED STORM MANHOLE
- EXISTING CATCH BASIN
- PROPOSED CATCH BASIN
- EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE
- PROPOSED SANITARY MANHOLE
- EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
- PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT
- EXISTING VALVE
- PROPOSED VALVE
- LIMITS OF PROPOSED CONCRETE

CODED NOTES

(A) EXISTING LIGHT POLE

Bird+Bull
C.F. BIRD & B.J. BULL, INC.
Engineers and Surveyors
2335 W. Dublin-Granville Road
Columbus, Ohio 43234
Ph (614) 761-1641
Fax (614) 761-1329
WWW.BIRDBULL.COM

PERIMETER RETAIL
PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO

UTILITY PLAN

SCALE 1" = 30'			ORIG. SHT. SZ. 22"x 34"
DWN.SG	CKD.AAG	DATE 07/07/2014	JOB NO. 14-066

C1.9

H:\Jobs\2014\066\ACAD\dwg\Engineering\Development Plans\14-066 Preliminary Utility Plan.dwg 07/07/2014

QTY	KEY	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COND.	REMARKS
	SHADE TREES					
11	ARA	ACER FREEMANII 'CELEBRATION'	CELEBRATION MAPLE	2" CAL.	B&B	
6	CC	CORYLUS COLURNA	TURKISH FILBERT	2" CAL.	B&B	
10	QI	QUERCUS IMBRICARIA	SHINGLE OAK	2" CAL.	B&B	
4	QR	QUERCUS RUBRA	RED OAK	2" CAL.	B&B	
5	UH	ULMUS P.H.C. 'HOMESTEAD'	HOMESTEAD ELM	2" CAL.	B&B	
9	GTI	GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS INERMIS 'IMPERIAL'	IMPERIAL HONEYLOCUST	2" CAL.	B&B	
1	AGG	GINKGO BILOBA 'AUTUMN GOLD GINKGO'	AUTUMN GOLD GINKGO	2" CAL.	B&B	
	ORNAMENTAL TREES					
7	MS	MALUS SPRING SNOW	SPRING SNOW CRABAPPLE	1 3/4" CAL.	B&B	
	EVERGREEN TREES					
98	JC	THUJA OCCIDENTALIS 'EMERALD' or approved equal	EMERALD ARBORVITAE	6' HT.	B&B	3.5' O.C. when used for screening
12	HFC	PICEA GLAUCA 'CONICA'	WEEPING WHITE SPRUCE	36" HT. NO.5	CONT.	
	SHRUBS					
73	SG	JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'SEA GREEN'	SEA GREEN JUNIPER	24" HT.	B&B	3.5' O.C.
116	BMW	BUXUS MEDIA 'WINTERGEM BOXWOOD'	WINTERGEM BOXWOOD	24" HT.	B&B	3.5' O.C.
244	VB	BUXUS SEMPERVIRENS 'VARDAR VALLEY'	VARDAR VALLEY BOXWOOD	NO. 3	CONT.	
96	BR	ROSA 'CAREFREE BEAUTY ROSE'	CAREFREE BEAUTY ROSE	15" HT. NO.3	CONT.	
5	MG	MISCHANTHUS SINENSIS 'GRACILLIMA'	MAIDEN GRASS	NO. 1	CONT.	
	PERENNIALS/GRASSES/GROUNDCOVERS					
NA	VM	VINCA MINOR - (SUBSTITUTED WITH DAYLILY DURING DEVELOPMENT)		2 1/2" P.P.	FLAT	
114	LB	PENNISETUM ALOPECUROIDES 'LITTLE BUNNY'	LITTLE BUNNY FOUNTAIN GRASS	NO. 1	CONT	
NA	SD	HEMEROCALLIS	STELLA D'ORO DAYLILY	NO. 2	CONT	
139	BF	FESTUCA OVINA 'ELLIJA BLUE' - (SUBSTITUTED WITH CATMINT DURING DEVELOPMNT)		NO. 1	CONT	
4	CT	CLEMATIS TERNIFLORA	SWEET AUTUMN CLEMATIS	NO. 3	CONT	TRELLIS
6	CJS	CLEMATIS 'JACKMANII SUPERBA'	JACKMANII SUPERBA	NO. 3	CONT	TRELLIS

GENERAL PLANTING NOTES:

1. BOUNDARY, TOPOGRAPHIC, AND UTILITY SURVEY WAS PREPARED C.F. BIRD AND R.J. BULL INC.
2. ALL PLANTS SHALL MEET OR EXCEED STANDARDS SET IN THE USA STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK.
3. ALL PLANTING OPERATIONS SHALL ADHERE TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN STANDARDS.
4. PLANT LOCATIONS AND BEDS SHALL BE LOCATED BY CONTRACTOR AND APPROVED BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
5. CONTRACTOR SHALL SEED ALL AREAS DISTURBED DURING CONSTRUCTION.
6. PLANTING BEDS AND SHRUB MASSES SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 3" DEEP SHREDDED HARDWOOD BARK MULCH. MULCH HEDGES IN A CONTINUOUS BED.
7. ALL PLANTING BEDS TO BE TILLED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 12".
8. ALL PLANTING BEDS TO BE FERTILIZED WITH 10-10-10 OR APPROVED EQUAL.
9. SEEDING BY LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR.
10. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN TO FACE OF CURB OR BUILDING WHERE APPLICABLE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
11. USE DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION GIVEN, DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS.
12. CONTRACTOR SHALL REFER QUESTIONS ON MATERIALS, FINISHES, LABOR, AND/OR PERFORMANCE STANDARDS NOT SPECIFIED HEREIN TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
13. THE LOCATION OF THE EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY AND HAVE NOT BEEN INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED BY THE OWNER OR ITS REPRESENTATIVE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK AND AGREES TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES.
14. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE TEMPORARY BARRIERS AT LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION TO ASSURE PUBLIC SAFETY DURING CONSTRUCTION.
15. ALL AREAS DISTURBED BY CONSTRUCTION ARE TO BE RESTORED. FINE GRADED AND SEEDED. (SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS)
16. ALL EXISTING PLANT MATERIAL SHOWN ON THIS PLAN IS TO BE PRESERVED UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.
17. CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE SPRAY IRRIGATION FOR ENTIRE SITE FOR EXCEPTION OF INTERIOR/ISOLATED PARKING ISLANDS.
18. QUANTITIES ARE SHOWN PER CITY REQUIREMENTS. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHOWN ON PLANS. INFORM LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT IF ANY DISCREPANCY ARISES.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES

1. SEED AREA, FILL WITH TOPSOIL. MINIMUM DEPTH SHALL BE 6". MEET ADJACENT SURFACES FLUSH. MOUND TO PROVIDE POSITIVE DRAINAGE ACROSS ALL SURFACES.
2. MULCH AREA
3. EARTH MOUNDING. TO BE 3'-6" ABOVE PAVEMENT. DASHED LINE INDICATES OUTLINE OF MOUNDING.
4. EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN

LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS

LOT COVERAGE	
- VEHICULAR USE AREA	50,472 S.F.
- BUILDING AREA	14,906 S.F.
INTERIOR GREENSPACE REQUIRED	
- 50,472 S.F. X 5% = 2,523 S.F. REQUIRED	
- 5,488 S.F. PROVIDED 11.3%	
GROUND COVERAGE TREE REQUIREMENTS - 1 / 12 SPACES	
- 111 PARKING SPACES	
- 10 TREES AT 2" MIN. CALIPER INCHES REQUIRED	
- 17 TREES AT 2" MIN. CALIPER INCHES PROVIDED	
ADDITIONAL SITE PLANTING - BUSINESS AND COMM. SHOPPING	
- 14,906 S.F. OF PROPOSED BUILDING COVERAGE	
- 14,906 S.F. x 2% = 298 S.F. REQUIRED	
- 563 S.F. PROVIDED	



kla studios
Landscape Architecture Site Planning
Environmental Graphics
614.335.9370 | info@kla-studios.com
www.kla-studios.com

STATE OF OHIO
BRENT A. KING
9710
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

COPYRIGHT 2013 - KLA STUDIOS

Perimeter Retail

6510 - 6570 Perimeter Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017

The Daimler Group
1533 Lake Shore Drive
Columbus Ohio 43204

KLA STUDIOS PROJECT NO:
20-0250

ISSUE DATE
2014.07.03

SHEET INFORMATION

CURRENT DATE
2014.09.3

REVISIONS

SHEET TITLE
LANDSCAPE PLAN

SCALE
1"=20'

SHEET NO.
A0
01



1 DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTING

NTS



2 EVERGREEN TREE PLANTING

NTS



3 SHRUB PLANTING

NTS

CONSTRUCTION NOTES

1. SEED AREA. FILL WITH TOPSOIL, MINIMUM DEPTH SHALL BE 6". MEET ADJACENT SURFACES FLUSH. MOUND TO PROVIDE POSITIVE DRAINAGE ACROSS ALL SURFACES.
2. MULCH AREA
3. BIKE RACK, DuMOR INC. #125-20. RIBBON BIKE RACK, SURFACE MOUNT. POWDER COAT: BLACK. LOCATE AND ORIENT AS INDICATED. INSTALL PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. DuMOR REPRESENTED BY SERVICE SUPPLY, 614-861-3681
4. BACKLESS BENCH. BELSON OUTDOORS. OAKLEY COLLECTION MODEL M6-BBC WITH CURVED ARMS. SURFACE MOUNT. POWDER COAT: BLACK. LOCATE AND ORIENT AS INDICATED, INSTALL PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. BELSON OUTDOORS. 1-800-323-5664.



kla studios
Landscape Architecture Site Planning
614.323.3173 | info@kla-studio.com
www.kla-studio.com

COPYRIGHT 2013 - 14 | DRAWINGS ARE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF KLA STUDIOS AND MAY NOT BE USED, DUPLICATED OR ALTERED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Perimeter Retail

6510 - 6570 Perimeter Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017

The Daimler Group
1533 Lake Shore Drive
Columbus Ohio 43204

KLA STUDIOS PROJECT NO:
20-0250

ISSUE DATE
2014.07.03

SHEET INFORMATION

CURRENT DATE
2014.09.3

REVISIONS

SHEET TITLE
ENLARGEMENT PLAN

SCALE
1"=10'

SHEET NO.
A0
02

Division 32 - Exterior Improvements __ Section 32 93 00
PLANTS

PART 1 -GENERAL

1.1 RELATED DOCUMENTS

A. Drawings and general provisions of the Contract, including General and Supplementary Conditions and Division 01 Specification Sections, apply to this Section.

1.2 SUMMARY

A. Section Includes:
1. Trees.
2. Shrubs.
3. Ground cover.
4. Plants.
5. Tree stabilization.
6. Edgings.
7. Accessories.

1.3 DEFINITIONS.

A. Backfill: The earth used to replace or the act of replacing earth in an excavation.

B. Balled and Burlapped Stock: Exterior stems dug with firm, natural balls of earth in which they are grown, with ball size not less than diameter and depth recommended by ANSI Z60.1 for type and size of tree or shrub required; wrapped, tied, rightly supported and stem turned as recommended by ANSI Z60.1.

C. Balled and Potted Stock: Exterior stems dug with firm, natural balls of earth in which they are grown and placed undisturbed in a container. Ball size is not less than diameter and depth recommended by ANSI Z60.1 for type and size of exterior plant required.

D. Bare-Root Stock: Exterior plants with a well-branched, fibrous-root system developed by transplanting or root pruning, with soil or growing medium removed, and with not less than minimum root spread according to ANSI Z60.1 for type and size of exterior plant required.

E. Clump: Where three or more young trees were planted in a group and have grown together as a single tree having three or more main stems or trunks.

F. Container-Grown Stock: Healthy, vigorous, well-rooted and established plants grown in a container with well-established root system reaching sides of container and maintaining a firm ball when removed from container. Container shall be right enough to hold ball shape and protect root mass during shipping and be sized according to ANSI Z60.1 for type and size of exterior plant required.

G. Fabric Bag-Grown Stock: Healthy, vigorous, well-rooted exterior plants established and grown in ground in a porous fabric bag with well-established root system reaching sides of fabric bag. Fabric bag size is not less than diameter depth and volume required by ANSI Z60.1 for type and size of exterior plant.

H. Finish Grade: Elevation of finished surface of planting soil.

I. Manufactured Topsoil: Soil produced off-site by homogeneously blending mineral soils or sand with stabilized organic soil amendments to produce loamy or clayey soil.

J. Multi-Stem: Where three or more main stems arise from the ground from a single root system or at a point right above the root crown.

K. Planting Soil: Native or imported topsoil, manufactured topsoil or surface soil modified to become topsoil mixed with soil amendments.

L. Subgrade: Surface or elevation of subsoil remaining after completing excavation or top surface of a fill or backfill, before placing planting soil.

M. Subsoil: All soil beneath the topsoil layer of the soil profile and typified by the lack of organic matter and soil organisms.

1.4 SUBMITTALS

A. Product Data: For each type of product indicated.

B. Samples for Verification: For each of the following:
1. 2 lb (2.2 kg) of mineral mulch for each color and texture of mulch required, in labeled plastic bags.
2. Edging materials and accessories, of manufacturer's standard size, to verify color selection.

C. Qualification Data: For qualified landscape installer.

D. Product Certificates: For each type of manufactured product, from manufacturer and complying with the following:
1. Manufacturer's certified analysis for standard products.
2. Analysis of other materials by a recognized laboratory made according to methods established by the Association of Official Analytical Chemists, where applicable.

E. Material Test Reports: For existing surface soil imported topsoil.

F. Planting Schedule: Indicating anticipated planting dates for exterior plants.

G. Maintenance Instructions: Recommended procedures to be established by Owner for maintenance of exterior plants during a calendar year. Submit before expiration of required maintenance periods.

H. Warranty: Sample of special warranty.

1.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

A. Installer Qualifications: A qualified landscape installer whose work has resulted in successful establishment of exterior plants.
1. Installer's Field Supervisor: Require installer to maintain an experienced full-time supervisor or Project site when planting is in progress.

B. Soil-Testing Laboratory Qualifications: An independent laboratory, recognized by the State Department of Agriculture with the expertise and capability to conduct the testing indicated and that specializes in types of tests to be performed.

C. Topsoil Analysis: If initial soil analysis by a qualified soil-testing laboratory stating percentages of organic matter; gradation of sand, silt, and clay content; cation exchange capacity; sodium absorption ratio; deleterious material; pH and mineral and plant-nutrient content of topsoil.
1. Report suitability of topsoil for plant growth. State recommended quantities of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potash nutrients, soil amendments and fertilizer to be added to produce satisfactory topsoil.

D. Provide quality, size, genus, species and variety of exterior plants indicated, complying with applicable requirements in ANSI Z60.1, "American Standard for Nursery Stock."
1. Selection of exterior plants purchased under allowances will be made by Architect, who will tag plants at their place of growth before they are prepared for transplanting.

E. Tree and Shrub Measurements: Measure according to ANSI Z60.1 with branches and trunks or canes in their normal position. Do not prune to obtain required sizes. Take caliper measurements 12-inches (300-mm) above the ground for trees up to 4-inch (100-mm) caliper size and larger. Measure main body of tree or shrub for height and spread; do not measure branches or roots tip-to-tip.

F. Close-within: Architect may observe trees and shrubs either at place of growth or at site before planting for compliance with requirements for genus, species, variety, size and quality. Architect retains right to observe trees and shrubs further for size and condition of balls and root systems, insects, injuries and latent defects, and to reject unsatisfactory or defective material at any time during progress of work. Remove rejected trees or shrubs immediately from Project site.
1. Notify Architect of sources of planting materials seven days in advance of delivery to site.

G. Preinstallation Conference: Conduct conference at Project site.

1.6 DELIVERY, STORAGE AND HANDLING

A. Deliver exterior plants freshly dug.
1. Immediately after digging up bare-root stock, pack root system in wet straw, hay or other suitable material to keep root system moist until planting.

B. Do not prune trees and shrubs before delivery except as approved by Architect. Protect bark, branches and root systems from sun scald, drying, wind-burn, excessive heat and mechanical damages at all times and keep root systems moist at all times. Do not bend or bind-the trees or shrubs in such a manner as to destroy their natural shape. Provide protective covering of exterior plants during delivery. Do not drop exterior plants during delivery and handling.

C. Handle planting stock by root ball.

D. Deliver exterior plants after preparations for planting have been completed and install immediately. If planting is delayed more than six hours after delivery, set exterior plants and trees in shade, protect from weather and mechanical damage and keep roots moist.
1. Heel-in bare-root stock. Soak roots that are in dry condition in water for two hours. Reject dried-out plants.
2. Set balled stock on ground and cover ball with soil, peat moss, sawdust or other acceptable material.
3. Do not remove container-grown stock from containers before time of planting.
4. Water root systems of exterior plants stored on-site with a fine-mist spray. Water as often as necessary to maintain root systems in a moist condition.

1.7 PROJECT CONDITIONS

A. Planting Restrictions: Plant during one of the following periods. Coordinate planting periods with maintenance periods to provide required maintenance from date of Substantial Completion.
1. Spring Planting: April 1 to June 15.
2. Fall Planting: September 1 to October 15.

B. Weather Limitations: Proceed with planting only when existing and forecasted weather conditions permit planting to be performed according to manufacturer's written instructions and warranty requirements.

C. Coordination with Lawns: Plant trees and shrubs after finish grades are established and before planting lawns unless otherwise acceptable to Architect.
1. When planting trees and shrubs after lawns, protect lawn areas and promptly repair damage caused by planting operations.

1.8 WARRANTY

A. Special Warranty: Installer's standard form in which Installer agrees to repair or replace plantings and accessories that fail in materials, workmanship, or growth within specified warranty period.
1. Failures include, but are not limited to, the following:
a. Death and unsatisfactory growth, except for defects resulting from abuse by Owner or incidents that are beyond Contractor's control.
b. Structural failures including plantings falling or blowing over.
c. Faulty operation of tree stabilization anchors.
d. Deterioration of metals, metal finishes and other materials beyond normal weathering.
2. Warranty Periods from Date of Substantial Completion:
a. Trees and Shrubs: One year.
Ground Cover and Plants: One year.
3. Include the following remedial actions as a minimum:
a. Remove dead exterior plants immediately. Replace immediately unless required to plant in the succeeding planting season.
b. Replace exterior plants that are more than 25 percent dead or in an unhealthy condition at end of warranty period.
c. A limit of one replacement of each exterior plant will be required except for losses or replacements due to failure to comply with requirements.
d. Provide extended warranty for replaced plant materials: warranty period equal to original warranty period.

PART 2 -PRODUCTS

2.1 MANUFACTURERS

A. Aluminum edging by Permalite Corporation forms the basis-of-Design. Products with comparable designs, materials, performance characteristics and finishes by the following manufacturers are also acceptable:
1. Cor-Ten, Inc.
2. Rynestl, J. D. Company.
3. Sure-Loc Edging Corporation.

2.2 TREE AND SHRUB MATERIAL

B. General: Furnish nursery-grown trees and shrubs complying with ANSI Z60.1, with healthy root systems developed by transplanting or root pruning. Provide well-shaped, fully branched, healthy, vigorous stock free of disease, insects, eggs, larvae and defects such as knots, sun scald, injuries, abrasions and disfigurement.

C. Provide trees and shrubs of sizes, grades and ball or container sizes complying with ANSI Z60.1 for types and kinds of trees and shrubs required. Trees and shrubs of a larger size may be used if acceptable to Architect, with a proportionate increase in size of roots or balls.

D. Root-Ball Depth: Furnish trees and shrubs with root balls measured from top of root ball which shall begin at root flare according to ANSI Z60.1. Root flare shall be visible before planting.

E. Label each tree and shrub with securely attached, waterproof tag bearing legible designation of botanical and common name.

F. Label at least one tree and one shrub of each variety and caliper with a securely attached, waterproof tag bearing legible designation of botanical and common name.

G. If formal arrangements or consecutive order of trees or shrubs is shown, select stock for uniform height and spread, and number label to assure symmetry in planting.

2.3 SHADE AND FLOWERING TREES

H. Type 1 Shade Trees: Single-stem trees with straight trunk, well-balanced crown and intact leader of height and caliper indicated, complying with ANSI Z60.1 for type of trees required as indicated on Drawings.
1. Tree Caliper: As indicated on Drawings.
2. Branching Height: As indicated on Drawings.

I. Small Upright Trees: Branched or pruned naturally according to species and type, with relationship of caliper, height and branching according to ANSI Z60.1; stem form as follows:
1. Stem Form: As indicated on Drawings.
2. Tree Characteristics: As indicated on Drawings.

C. Small Spreading Trees: Branched or pruned naturally according to species and type, with relationship of caliper, height and branching according to ANSI Z60.1; stem form as follows:
1. Stem Form: As indicated on Drawings.
2. Tree Characteristics: As indicated on Drawings.

2.4 DECIDUOUS SHRUBS

A. Form and Size: Shrubs with not less than the minimum number of canes required by and measured accordingly in ANSI Z60.1 for type, shape and height of shrub.
1. Shrub sizes indicated are sizes after pruning.
2. Shrub Characteristics: As indicated on Drawings.

2.5 CONIFEROUS EVERGREENS.

A. Form and Size: Horizontal-quality, well-balanced coniferous evergreens of type, height, spread and shape required, complying with ANSI Z60.1.

2.6 GROUND COVER PLANTS

A. Ground Cover: Provide ground cover of species indicated, established and well rooted in pots or smaller containers, and complying with ANSI Z60.1 and the following requirements:
1. Plants: As indicated on Drawings.

2.7 PLANTS

A. Provide: Provide healthy, field-grown plants from a commercial nursery, of species and variety shown or listed, complying with requirements in ANSI Z60.1.

2.8 TOPSOIL

A. Topsoil: ASTM D 5268, pH range of 5.5 to 7, a minimum of 6 percent organic material content free of stones 1-inch (25-mm) or larger in any dimension and other extraneous materials harmful to plant growth.
1. Topsoil Source: Reuse surface soil stockpiled on-site. Verify suitability of stockpiled surface soil to produce topsoil. Clean surface soil of roots, plants, sod, stones, clay lumps and other extraneous materials harmful to plant growth.
a. Supplement with imported or manufactured topsoil from off-site sources when quantities are insufficient. Obtain topsoil displaced from naturally well-drained construction or mining sites where topsoil occurs at least 4-inches (100-mm) deep; do not obtain from agricultural land, bogs or marshes.

B. USDA Particle Size Analysis, USDA soil texture classification of Silty Clay Loam, Clay Loam, Silt Loam, Loam, Sandy Loam or Sandy Clay Loam. Sand, silt and clay determined by ASTM D 422.
1. Gravel: Plus 2-mm; less than 10 percent.
2. Sand: 0.05-mm to 2-mm; 15 to 40 percent.
3. Silt: 0.002-mm to 0.05-mm; 25 to 65 percent.
4. Clay: Minus 0.002-mm; 20 to 35 percent.

C. Topsoil tested by qualified laboratory as indicated in this Section. Correct deficiencies in organic matter content using specified amendments in compliance with soil test report recommendations.

D. Amend topsoil with lime to achieve specified pH in accordance with laboratory's recommendations if an acidic soil condition exists.

2.9 INORGANIC SOIL AMENDMENTS

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required inorganic soil amendments and their application rates.

B. Lime: ASTM C 602, agricultural limestone containing a minimum of 80 percent calcium carbonate equivalent and as follows:
1. Class: C, with a minimum of 99 percent passing through No. 8 (2.36-mm) sieve and a minimum of 55 percent passing through No. 60 (0.25-mm) sieve.
2. Provide lime in form of dolomitic limestone.

C. Sulfur: Granular, biodegradable, containing a minimum of 90 percent sulfur, with a minimum of 99 percent passing through No. 6 (3.35-mm) sieve and a minimum of 10 percent passing through No. 40 (0.425-mm) sieve.

D. Iron Sulfate: Granulated ferrous sulfate containing a minimum of 20 percent iron and 10 percent sulfur.

E. Aluminum Sulfate: Commercial grade, unadulterated.

F. Peat: Horticultural grade, soil treatment grade.

G. Agricultural Gypsum: Finely ground, containing a minimum of 90 percent calcium sulfate.

H. Sand: Clean, washed natural or manufactured free of toxic materials.

I. Diatomaceous Earth: Calcined, diatomaceous earth, 90 percent silica, with approximately 140 percent water-absorption capacity by weight.

J. Zeolite: Mineral clinoptilolite with at least 60 percent water absorption by weight.

2.10 ORGANIC SOIL AMENDMENTS

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required organic soil amendments and their application rates.

B. Compost: Well-composted, stable and weed-free organic matter, pH range of 5.5 to 8; moisture content 35 to 55 percent by weight; 100 percent passing through 1/2-inch (13-mm) sieve; soluble salt content of 5 to 10 decisiemens/m; not exceeding 0.5 percent inert contaminants and free of substances toxic to plantings; and as follows:
1. Organic Matter Content: 50 to 80 percent of dry weight per ASTM D 2974.
2. Feedstock: Agricultural, food, or industrial residuals; Municipal yard trimmings; or source-separated or commingled mixed solid waste.

C. Peat: Sphagnum peat moss partially decomposed, finely divided or granular texture, with a pH range of 3.4 to 4.8.

D. Peat: Finely divided or granular texture, with a pH range of 6 to 7.5, containing partially decomposed moss peat = sifted peat or reed-sedge peat and having a water-holding capacity of 1100 to 2000 percent.

E. Manure: Well-aged, unleached, stable or cattle manure containing not more than 25 percent by volume of straw, sawdust or other bedding materials; free of toxic substances, stones, sticks, soil, weed seed and material harmful to plant growth.

2.11 FERTILIZER

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required fertilizers and their application rates.

B. Bulk-Mix: Commercial, raw or processed, finely ground; a minimum of 4 percent nitrogen and 12 percent phosphoric acid.

C. Superphosphate: Commercial, phosphate mixture soluble; a minimum of 20 percent available phosphoric acid.

D. Commercial Fertilizer: Commercial-grade complete fertilizer of neutral character, consisting of fast- and slow-release nitrogen, 50 percent derived from natural organic sources of urea formaldehyde, phosphorous and potassium in the following composition:
1. Composition: Nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium in amounts recommended in soil reports from a qualified soil-testing agency.

E. Slow-Release Fertilizer: Granular or pelleted fertilizer consisting of 50 percent water-insoluble nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in the following composition:
1. Composition: Nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium in amounts recommended in soil reports from a qualified soil-testing agency.

2.12 MULCHES

A. Organic Mulch: Free from deleterious materials and suitable as a top dressing of trees and shrubs, consisting of one of the following:
1. Type: Shredded hardwood Ground or shredded bark, or Wood and bark chips.

2.13 WEED-CONTROL BARRIERS

A. Composite Fabric Weed-: Heavy-duty, woven-pattern polypropylene substrate bonded to a nonwoven polypropylene fabric; 4.8 oz/sq. yd. (162 g/sq. m).

2.14 TREE STABILIZATION MATERIALS

A. Stakes and Guys:
1. Upright and Guy Stakes: Rough-sawn, round, new hardwood or pressure-preservative-treated softwood, free of knots, holes, cross grain and other defects, 2-by-2-inch nominal (38-by-38-mm) actually by length indicated painted at one end.
2. Flexible Tie: Wide rubber or plastic bands or straps of length required to reach stakes or bumpkins.
3. Guys and Tie Wires: ASTM A 641/A 641M, Class 1, galvanized-steel wire, 2-strand twisted, 0.106-inch (2.7-mm) in diameter.
4. Guy Cables: 5-strand, 3/16-inch (4.8-mm) diameter, galvanized-steel cable with zinc-coated turnbuckles a minimum of 3-inches (75-mm) long, with two 3/8-inch (10-mm) galvanized eyebolts.
5. Flags: Standard nursery's plastic flagging tape, white, 6-inches (150-mm) long.

2.15 LANDSCAPE EDGINGS

A. Aluminum Edging: Standard-profile extruded-aluminum edging, ASTM B 221 (ASTM B 221M) Alloy 6063-T6, fabricated in standard lengths with interlocking sections with loops stamped from face of sections to receive stakes.
1. Product Classes.
2. Edging Size: 3/16-inch (4.8-mm) wide by 5-1/2-inches (140-mm) deep.
3. Stakes: Aluminum, ASTM B 221 (ASTM B 221M), Alloy 6061-T6, approximately 1-1/2-inches (38-mm) wide by 12-inches (305-mm) long.
4. Finish: Black anodized.

2.16 MISCELLANEOUS PRODUCTS

A. Anti-desiccant: Water-insoluble emulsion, permeable moisture retarder, film forming, for trees and shrubs. Deliver in original, sealed and fully labeled containers and mix according to manufacturer's written instructions.

B. Trunk-Wrap Tape: Two layers of crinkled paper cemented together with bituminous material, 4-inch (100-mm) wide minimum, with stretch factor of 33 percent.

2.17 PLANTING SOIL MIX

A. Planting Soil Mix: Topsoil mixed with soil amendments and fertilizers in compliance with the Topsoil Analysis Report.

PART 3 -EXECUTION

3.1 EXAMINATION

A. Examine areas to receive exterior plants for compliance with requirements and conditions affecting installation and performance.

B. Proceed with installation only after unsatisfactory conditions have been corrected.

3.2 PREPARATION

A. Protect structures, utilities, sidewalks, pavements and other facilities and lawns and existing exterior plants from damage caused by planting operations.

B. Provide erosion-control measures to prevent erosion or displacement of soils and discharge of soil-bearing water runoff or airborne dust to adjacent properties and walkways.

C. Lay out individual tree and shrub locations and areas for multiple plantings. Stake locations, outline areas, adjust locations when requested and obtain Architect's acceptance of layout before planting. Make minor adjustments as required.

D. Lay out exterior plants at locations directed by Architect. Stake locations of individual trees and shrubs and outline areas for multiple plantings.

E. Tree Wrapping: Inspect tree trunks for injury. Improper pruning and insect infestation take corrective measures required before wrapping. Wrap trees of 3-inch (50-mm) caliper and larger with trunk-wrap tape. Start at base of trunk and spiral cover trunk to height of first branches. Overlap wrap, exposing half the width and securely attach without causing girdling.

F. Apply antidesiccant to trees and shrubs within cover spray to provide an adequate film over trunks (before wrapping), branches, stems, twigs and foliage to protect during digging, handling and transportation.
1. If deciduous trees or shrubs are moved in full leaf, spray with antidesiccant at nursery before moving and again two weeks after planting.

G. Wrap trees and shrubs with burlap fabric over trunks, branches, stems, twigs and foliage to protect from wind and other damage during digging, handling and transportation.

3.3 PLANTING BED ESTABLISHMENT

A. Loosen subgrade of planting beds to a minimum depth of 6-inches (150-mm). Remove stones larger than 1-inch (25-mm) in any dimension and sticks, roots, rubbish and other extraneous matter and legally dispose of them off Owner's property.
1. Apply superphosphate fertilizer directly to subgrade before tilling.
2. Thoroughly blend planting soil mix off-site before spreading.
a. Delay mixing fertilizer with planting soil if planting will not proceed within a few days.
3. Spread planting soil mix to a depth of 12-inches (300-mm) but not less than required to meet finish grades after natural settlement. Do not spread if planting soil or subgrade is frozen, muddy, or excessively wet.
a. Spread approximately one-half the thickness of planting soil mix over loosened subgrade. Mix thoroughly into top 4-inches (100-mm) of subgrade. Spread remainder of planting soil mix.

B. Finish Grading: Grade planting beds to a smooth, uniform surface plane with loose, uniformly fine texture. Roll and rake, remove ridges and fill depressions to meet finish grades.

C. Before planting, restore planting beds if eroded or otherwise disturbed after finish grading.

3.4 EXCAVATION FOR TREES AND SHRUBS

A. Pits and Trenches: Excavate circular pits with sides sloped inward. Trees base leaving center area raised slightly to a plant root ball and assist in drainage. Do not further disturb base. Scarify sides of plant pit smeared or smoothed during excavation.
1. Excavate approximately three times as wide as ball diameter for balled and burlapped balled and potted container-grown stock.
2. Excavate at least 12-inches (300-mm) wider than root spread and deep enough to accommodate vertical roots for bare-root stock.
3. If drain tile is shown or required under planted areas, excavate to top of porous backfill over tile.

B. Subsoil removed from excavations may not be used as backfill.

C. Obstructions: Notify Architect if unexpected rock or obstructions encountered in trees or shrubs are encountered in excavations.
1. Hardpan Layer: Drill 6-inch (150-mm) diameter holes, 24-inches (600-mm) apart into free-draining strata or to a depth of 10-feet (3-m), whichever is less, and backfill with free-draining material.

D. Drainage: Notify Architect if subsoil conditions evidence unexpected water seepage or retention in tree or shrub pits.

E. Fill excavations with water and allow to percolate away before positioning trees and shrubs.

3.5 TREE AND SHRUB PLANTING

A. Before planting, verify that root flare is visible at top of root ball according to ANSI Z60.1.

B. Set balled and burlapped stock plumb and in center of pit or trench with top of root ball 2-inches (50-mm) above adjacent finish grades.
1. Remove burlap and wire baskets from tops of root balls and carefully from sides, but do not remove from under root balls. Remove soiled, if any, before setting. Do not use planting stock if root ball is cracked or broken before or during planting operation.
2. Place planting soil mix around root ball in layers, tamping to settle mix and eliminate voids and air pockets. When pit is approximately one-half backfilled, water thoroughly before placing remainder of backfill. Repeat watering until no more water is absorbed. Water again after placing and tamping final layer of planting soil mix.

C. Set balled and potted and container-grown stock plumb and in center of pit or trench with top of root ball flush with adjacent finish grades.
1. Carefully remove root ball from container without damaging root ball or plant.
2. Place planting soil mix around root ball in layers, tamping to settle mix and eliminate voids and air pockets. When pit is approximately one-half backfilled, water thoroughly before placing remainder of backfill. Repeat watering until no more water is absorbed. Water again after placing and tamping final layer of planting soil mix.

D. Set fabric bag-grown stock plumb and in center of pit or trench with top of root ball flush with adjacent finish grades.
1. Carefully remove root ball from fabric bag without damaging root ball or plant. Do not use planting stock if root ball is cracked or broken before or during planting operation.
2. Place planting soil mix around root ball in layers, tamping to settle mix and eliminate voids and air pockets. When pit is approximately one-half backfilled, water thoroughly before placing remainder of backfill. Repeat watering until no more water is absorbed. Water again after placing and tamping final layer of planting soil mix.

E. Set and support bare-root stock in center of pit or trench with roots flare flush with adjacent finish grade. Spread roots without tangling or bunching toward surface, and carefully work backfill around roots by hand. Puddle with water until backfill layers are completely saturated. Plumb before backfilling and maintain plumb while working backfill around roots and planting layers above roots. Tamp final layer of backfill. Remove injured roots by cutting cleanly at root bark.

F. Organic Mulching: Apply 3-inch (75-mm) average thickness of organic mulch extending 12-inches (300-mm) beyond edge of plant pit or trench. Do not place mulch within 3-inches (75-mm) of trunks or stems.

G. Trunk Wrapping: Inspect tree trunks for injury. Improper pruning, and insect infestation take corrective measures required before wrapping. Wrap trees of 2-inch (50-mm) caliper and larger with trunk-wrap tape. Start at base of trunk and spiral cover trunk to height of first branches. Overlap wrap, exposing half the width and securely attach without causing girdling.

3.6 TREE AND SHRUB PRUNING

A. Prune, thin and shape trees and shrubs according to standard horticultural practice. Prune trees to retain required height and spread. Unless otherwise indicated by Architect, do not cut tree leaders; remove only injured or dead branches from flowering trees. Prune shrubs to retain natural character.

3.7 TREE STABILIZATION

A. Trunk Stabilization: Unless otherwise indicated provide trunk stabilization as follows:
1. Use 2 stakes for trees up to 12-feet (3.6-m) high and 2-1/2-inches (63-mm) or less in caliper; 3 stakes for trees less than 14-feet (4.2-m) high and up to 4-inches (100-mm) in caliper. Space stakes equally around trees.
2. Support trees with bands of flexible ties at locations with least trunk. Allow enough slack to avoid rigid restraint of tree.

B. Guying and Staking: Guy and stake trees exceeding 14-feet (4.2-m) in height and more than 3-inches (75-mm) in caliper unless otherwise indicated. Securely attach no lower than 3 guys in stakes 30-inches (760-mm) long, driven to grade.
1. For trees more than 3-inches (100-mm) in caliper, anchor guys to pressure-preservative-treated deadmen 8-inches (200-mm) in diameter and 18-inches (1200-mm) long buried at least 36-inches (900-mm) below grade. Provide compression spring for each guy wire and tighten securely.
2. Support trees with bands of flexible ties at contact points with tree trunk and reaching to compression spring. Allow enough slack to avoid rigid restraint of tree.
3. Attach flags to each guy wire, 30-inches (760-mm) above finish grade.

3.8 GROUND COVER AND PLANT PLANTING

A. Set and and space ground cover and plants as indicated on Drawings.

B. Dig holes large enough to allow spreading of roots and backfill with planting soil.

C. Work soil around roots to eliminate air pockets and leave a slight saucer indentation around plants to hold water.

D. Water thoroughly after planting, taking care not to cover plant crowns with wet soil.

E. Protect plants from hot sun and wind; remove protection if plants show evidence of recovery from transplanting shock.

3.9 PLANTING BED MULCHING

A. Install weed-control barriers before mulching according to manufacturer's written instructions. Completely cover area to be mulched, overlapping edges a minimum of 6-inches (150-mm).
1. Mineral and Sand Treatment: Nonwoven fabric with coarse pleat.

B. Mulch backfilled surfaces of planting beds and other areas indicated. Provide mulch ring around trees in lawn areas.
2. Organic Mulch: Apply 3-inch (75-mm) average thickness of organic mulch and finish level with adjacent finish grades. Do not place mulch against plant stems.
3. Mineral Mulch: Apply average thickness of mineral mulch as indicated on Drawings, and finish level with adjacent finish grades. Do not place mulch against plant stems.

3.10 EDGING INSTALLATION

A. Aluminum Edging: Install aluminum edging where indicated according to manufacturer's written instructions. Anchor with aluminum stakes spaced approximately 36-inches (900-mm) apart, driven below top elevation of edging.

3.11 PLANT MAINTENANCE

A. Trees and Shrub Maintenance: Maintain plantings by pruning, cultivating, watering, weeding, fertilizing, restoring planting saucers, adjusting and repairing stakes and guy supports and resetting to proper grades or vertical position, as required to establish healthy, viable plantings. Spray or treat as required to keep trees and shrubs free of insects and diseases. Restore or replace damaged tree wrappings.

B. Ground Cover and Plant Maintenance: Maintain and establish plantings by watering, weeding, fertilizing, mulching and other operations as required to establish healthy, viable plantings.

3.12 CLEANUP AND PROTECTION

A. During planting, keep adjacent paving and construction clean and work area in an orderly condition.

B. Protect exterior plants from damage due to landscape operations, operations by other contractors and trades, and others. Maintain protection during installation and maintenance periods. Treat, repair or replace damaged plantings.

C. Return at end of warranty period remove stakes and guy supports, and trunk wrapping.

3.13 DISPOSAL

A. Disposal: Remove surplus soil and waste material, including excess subsoil, unsuitable soil, trash and debris, and legally dispose of them off Owner's property.

END OF SECTION

kla studios
Landscape Architecture Site Planning
1335 Dublin Road Suite 218-B
Columbus, OH 43215
614.486.1373 | kla@kla-studios.com
www.kla-studios.com

STATE OF OHIO
BRENT A. KIRCHER
STUDIO
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

COPYRIGHT 2013 - 14 - THIS DRAWING AND ANY SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF KLA STUDIOS AND MAY NOT BE USED, DUPLICATED OR ALTERED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Perimeter Retail

6510 - 6570 Perimeter Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017

The Daimler Group
1533 Lake Shore Drive
Columbus Ohio 43204

KLA STUDIOS PROJECT NO:
20-0250

ISSUE DATE
2014.07.03

SHEET INFORMATION

CURRENT DATE
2014.09.3

REVISIONS

SHEET TITLE
SPECIFICATIONS
PLANTS
SCALE

SHEET NO.
A0
03

TURF AND GRASSES

PART 1 - GENERAL

1.1 RELATED DOCUMENTS

A. Drawings and general provisions of the Contract, including General and Supplementary Conditions and Division 01 Specification Sections, apply to this Section.

1.2 SUMMARY

A. Section Includes:
1. Seeding.
2. Erosion-control material(s).
3. Accessories.

1.3 DEFINITIONS

A. Finish Grade: Elevation of finished surface of planting soil.

B. Manufactured Soil: Soil produced off-site by homogeneously blending mineral soils or sand with stabilized organic soil amendments to produce topsoil or planting soil.

C. Subgrade: Surface or elevation of subsoil remaining after completing excavation or top surface of a fill or backfill immediately beneath planting soil.

D. Subsoil: All soil beneath the topsoil layer of the soil profile and typified by the lack of organic matter and soil organisms.

1.4 SUBMITTALS

A. Product Data: For each type of product indicated.

B. Certification of Grass Seed: From seed vendor for each grass-seed monostand or mixture stating the botanical and common name and percentage by weight of each species and variety, and percentage of purity, germination and weed seed. Include the year of production and date of packaging.

C. Qualification Data: For qualified landscape Installer.

D. Material Test Reports: For existing surface soil and imported topsoil.

E. Planting Schedule: Indicating anticipated planting dates for each type of planting.

F. Maintenance Instructions: Recommended procedures to be established by Owner for maintenance of lawns during a calendar year. Submit before expiration of required initial maintenance periods.

1.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

A. Installer Qualifications: A qualified landscape Installer whose work has resulted in successful lawn establishment.
1. Installer's Field Supervision: Require Installer to maintain an experienced full-time supervisor on Project site when planting is in progress.
2. Maintenance Proximity: Not more than two hours' normal travel time from Installer's place of business to Project site.

B. Soil-Testing Laboratory Qualifications: An independent laboratory, recognized by the State Department of Agriculture, with the experience and capability to conduct the testing indicated and that specializes in types of tests to be performed.

C. Topsoil Analysis: Furnish soil analysis by a qualified soil-testing laboratory stating percentages of organic matter; gradation of sand, silt and clay content; cation exchange capacity; sodium absorption ratio; deleterious material; pH and mineral and plant-nutrient content of topsoil.
1. Report suitability of topsoil for lawn growth. State recommended quantities of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potash nutrients, soil amendments and fertilizer to be added to produce satisfactory topsoil.

D. Preinstallation Conference: Conduct conference at Project site.

1.6 DELIVERY, STORAGE AND HANDLING

A. Seed: Deliver seed in original sealed, labeled and undamaged containers.

1.7 PROJECT CONDITIONS

B. Planting Restrictions: Plant during one of the following periods. Coordinate planting periods with initial maintenance periods to provide required maintenance from date of Substantial Completion.
1. Spring Planting: April 1 to June 15.
2. Fall Planting: September 1 to October 15.

C. Weather Limitations: Proceed with planting only when existing and forecasted weather conditions permit.

1.8 MAINTENANCE SERVICE

A. Initial Lawn Maintenance Service: Provide full maintenance by skilled employees of landscape Installer. Maintain as required in Part 3. Begin maintenance immediately after each area is planted and continue until acceptable lawn is established, but for not less than the following periods:
1. Seeded Lawns: 60 days from date of Substantial Completion.

PART 2 - PRODUCTS

2.1 SEED

A. Grass Seed: Fresh, clean, dry, new-crop seed complying with AOSA's "Journal of Seed Technology; Rules for Testing Seeds" for purity and germination tolerances.

B. Seed Species: Seed of grass species as follows, with not less than 80 percent germination, not less than 85 percent pure seed and not more than 0.5 percent weed seed:
1. Full Sun: Kentucky bluegrass (Poa pratensis), a minimum of three cultivars.
2. Sun and Partial Shade: Proportioned by weight as follows:
a. 50 percent Kentucky bluegrass (Poa pratensis).
b. 30 percent chewings red fescue (Festuca rubra variety).
c. 10 percent perennial ryegrass (Lolium perenne).
d. 10 percent redtop (Agrostis alba).
3. Sowing Rate 6 lb per acre broadcast, 5.3 lb/acre drilled.

2.2 TOPSOIL

A. Topsoil: ASTM D 5268, pH range of 5.5 to 7, a minimum of 6 percent organic material content; free of stones 1-inch (25-mm) or larger in any dimension and other extraneous materials harmful to plant growth.
1. Topsoil Source: Reuse surface soil stockpiled on-site. Verify suitability of stockpiled surface soil to produce topsoil. Clean surface soil of roots, plants, sod, stones, clay lumps and other extraneous materials harmful to plant growth.
a. Supplement with imported or manufactured topsoil from off-site sources when quantities are insufficient. Obtain topsoil displaced from naturally well-drained construction or mining sites where topsoil occurs at least 4-inches (100-mm) deep; do not obtain from agricultural land, bogs or marshes.
2. Topsoil Source: Import topsoil or manufactured topsoil from off-site sources. Obtain topsoil displaced from naturally well-drained construction or mining sites where topsoil occurs at least 4-inches (100-mm) deep; do not obtain from agricultural land, bogs or marshes.

2.3 INORGANIC SOIL AMENDMENTS

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required inorganic soil amendments and their application rates.

B. Lime: ASTM C 602, agricultural limestone containing a minimum of 80 percent calcium carbonate equivalent and as follows:
1. Class: O, with a minimum of 95 percent passing through No. 8 (2.36-mm) sieve and a minimum of 55 percent passing through No. 60 (0.25-mm) sieve.
2. Provide lime in form of dolomitic limestone.

C. Sulfur: Granular, biodegradable, containing a minimum of 90 percent sulfur, with a minimum of 99 percent passing through No. 6 (3.35-mm) sieve and a maximum of 10 percent passing through No. 40 (0.425-mm) sieve.

D. Iron Sulfate: Granulated ferrous sulfate containing a minimum of 20 percent iron and 10 percent sulfur.

E. Aluminum Sulfate: Commercial grade, unadulterated.

F. Perlite: Horticultural perlite, soil amendment grade.

G. Agricultural Gypsum: Finely ground, containing a minimum of 90 percent calcium sulfate.

H. Sand: Coarse sand per ASTM C 33. Fine Aggregate with fineness modulus index of 2.7 to 3.1.
1. Sand: Clean, sharp natural sands, free of toxic materials.
2. ASTM Size Gradation.
a. Sieve Designation / Percent Passing
1) 3/8-inch — 100.
2) No. 4 — 95-100.
3) No. 8 — 80-100.
4) No. 16 — 50-85.
5) No. 30 — 25-60.
6) No. 50 — 10-30
7) No. 100 — 2-10

I. Diatomaceous Earth: Calcined, diatomaceous earth, 90 percent silica, with approximately 140 percent water absorption capacity by weight.

J. Zeolites: Mineral clinoptilolite with at least 60 percent water absorption by weight.

2.4 ORGANIC SOIL AMENDMENTS

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required organic soil amendments and their application rates.

B. Compost: Well-composted, stable, and weed-free organic matter, pH range of 5.5 to 8; moisture content 35 to 55 percent by weight; 100 percent passing through 3/4-inch (19-mm) sieve; soluble salt content of 5 to 10 decisiemens/m; not exceeding 0.5 percent inert contaminants and free of substances toxic to plantings; and as follows:
1. Organic Matter Content: 25 to 65 percent of dry weight per ASTM D 2974.
2. Feedstock: Agricultural, food or industrial residuals; biosolids; yard trimmings; or source-separated or compostable mixed solid waste.

C. Peat: Sphagnum peat moss, partially decomposed, finely divided or granular texture, with a pH range of 3.4 to 4.8.

D. Peat: Finely divided or granular texture, with a pH range of 6 to 7.5, containing partially decomposed moss peat, native peat, or reed-sedge peat and having a water-absorbing capacity of 1100 to 2000 percent.

E. Manure: Well-rotted, unleached, stable or cattle manure containing not more than 25 percent by volume of straw, sawdust, or other bedding materials; free of toxic substances, stones, sticks, soil, weed seed and material harmful to plant growth.

2.5 PLANTING ACCESSORIES

A. Selective Herbicides: EPA registered and approved, of type recommended by manufacturer for application.

2.6 FERTILIZER

A. Refer to Topsoil Analysis report for selection of required fertilizers and their application rates.

B. Bonemeal: Commercial, raw or steamed, finely ground; a minimum of 4 percent nitrogen and 20 percent phosphoric acid.

C. Superphosphate: Commercial, phosphate mixture, soluble; a minimum of 20 percent available phosphoric acid.

D. Commercial Fertilizer: Commercial-grade complete fertilizer of neutral character, consisting of fast- and slow-release nitrogen, 50 percent derived from natural organic sources of urea formaldehyde, phosphorous and potassium in the following composition:
1. Composition: Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in amounts recommended in soil reports from a qualified soil-testing agency.

E. Slow-Release Fertilizer: Granular or pelleted fertilizer consisting of 50 percent water-insoluble nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in the following composition:
1. Composition: 20 percent nitrogen, 10 percent phosphorous and 10 percent potassium, by weight.
2. Composition: Nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium in amounts recommended in soil reports from a qualified soil-testing agency.

2.7 MULCHES

A. Straw Mulch: Provide air-dry, clean, mildew- and seed-free, salt hay or threshed straw of wheat, rye, oats or barley.

2.8 EROSION-CONTROL MATERIALS

B. Erosion-Control Blankets: Biodegradable wood excelsior, straw or coconut-fiber mat enclosed in a photodegradable plastic mesh. Include manufacturer's recommended steel wire staples, 6-inches (150-mm) long.
1. Application: Slopes 1:3 to 1:5.

2.9 PLANTING SOIL MIX

A. Planting Soil Mix: Topsoil mixed with soil amendments and fertilizers materials in compliance with Topsoil Analysis Report.

PART 3 - EXECUTION

3.1 EXAMINATION

A. Examine areas to receive lawns and grass for compliance with requirements and other conditions affecting performance.

B. Proceed with installation only after unsatisfactory conditions have been corrected.

3.2 PREPARATION

A. Protect structures, utilities, sidewalks, pavements and other facilities, trees, shrubs and plantings from damage caused by planting operations.
1. Protect grade stakes set by others until directed to remove them.

B. Provide erosion-control measures to prevent erosion or displacement of soils and discharge of soil-bearing water runoff or airborne dust to adjacent properties and walkways.

3.3 LAWN PREPARATION

A. Limit lawn subgrade preparation to areas to be planted.

B. Newly Graded Subgrades: Loosen subgrade to a minimum depth of 6-inches (150-mm). Remove stones larger than 1-inch (25-mm) in any dimension and sticks, roots, rubbish and other extraneous matter and legally dispose of them off Owner's property.
1. Apply superphosphate fertilizer directly to subgrade before loosening.
2. Thoroughly blend planting soil mix off-site before spreading or spread topsoil, apply soil amendments and fertilizer on surface, and thoroughly blend planting soil mix.
a. Delay mixing fertilizer with planting soil if planting will not proceed within a few days.
b. Mix lime with dry soil before mixing fertilizer.
3. Spread planting soil mix to a depth of 6-inches (150-mm) but not less than required to meet finish grades after light rolling and natural settlement. Do not spread if planting soil or subgrade is frozen, muddy or excessively wet.
a. Spread approximately 1/2 the thickness of planting soil mix over loosened subgrade. Mix thoroughly into top 4-inches (100-mm) of subgrade. Spread remainder of planting soil mix.

C. Unchanged Subgrades: If lawns are to be planted in areas unaltered or undisturbed by excavating, grading or surface-soil stripping operations, prepare surface soil as follows:
1. Remove existing grass, vegetation and turf. Do not mix into surface soil.
2. Loosen surface soil to a depth of at least 6-inches (150-mm). Apply soil amendments and fertilizers according to planting soil mix proportions and mix thoroughly into top 4-inches (100-mm) of soil. Till soil to a homogeneous mixture of fine texture.
a. Apply fertilizer directly to surface soil before loosening.
3. Remove stones larger than 1-inch (25-mm) in any dimension and sticks, roots, trash and other extraneous matter.
4. Legally dispose of waste material, including grass, vegetation and turf, off Owner's property.

D. Finish Grading: Grade planting areas to a smooth, uniform surface plane with loose, uniformly fine texture. Grade to within plus or minus 1/2-inch (13-mm) of finish elevation. Roll and rake, remove ridges and fill depressions to meet finish grades. Limit finish grading to areas that can be planted in the immediate future.

E. Moisten prepared lawn areas before planting if soil is dry. Water thoroughly and allow surface to dry before planting. Do not create muddy soil.

F. Before planting, restore areas if eroded or otherwise disturbed after finish grading.

3.4 PREPARATION FOR EROSION-CONTROL MATERIALS

A. Prepare area as specified in "Lawn Preparation" Article.

B. For erosion-control blanket install from top of slope, working downward, and as recommended by material manufacturer for site conditions. Fasten as recommended by material manufacturer.

C. Moisten prepared area before planting if surface is dry. Water thoroughly and allow surface to dry before planting. Do not create muddy soil.

3.5 SEEDING

A. Sow seed with spreader or seeding machine. Do not broadcast or drop seed when wind velocity exceeds 5 mph (8 km/h). Evenly distribute seed by sowing equal quantities in two directions at right angles to each other.
1. Do not use wet seed or seed that is moldy or otherwise damaged.
2. Do not seed against existing trees. Limit extent of seed to outside edge of planting saucer.

B. Sow seed at a total rate as recommended by the seed supplier.

C. Rake seed lightly into top 1/8-inch (3-mm) of soil, roll lightly and water with fine spray.

D. Protect seeded areas with slopes exceeding 1:6 with erosion-control fiber mesh installed and stapled according to manufacturer's written instructions.

E. Protect seeded areas with slopes not exceeding 1:6 by spreading straw mulch. Spread uniformly at a minimum rate of 2 tons/acre (42 kg/92.9 sq. m) to form a continuous blanket 1-1/2-inches (38-mm) in loose depth over seeded areas. Spread by hand, blower or other suitable equipment.
1. Anchor straw mulch by crimping into soil with suitable mechanical equipment.

F. Protect seeded areas from hot, dry weather or drying winds by applying, within 24 hours after completing seeding operations. Soak areas, scatter mulch uniformly to a depth of 3/16-inch (4.8-mm) and roll surface smooth.

3.6 LAWN RENOVATION

A. Apply seed and protect with straw mulch as required for new lawns.

3.7 LAWN MAINTENANCE

A. Maintain and establish lawn by watering, fertilizing, weeding, mowing, trimming, replanting and other operations. Roll, regrade and replant bare or eroded areas and remulch to produce a uniformly smooth lawn. Provide materials and installation the same as those used in the original installation.
1. In areas where mulch has been disturbed by wind or maintenance operations, add new mulch and anchor as required to prevent displacement.

B. Watering: Provide and maintain temporary piping, hoses and lawn-watering equipment to convey water from sources and to keep lawn uniformly moist to a depth of 4-inches (100-mm).
1. Schedule watering to prevent wilting, puddling, erosion and displacement of seed or mulch. Lay out temporary watering system to avoid walking over muddy or newly planted areas.
2. Water lawn with fine spray at a minimum rate of 1-inch (25-mm) per week unless rainfall precipitation is adequate.

C. Mow lawn as soon as top growth is tall enough to cut. Repeat mowing to maintain specified height without cutting more than 1/3 of grass height. Remove no more than 1/3 of grass-leaf growth in initial or subsequent mowings. Do not delay mowing until grass blades bend over and become matted. Do not mow when grass is wet. Schedule initial and subsequent mowings to maintain the following grass height:
1. Mow grass to a height of 2- to 3- inches (50- to 75-mm).

D. Lawn Postfertilization: Apply fertilizer after initial mowing and when grass is dry.
1. Use fertilizer that will provide actual nitrogen of at least 1 lb/1000 sq. ft. (0.45 kg/92.9 sq. m) to lawn area.

3.8 SATISFACTORY LAWNS

A. Lawn installations shall meet the following criteria as determined by Architect:
1. Satisfactory Seeded Lawn: At end of maintenance period, a healthy, uniform, close stand of grass has been established, free of weeds and surface irregularities, with coverage exceeding 90 percent over any 10-sq. ft. (0.92-sq. m) and bare spots not exceeding 5 by 5-inches (125- by 125-mm).

B. Use specified materials to reestablish lawns that do not comply with requirements and continue maintenance until lawns are satisfactory.

3.9 CLEANUP AND PROTECTION

A. Promptly remove soil and debris created by lawn work from paved areas. Clean wheels of vehicles before leaving site to avoid tracking soil onto roads, walks or other paved areas.

B. Erect temporary fencing or barricades and warning signs as required to protect newly planted areas from traffic. Maintain fencing and barricades throughout initial maintenance period and remove after lawn is established.

C. Remove nondegradable erosion-control measures after grass establishment period.

END OF SECTION

kla studios
Landscape Architecture Site Planning
Westerville Ohio 43082
614.533.5273 | info@kla-studios.com
www.kla-studios.com

COPYRIGHT 2013 - ALL DRAWINGS ARE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF KLA STUDIOS AND MAY NOT BE USED, DUPLICATED OR ALTERED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Perimeter Retail
6510 - 6570 Perimeter Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017

The Daimler Group
1533 Lake Shore Drive
Columbus Ohio 43204

KLA STUDIOS PROJECT NO:
20-0250

ISSUE DATE
2014.07.03

SHEET INFORMATION

CURRENT DATE
2014.09.3

REVISIONS

SHEET TITLE
SPECIFICATIONS
TURF / GRASSES
SCALE

SHEET NO.
A0
04



(A) PARTIAL SOUTH BUILDING ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



(B) PARTIAL NORTH BUILDING ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(C) EAST BUILDING ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

ELEVATION CODED NOTES

1. EXISTING CULTURED STONE VENEER
2. EXISTING 6" EXPOSURE FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING, SMOOTH
3. EXISTING ASPHALT ROOF SHINGLES
4. EXISTING PREFINISHED METAL DECORATIVE WALL FIXTURE
5. EXISTING ELECTRIC METER CENTER
6. FIBER CEMENT PANEL SIDING, SMOOTH (PAINT)
7. PAULOWNIA WOOD TRIM, SMOOTH (PAINT)
8. PAULOWNIA WOOD MOULDING, SMOOTH (PAINT)
9. PAULOWNIA WOOD FASCIA, SMOOTH (PAINT)
10. PREFINISHED METAL (24 GAUGE) FASCIA EDGE FLASHING
11. TUBELITE T-14000 SERIES STOREFRONT SYSTEM WITH GLAZING
12. ALUMINUM STOREFRONT SYSTEM ENTRANCE DOOR WITH GLAZING
13. PREFINISHED ALUMINUM DRIVE-THRU SERVICE WINDOW w/ 1/4" TEMPERED GLASS UNITS WITH STAINLESS STEEL SHELF
14. CANVAS AWNING c/ METAL FRAME AND DECORATIVE BRACKETS
15. 3/4" M.D.O. SIGN BOARD (PAINT EGGSHELL 'BLACK') w/ SURFACE APPLIED, RAISED LETTERING/GRAPHICS. COLOR AND FONT STYLE TO BE SELECTED BY TENANT (N.I.C.)
16. 3/4" M.D.O. BLADE SIGN (PAINT EGGSHELL 'BLACK') w/ SURFACE APPLIED, RAISED LETTERING/GRAPHICS AND WROUGHT IRON CHAIN AND BRACKET (TO BE PROVIDED UNDER TENANT IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE (N.I.C.). COLOR AND FONT STYLE TO BE SELECTED BY TENANT.
17. 8' LONG LINEAR FLUORESCENT LIGHT FIXTURE

EXTERIOR MATERIAL FINISH KEY

MARK	MANUFACTURER	DESCRIPTION	REMARKS
ASPHALT ROOF SHINGLES			
AS-1	GAF	SLATELINE SHINGLE "WEATHERED SLATE"	
PREFINISHED STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF			
SS-1	DMI	24 GAUGE INTERLOCKING PANEL SYSTEM, "COLONIAL RED"	18" FLAT PANEL
CRUSHED STONE VENEER			
CS-1	CENTURION	CENTURION CASTLE COLLECTION COLOR #236, "CALIFORNIA"	MORTAR- CEMEX RC-63-C "HONEYCOMB"
MODULAR BRICK VENEER			
BR-1	GLEN-GERY	MODULAR HOMETOWN SERIES, "CAMBRIDGE"	MORTAR- CEMEX RC-63-C "HONEYCOMB"
CANVAS AWNING			
AWN-1	SUNBRELLA	"BLACK" #4600	FRAME & DECORATIVE SUPPORTS TO BE PREFINISHED "BLACK"
PREFINISHED METAL			
MN-1	DMI	"STONE"	GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS TO BE "NORANDEX-REYNOLDS, "SIERRA"
MN-2	DMI	"WEATHERED ZINC"	
STOREFRONT SYSTEM			
SF-1	TUBELITE	"COLONIAL RED"	T-4000 SERIES, 2" x 4 1/2" FRAMING WITH 1" INSULATED GLAZING
SF-2	TUBELITE	"MEDIUM BRONZE" ANODIZED	T-4000 SERIES, 2" x 4 1/2" FRAMING WITH 1" INSULATED GLAZING
SF-3	TUBELITE	"DARK BRONZE" ANODIZED	T-4000 SERIES, 2" x 4 1/2" FRAMING WITH 1" INSULATED GLAZING
SF-4	TUBELITE	"MILITARY BLUE"	T-4000 SERIES, 2" x 4 1/2" FRAMING WITH 1" INSULATED GLAZING
PAINT			
PT-1	BENJAMIN MOORE	"AUCKLAND BLUE" #HC-161	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-2	BENJAMIN MOORE	"ESSEX GREEN" #6-43	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-3	BENJAMIN MOORE	"RACCOON HOLLOW" #978	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-4	BENJAMIN MOORE	"WOODCLIFF LAKE" #960	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-5	BENJAMIN MOORE	"ONYX" #2133-10	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-6	BENJAMIN MOORE	"MINK", #2113-10	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
PT-7	BENJAMIN MOORE	"COTTAGE RED"	"EGGSHELL" FINISH
COPPER ROOF ACCESSORIES			
RV-1	EUROPEAN ATTIC	"LARGE TOMBSTONE" COPPER ROOF VENT, #CV40894	MANUFACTURER TO PROVIDE COPPER INSECT SCREEN
RS-1	EUROPEAN ATTIC	4" H. COPPER FINIAL, #FN35004	

DRAFT

PERIMETER RETAIL
6510-6570 PERIMETER DRIVE
DUBLIN, OHIO 43017

FOR

THE DAIMLER GROUP
1533 LAKE SHORE DRIVE, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43204

DRAWING STATUS

ISSUED	DATE
FINAL DEV. PLAN	JULY 8, 2014

DRAWING TITLE

EXTERIOR ELEVATION MODIFICATIONS

DRAWING NUMBER

A-2.1

Drive-thru Case Studies

Central Ohio Market

August 12, 2014

STARBUCKS COFFEE

DAIMLER

Development • Leasing • Construction • Sales



21 Neverland Drive, Lewis Center

Corner of Powell Road and US-23

Parcel - 1.52 acres
Building - 7,182 sf
Average Annual Daily Traffic - 41,750*

Morning Customer Statistics

Start Time	End Time	No. of Customers
7:00am	7:30am	31
7:30am	8:00am	38
8:00am	8:30am	45
8:30am	9:00am	47
	Total	161

*Source: Ohio Department of Transportation 2012



6264 East Broad Street, Columbus

Adjacent to Mount Carmel Hospital East

Morning Customer Statistics

Start Time	End Time	No. of Customers
7:00am	7:30am	48
7:30am	8:00am	65
8:00am	8:30am	52
8:30am	9:00am	44
	Total	209

Parcel - 2.044 acres
Building - 9,272 sf
Average Annual Daily Traffic - 29,200

*Source: Ohio Department of Transportation 2010



3235 Tremont Road, Upper Arlington

Corner of Tremont Road and Fishinger Blvd

Parcel - 0.86 acres
Building - 5,060 sf

Morning Customer Statistics

Start Time	End Time	No. of Customers
7:00am	7:30am	36
7:30am	8:00am	43
8:00am	8:30am	47
8:30am	9:00am	48
	Total	174

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

RECORD OF ACTION

AUGUST 21, 2014

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

6. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks
14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Conditional Use

Proposal:	This is a proposal for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru and associated site improvements for an existing shopping center within Subarea A3 of the Riverside PCD North Planned District on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Request:	This is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning/preliminary development plan application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a request for review and approval of a final development plan application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and review and approval of a conditional use for a drive-thru under the provisions of Zoning Co9de Section 153.236.
Applicant:	Centre at Perimeter, LLC; represented by Paul Ghidotti, The Daimler Group.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #1: John Hardt moved, Todd Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval/disapproval to City Council for this preliminary and final plat application because the proposal complies with the preliminary and final plat criteria, with one condition:

1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

*Paul Ghidotti agreed to the above condition.

VOTE: 4 – 2.

RESULT: This Preliminary and Final Plat will be forwarded to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	No
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent
Amy Salay	No

DRAFT

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

RECORD OF ACTION

AUGUST 21, 2014

6. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks
14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Conditional Use

MOTION #2: John Hardt moved, Amy Kramb seconded, to approve this final development plan because this proposal complies with the proposed development text and preliminary development plan, the final development plan criteria and existing development in the area, with two conditions.

1. That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit; and
2. That the evergreens screening the drive-thru be pulled back from the curb at least 5 feet and that a plant different from junipers be selected, subject to approval by Planning.

*Paul Ghidotti agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 4 – 2.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	No
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent
Amy Salay	No

MOTION #3: John Hardt moved, Todd Zimmerman seconded, to approve this conditional use application because the proposal complies with the applicable review criteria, with two conditions.

1. That this approval is only applicable to a coffee shop; and
2. That should this drive-thru cease operating, the site will be required to be restored to pre-drive-thru conditions within one year of the close of business or a new conditional use application is approved by the Commission.

*Paul Ghidotti agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 1.

RESULT: The Conditional Use application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Chris Amorose Groomes	Yes
Richard Taylor	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
John Hardt	Yes
Todd Zimmerman	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent
Amy Salay	No

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____
Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

DRAFT

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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 21, 2014

DRAFT

6. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks
14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU 6510-6570 Perimeter Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Conditional Use

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, introduced this application for a request for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru and associated site improvements for an existing shopping center within Subarea A3 of the Riverside PCD North Planned District on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive. She said the Commission will forward the recommendation to City Council for a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan application, and the Commission will review the requests for a Final Development Plan and a conditional use for a drive-thru.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in anyone intending to address this Commission on this case.

Claudia Husak said this proposal was discussed informally in June. She said the construction on the new retail center has been substantially completed and there are two businesses operating out of the shopping center. She presented a slide showing the proposed site plan and how it has changed since the concept was reviewed in June to accommodate the Starbucks with the drive-thru and how the Commission's comments. She said the proposal involves a request for approximately 2,000 square feet of space for the coffee shop and drive-thru window. She pointed out the internal drive that comes off of the Perimeter Drive access point which is being closed as part of this application to avoid conflict with people entering and leaving the center. She demonstrated the proposed drive-thru stacking which will be routed along the east side of the site, and then wraps south and west to the drive-thru window. She explained there have been some large islands incorporated into the plan to separate the drive-thru activity with the parked cars and to route the traffic exiting the drive-thru.

Ms. Husak summarized the recommended conditions:

<u>Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan</u>

1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

<u>Final Development Plan</u>

1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit.

Ms. Husak said there will be pavement markings shown so that customers will be routed to the drive-thru. She pointed out where the order menu board is located.

Ms. Husak said the Commission had inquired about the development text and fast food uses being prohibited. She stated that in 2012 – 2013, the permitted uses were changed for this particular subarea to accommodate restaurants within a shopping center that would be in one building. She explained that previously, the requirement was that there are two buildings on this site. She said the overall limitations within the development include a prohibition against drive-thrus and fast food restaurants. She said the drive-thru portion was addressed by proposing language that allows a coffee shop drive-thru as a

conditional use for this particular subarea. She said the fast food language was left alone as it seemed more comprehensive to the entire planned district. She said coffee shops are called out separately in the other subarea. She said in Subarea A3, Staff recommended that the uses be a little more generalized. She said Staff put Starbucks in the 'restaurant and eating and drinking establishment' category of the permitted uses.

Ms. Husak reiterated there are three motions required by the Commission for this application: the rezoning/preliminary development plan, which is the change in the development text, including the list of permitted uses which would then be forwarded from the Commission to City Council for approval. She said approval is recommended with one condition:

1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Ms. Husak said the second motion is for the Final Development Plan, which is a determination on all of the site details. She said approval is recommended with one condition:

1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit.

Ms. Husak concluded that the third motion is for the Conditional Use for the drive-thru. She said approval is recommended with no conditions as it complies with the conditional use review criteria.

Ms. Amorose Groomes swore in the applicant.

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, Ohio, said Daimler tried to address the concerns from the informal review on June 5, 2014 that related to the operational issues of the drive-thru. He recalled Mr. Taylor had said the placement of the drive-thru seemed awkward and shoe-horned onto the site and the rest of the Commissioners requested more detail on the drive-thru. He said Daimler has since received more detailed information from Starbucks. He explained they had three different locations in the case studies. He compared the traffic counts to Perimeter Drive, which was about 8,000 – 9,000 cars per day, substantially less than the other three locations. He also learned that on average, Starbucks receives 60 percent of their customers between 7 am – 9:30 am. He addressed the lunchtime service to accommodate the stacking in the drive-thru of 12 cars. He said food is offered but not made on site as the cafes are only 1,800 square feet. He explained that food is delivered by truck and then heated up.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the morning customer statistics were all drive-thru. Mr. Ghidotti said the numbers reflect total customers inside and out. He explained the traffic analysis.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited anyone from the public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [Hearing none.] She invited thoughts from the Commission.

Amy Salay said she had asked Mr. Ghidotti to approach the neighborhoods that are to the north because they have always been very active and concerned about development in this area, and she asked how that discussion went.

Mr. Ghidotti said they reached out to the four officers from the Indian Run Meadows Homeowners Association (IRMHA). He said Michael Welsh, secretary for IRMHA, provided a written response that stated he thanked the applicant for the information but said it did not present any issues for their residents as they are not adjacent to the site and take a neutral stance.

Ms. Salay asked if he reached out to Lowell Trace, to which he responded he did not. He said Lowell Trace is even farther removed than Indian Run Meadows but offered to if the Commission recommended that they do so.

Ms. Salay said she did not have an extremely negative opinion of this project before and stated that she has since given it a lot of thought, visited the site, and concluded that drive-thrus really do not make anything better and are never an improvement either in appearance or helping the site function better. She said the case studies were interesting but said nobody anticipated what would happen at McDonald's and the Wendy's/Tim Horton's at Avery Road. She said the Starbucks building looks great but she is not sure the drive-thru will improve the development. She said she is not going to be supportive of this proposal. She said Starbucks fits into the definition of fast food in her opinion. She said changing the text to allow fast food is the "tail wagging the dog," and she has never been interested in fast food for this location.

John Hardt said he has given this a lot of thought as well. He said going back to the beginning when the change in zoning was granted, the site was zoned for two sit-down restaurants. He said a compelling argument was made to which he was receptive. He said we now have the prospect of replacing one sit-down restaurant with a drive-thru, which makes him uneasy. If he supports this, he said he would not want to change the text. He stated the prohibition of fast food is important. He said if he supports this, it is only because Starbucks is a coffee shop. He explained that if Starbucks decides not to occupy this space in the future, he would not be the least bit supportive of having a burger joint take their place. He indicated he is concerned with what will become of the other side of the building, and asked if there was information to be provided regarding the end cap on the west end.

Mr. Ghidotti said he had explained at the June informal that they had tried all along to get two sit-down restaurants with two patios on the ends of the building. He said they begged Dewey's Pizza to take an end but they did not want it, and he is still not sure why. He said this may be a different discussion if they were on one end or the other. He said since fall of 2002, trying to market this site, Daimler has struggled. He said he still believes they are going to have two restaurants and not a traditional fast food restaurant, and he does not consider a coffee shop to be fast food. He said he does not have a problem with limiting this to a coffee shop. Mr. Ghidotti indicated if there is a desire to clarify what type of shop can be in there, he said they are willing to consider that.

Mr. Hardt said the request for the drive-thru is a conditional use and asked if it was occupant specific.

Ms. Husak said drive-thru was conditional use and not based on any particular occupant as proposed.

Mr. Hardt said he can get comfortable with what is in front of the Commission this evening, but if the space were to turn over, he would like to have a conversation about it.

Amy Kramb said that was her biggest concern. She said she is okay with a coffee shop. She said in the language in the existing text, she is not comfortable because it opens it up to too many possibilities. She indicated she would be okay if they tied the drive-thru specifically to the conditional use and if the space turns over, they remove the drive-thru altogether. She said she was not certain the Commission could get to that language into the text.

Mr. Hardt said it was not unlike some of the conversations they have had regarding gas stations connected to grocery stores, to which Ms. Kramb agreed.

Todd Zimmerman recalled that when BJ's opened up on Sawmill Road, they had a conditional use for the gas station, but they closed less than a year later and the station went away, and now it is level, paved, and you would never know it had been there.

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that that had happened for several businesses.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what would happen if the drive-thru were installed and then later removed, and how the site would be designed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thought it should be returned to the original design.

Ms. Husak offered options: 1) a drive-thru is permitted for a coffee shop. She said if Starbucks went out of business and another coffee shop were to move in within a year, and the operations were similar, the other coffee shop could use this conditional use for themselves; or 2) if any new user comes in regardless of their use, they would need to request a conditional use from the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought the Commission would be more comfortable with the second option. She said stacking issues need to be discussed.

Mr. Ghidotti said, from an ownership standpoint, that gives a lot of leverage to a Starbucks because if *any* coffee shop comes in, a lot of leverage is in a single tenant's hands.

Phil Hartman said another idea that had been discussed was percentage of sales for beverages.

Mr. Hardt said he is concerned that if Starbucks moves out of this space and an ice cream shop moved in for example, he has seen their drive-thrus, and on an 80-degree June night he does not believe this stacking would be sufficient so he would want the opportunity to re-evaluate that, if the use changed.

Mr. Ghidotti said he liked the idea of percentage of sales from coffee. Ms. Kramb agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said it holds Starbucks to a standard. She said the drink relation percentage of sales would protect the Commission from some of those other businesses.

Ms. Kramb inquired about the size of the menu board sign received in their cut sheets.

Ms. Husak pointed out that it was close to 50 square feet.

Ms. Kramb asked what size it was permitted.

Ms. Husak said Code limits the square footage of menu boards to 32 square feet.

Ms. Kramb said the menu board needs to be smaller. She asked for a size of a typical menu board in the area to which Ms. Husak responded they must be 32 square feet.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have already cut the size of the menu board down by a third. He said the first board shows the menu offerings before the customer reaches the drive-thru speaker for more efficient ordering. He said there are actually two faces, pretty close in proximity to each other, and confirmed the faces are not connected. He said there are two different designs.

Ms. Kramb asked for clarification if there were two separate signs.

Mr. Ghidotti said the applicant is still limited to a total of 32 square feet. Ms. Kramb said the text reads "one menu board".

Ms. Husak clarified the one sign the applicant is proposing has three panels.

Mr. Hardt asked for clarification on the sign placement and a few Commissioners commented on the configuration. Mr. Hardt thought the response should be, wherever the sign is, between the sign and the private drive, there needs to be some additional landscaping so the back of the sign is not visible.

Mr. Ghidotti agreed that landscaping might be better than introducing a different material for the back of the menu board. Mr. Ghidotti pointed out the menu board on the landscape plan.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested different plant materials.

Mr. Hartman said he would be comfortable adding a condition to the conditional use to limit the use to 60 or 65 percent beverage sales.

Ms. Husak said under the Subarea A3 permitted uses, the language currently states "one drive-thru may be permitted as a conditional use within Subarea A3, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission…". She suggested "one drive-thru for a tenant whose sale volume is made up of a minimum of 65 percent beverages, may be permitted" and keep the language.

Mr. Hartman suggested "non-alcoholic" text be added.

Mr. Ghidotti questioned the "magic" number of 65 percent. He asked for flexibility before going to Council.

Mr. Hardt asked for confirmation that this is not a condition on tonight's vote; it is a modification to the development text.

Ms. Husak said it would have to be conditioned, somehow but wanted to get a comfort level, first.

Ms. Kramb suggested the condition would be 'the Commission would modify the text to include a beverage limit that will be verified', to which Ms. Husak agreed the condition could be written that way.

Ms. Husak said this would be for the conditional use language that Staff added for Subarea A3, which does not address the fast food discussion, earlier. She confirmed the Commission believed the beverage requirement creates the distinction between fast food and this type of operation.

Mr. Hardt said there was a separate paragraph that prohibits fast food.

Ms. Husak said the definition of fast food was not in their Zoning Code.

Ms. Salay said it was important to have an opinion on this before it goes to Council.

Mr. Hartman said the distinction should be made if it is not fast food. He said the opinion is that it is not based on current laws and cases dealt with in the past unless it is specifically defined as the zoning is going to be construed.

Mr. Hardt asked if not having a kitchen makes it relevant to that conversation.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked Legal to help define fast food as defined by the City of Dublin.

Mr. Hardt asked why this is considered a coffee shop.

Ms. Husak said when she had a conversation with Legal, it seemed Ms. Readler she was leaning toward fixing that fast food language in the text for this specific Subarea to give the City some protection. She said she thought the beverage percentage was to resolve the fast food point.

Mr. Hardt asked if the applicant had a specific deadline.

Mr. Ghidotti said time is money. He said there are three tenants they are talking to that will not commit until Starbucks is signed.

Ms. Kramb said she was comfortable with Starbucks but her concern was the text modification.

Mr. Hardt concluded the Commission is just being asked to vote on a conditional use to which they are only supportive if it is for a coffee shop.

Richard Taylor asked what the Commission does not like about fast food.

Ms. Kramb stated her concern with fast food related to traffic at specific times of the day. She said she does not want to see stacked cars at lunchtime or between 4 pm – 6 pm when every business is so busy during that time.

Ms. Salay asked how to get around the idea that Starbucks might want to expand their business, add food, offer more and more breakfast and lunch items, offer a big pastry line, etc.

Mr. Hardt said the argument at the informal was there would be predominantly morning traffic. He said, traffic data specific to this user has been provided and he would want to see the same data to evaluate it for a proposed future use.

Mr. Taylor summarized that the issue seems to be the amount of traffic.

Ms. Kramb agreed it was purely traffic because the whole area is a traffic nightmare.

Ms. Salay inquired about data for the rest of the day.

Mr. Ghidotti said back in June, the concern was about the stacking of cars and if there was not enough stacking, would cars end up blocking some of the parking spaces.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hardt that he preferred to review the specific traffic data related to another user if the business turns over.

Ms. Salay again brought up the condition with BJ's gas station and asked if there could be a condition whereas if Starbucks goes away, the drive-thru gets removed.

Ms. Husak said the prospective tenant would need to start this process all over again unless they were a coffee shop.

Mr. Ghidotti was concerned about the condition being tied to a named user.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that could put the property owner in a very difficult position.

Ms. Salay said it *should* be difficult, as a drive-thru is being requested when the Commission is not really comfortable with one.

Mr. Hardt asked if the definition of fast food was being written into the Code.

Steve Langworthy said Staff attempted to tackle that, reviewing the old SIC Codes, but could not find a solution.

Mr. Hardt said if that cannot be cracked, then the notion of updating this text to clarify what is meant by this particular use seems just as unlikely.

Mr. Langworthy suggested instead of defining fast food, just find a new term.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what that term might be.

Mr. Langworthy said "fast casual" as that has a definition to it. He reiterated that "fast food" is an umbrella with multiple categories underneath that do tend to have definitions.

Mr. Taylor said that appears to be a moving target and brought up the example of salads at McDonald's and he wanted to know why a Starbucks might work here but a McDonald's does not. He said he is comfortable saying whatever happens after Starbucks, gets reviewed by the Commission.

Ms. Salay asked what happens to the physical drive-thru, lanes, facility, and building addition if the subsequent tenant is not a coffee shop.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented on the landscape plan. She said she would like Globe Arborvitae or some other evergreen instead of Juniper and would like them pulled back behind the curb at least five feet to alleviate constant conflict with vehicles.

Ms. Husak said plant material was changed during the Final Development Plan approval.

Mr. Ghidotti said the applicant has already changed this once.

Ms. Salay said she thought the goal was to hide the cars in the drive-thru.

Mr. Ghidotti offered to achieve the opacity requirement with a combination of mounding and plant materials. Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested this could be "subject to Staff approval".

Ms. Husak asked for clarification for the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with respect to development text and the Final Development Plan would have one condition about menu boards, asking if a size had been determined.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Code permits 32 square feet.

Mr. Langworthy explained that if there are two panels, it is considered one sign and if there is a gap between, it counts toward the square footage so it is the advantage of the applicant not to do that.

Mr. Hardt inquired about the mention of two different locations.

Mr. Ghidotti said he had misspoke and the applicant is not proposing that at this location.

Ms. Kramb asked about the requirements with respect to lighting the menu boards.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was not on the Commission at the time of the informal review. He inquired about the future seating area outside and asked if it is typical seating area, following Code.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any further questions or comments with respect to this case. [Hearing none.] She said there were three motions and three votes before the Commission.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Hardt moved and Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application with one condition:

1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he agreed to the condition as written in the Staff Report. Mr. Ghidotti agreed. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Salay, no; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, no; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 4 – 2)

Motion and Vote
Mr. Hardt moved and Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve this Final Development Plan with two conditions:

1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit;
2) That the evergreens screening the drive-thru be pulled back from the curb at least 5 feet and that a plant different from junipers be selected, subject to approval by Planning.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he agreed to the two conditions. Mr. Ghidotti said he agreed. The vote was as follows: Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Salay, no; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, no; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Hardt, yes. (Approved 4 – 2)

Motion and Vote
Mr. Hardt moved and Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve this Conditional Use application with two conditions that were added this evening:

1) That this approval is only applicable to a coffee shop;
2) That should this drive-thru cease operating, the site will be required to be restored to pre-drive-thru conditions within one year of the close of business or a new conditional use application is approved by the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if he agreed to the two conditions as written on the board. Mr. Ghidotti agreed. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Salay, no; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Zimmerman, yes. (Approved 5 – 1)

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

City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission

Planning Report

Thursday, August 21, 2014

Riverside Planned Commerce District North Subareas A_3 - The Perimeter - Starbucks

Case Summary

Agenda Item	6
Case Number	14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Site Location	6510-6570 Perimeter Drive On the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Proposal	A Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru and associated site improvements for an existing shopping center within Subarea A3 of the Riverside PCD North Planned District on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Requests	1) Review and recommendation to City Council under the Planned District provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 for a rezoning with preliminary development plan. 2) Review and approval of a final development plan under the Planned District provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. 3) Review and approval of a conditional use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236
Owner/Applicant	Centre at Perimeter, LLC; represented by Paul Ghidotti, The Daimler Group.
Case Manager	Claudia D. Husak, AICP Planner II | (614) 410-4675 | chusak@dublin.oh.us
Planning Recommendation	In Planning's analysis the proposal complies with all applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards. Planning recommends: 1) Approval to City Council of the rezoning with preliminary development plan with no conditions. 2) Approval of the final development plan with 1 condition. 3) Approval of the conditional use. Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan Condition 1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Final Development Plan Condition 1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit.

City of Dublin

14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Final Development Plan/ Conditional Use
Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 - The Perimeter Starbucks
6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

0 150 300
Feet

Facts	
Site Area	2.93 acres
Zoning	PUD, Planned Commerce District (Riverside North plan, Subarea A_3)
Surrounding Zoning	South: PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Avery Square plan) containing the Avery Square shopping center. All Others: PCD, Planned Commerce District (Riverside North plan) containing office, daycare and commercial uses, including the Shoppes at Avery restaurant and retail center.
Site Features	• Rectangular parcel with 450 feet of frontage along Perimeter Drive. • Access is provided by two private drives from Perimeter Drive. • Existing sidewalk located along Perimeter Drive. • A 14,000-sqaure-foot shopping center with 126 parking spaces was constructed earlier this year.
Development Context	• The subject parcel is in Subarea A_3 of the Riverside North development, which includes 24 acres at the northwest corner of Perimeter Drive and Avery-Muirfield Drive. • Divided into three Subareas, with specific permitted uses, such as office, medical office, daycare, retail and restaurant, depending on the Subarea. • The PCD has been under development for several years and currently includes the Shoppes at Avery shopping center, Huntington National Bank, Champaign Bank, the Primrose School daycare and medical office buildings. • Subarea A3 was rezoned in 2013 to allow restaurants within a single building and to permit additional retail uses. • The site was approved with a parking agreement with Champaign Bank, immediately to the east of the site. • Among other permitted uses, the development text permits casual and fine dining restaurants and eating and drinking establishments up to 11,000 square feet. Additional restaurant square footage may be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The text specifically states that those establishments shall at no time include a drive-thru.
Background	• On June 6, 2014, the Planning and Zoning Commission commented informally on a request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru. Commissioners were concerned about the impacts of the proposal on parking, circulation, screening and potential noise. They suggested contacting adjacent neighborhoods who were previously concerned about commercial development north of Perimeter Drive. Members suggested the applicant revise the development text to limit

Facts

	drive-thrus to certain uses and requested operational details for a Starbucks drive-thru as well as stacking data and peak time use data. • City Council approved the rezoning for Subarea A_3 in January of 2013. • The Commission recommended approval of the rezoning on December 6, 2012 after reviewing an informal proposal in September of 2012. • Ordinance 118-03 approved Planned Commerce District on April 19, 2004. Preliminary and Final Plats approved on August 2, 2004. • The Commission has approved numerous final development plans for a variety of office and commercial uses within this District.
Community Plan	*Future Land Use* The Community Plan's Future Land Use Map shows the site as *General Commercial (6,500 – 8,700 SF per acre)* and the current zoning allows restaurants and office but excludes retail uses. The Plan describes this land use classification as retail and commercial development that is heavily dependent upon the automobile with a mix of retail, restaurant and personal services. The plan also states this type of commercial development is outdated and should not be used in the future due to the reliance on the automobile. *Land Use Principles* Land Use Principles 3 and 4 suggest places with integrated uses that are distinctive and sustainable, and contribute to the City's overall vitality. The Plan states it is important to provide some retail services closer to residential areas as an amenity. The Plan also highlights design considerations.

Details

Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Process	This is a request for review and recommendation to City Council of approval of a rezoning with preliminary development plan to revise the development text for Subarea A_3 of the Riverside North Planned District to allow a drive-thru for a Starbucks coffee shop. Rezoning to a Planned Unit Development requires approval of a development text to serve as the zoning regulation for the development requirements noted. The proposal is a request to rezone 2.9 acres from PUD (Planned Unit Development District, Riverside PUD North, Subarea A_3) to the same district but creating a new PUD with standards and regulations only applicable to this Subarea. No changes are proposed to Subareas A_1 and A_2.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Development Text	This development text modifies the permitted uses for Subarea A_3. A coffee shop is a permitted use within Subarea A3 of this Planned District however, a drive-thru is explicitly prohibited in this Subarea. The revised permitted uses and prohibited use sections of the development text (Page 6) deletes the drive-thru prohibition. Text has been added to permit one drive-thru as a conditional use in Subarea A_3, including an allowance for a menu board sign.
Preliminary Development Plan	This use is to occupy the easternmost tenant space, converting the previously proposed patio area into a drive-thru window and lane. To accommodate the stacking spaces, the proposal eliminates an internal driveway into the site from the east side and 14 parking spaces. The drive-thru is proposed to be accessed from the north driveway into the site with drive-thru circulation on the east side. A landscape island separates the drive-thru circulation from parking spaces. Pavement markings will indicate the intended traffic flow for the drive-thru. The Commission previously expressed concerns regarding the potential for vehicles stacking beyond the 12 required stacking spaces. This proposal provides the 12 spaces and in the event stacking occurred beyond this point, the parking spaces that would be potentially blocked are relatively remote from the rest of the center.
Architecture	The architecture was part of the previous approval for this Subarea. The changes to the elevations are minimal. The drive-thru window will add approximately 200 square feet to the building and remains integrated into the building architecture.
Parking	The development text requires parking by the Zoning Code. As a "shopping center" the parking requirement is 1 space/150 square feet of building, or 99 spaces. The site was approved with 126 spaces. The applicant has a shared parking agreement with the owner of the adjacent Champaign Bank allowing shared parking on evenings and weekends. This proposal requires the removal of parking spaces and provides 111 spaces. While the development text would be met as proposed, the Commission was concerned at the rezoning stage that popular restaurants could stress the on-site parking. The applicant has indicated that other shared parking agreement options may be available should parking become an issue.

Details	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Signs	The development text permits one menu board sign for a drive-thru to be approved at the final development plan stage. The menu board may be 32 square feet and 6 feet and is permitted in addition to the other signs permitted for the tenant (2 wall signs and 1 projecting sign).
Traffic Study	A traffic analysis has been provided to the City Engineer. The study reviews the area originally studied for The Fairway Traffic Study in 2003. A comparison was made between the anticipated trip generation in 2003 and the currently developed and planned areas. The trips are balanced. Therefore no new transportation infrastructure is anticipated. The City Engineer is requesting minor revisions and a resubmission of the analysis.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Process	Section 153.050 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval for a rezoning/preliminary development plan (full text of criteria attached). Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.
1) Consistency with Dublin Zoning Code	**Criterion met:** The proposed development text modifications address the unique needs of this Subarea and includes appropriate regulations.
2) Conformance with adopted Plans	**Criterion met:** The Future Land Use Plan of the 2007 Community Plan identifies the land use for this site as *General Commercial*, which is met.
3) Advancement of general welfare & orderly development	**Criterion met:** The preliminary development plan encourages development as a cohesive and complementary development to the surrounding area.
4) Effects on adjacent uses	**Criterion met:** The proposed development fits well within the existing development pattern of this area. The drive-thru circulation is proposed in a manner that avoids off-site conflicts. Code required stacking is met, with the potential for several additional stacking spaces. With the main entrance at the north side of the center, the likelihood of conflict on the public street, or on the adjacent private drive is remote.
5) Adequacy of open space for residential	Not applicable.
6) Protection of natural features and resources	**Criterion met:** The proposal includes additional landscape screening to limit views of the drive-thru.

Analysis	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
7) Adequate infrastructure	**Criterion met:** All required public infrastructure is in place.
8) Traffic and pedestrian safety **Condition 1**	**Criterion met with Condition:** The applicant provided traffic analysis, which accounts for the proposed use. The City Engineer is requesting an update to the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District. Code required stacking spaces are met and with the location of this use at the end of the shopping center, the conflict with pedestrian movement is minimized.
9) Coordination & integration of building & site relationships	**Criterion met:** The proposal provides for a coordinated and integrated development consistent architectural and landscaping details.
10) Development layout and intensity	**Criterion met:** The proposed use meets lot coverage requirements, has adequate parking and circulation. The layout is cohesive in relation to the existing development.
11) Stormwater management	**Criterion met:** The applicant has provided the necessary information to satisfy City requirements.
12) Community benefit	**Criterion met:** The proposal will provide an additional retail service near residential and commercial areas, giving the community more options.
13) Design and appearance	**Criterion met:** The proposed development uses high quality materials consistent with the previously approved development text and other developments in the area.
14) Development phasing	**Criterion met:** This will be constructed in a single phase.
15) Adequacy of public services	**Criterion met:** There are adequate services for the proposed uses.
16) Infrastructure contributions	**Criterion met:** No public infrastructure contributions are required.

Recommendation	**Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan**
Approval	Based on Planning's analysis, this proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria, provides the opportunity for additional retail options within the city and includes a cohesive campus development. Approval is recommended with one condition.
Condition	1) That the applicant update the traffic information provided to more accurately reflect the existing uses within the Planned District; subject to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Details	**Final Development Plan**
Proposal/ Development Details	The proposed improvements include: • 228 square foot building addition for a drive-thru window for a Starbucks coffee shop • Elimination of east driveway to accommodate drive-thru lane • Removal of parking spaces, east of the building • Landscape islands to separate drive-thru activity from circulation • Pedestrian crossing from parking area to building • Architecture with a residential character and rich materials and colors
Access and Circulation	Access for this site was determined at the time of the original rezoning and the proposed plan eliminates an access point along the eastern site boundary. The removal of this access point allows for drive-thru stacking and alleviates conflicts between the drive-thru lane and parking spaces. The site meets Code requirements for vehicular stacking and circulation through the site. The Washington Township Fire Department has access from the internal drives surrounding the site. Pedestrian circulation includes a five-foot wide sidewalk immediately along the south site of the building. A minor change is proposed to allow for the drive-thru turn toward the pick-up window proposed on the eastern side of the building. Six-foot wide sidewalks connect to the public sidewalk along Perimeter Drive.
Drive-Thru	The proposal includes 12 stacking spaces total, which circulate around the east side of the building. Two large landscape islands separate the drive-thru circulation from the parking lot. A crosswalk is provided across the drive-thru to provide a marked pedestrian crossing from the parking area in the eastern portion of the site to the building. The applicant will be asked to work with staff to provide pavement markings or directional signs that indicate the drive-thru entrance. A landscape island is also proposed near the drive-thru exit to address previous concerns raised by Planning regarding conflicts with parking spaces and exits from the drive-thru lane. The menu board is proposed in a location that forces patrons onto the drive-thru aisle therefore eliminating the potential of cut-through using the adjacent parking area.

Details	**Final Development Plan**
Parking	The plan provides 111 spaces, which meets Code. There were some concerns mentioned by the Planning and Zoning Commission at the informal review of this proposal regarding the parking impacts of popular restaurants. Given the development pattern of this area, it is likely that off-site parking areas may be available during evening or weekend peak times for restaurants. The applicant has an arrangement with Champaign Bank to allow employee parking at the bank weekday nights after 6 p.m. and on weekends should parking prove to be insufficient.
Architecture	The proposed architecture meets the development text requirements for traditional architecture with a residential character and natural materials. A storefront with an ordering window will be added to the east elevation. An awning will be included over the window.
Landscaping	The proposal meets the Code required landscaping as well as the text requirements for mounding and landscaping along Perimeter Drive. The plan includes large landscape islands in the parking lots and smaller pockets of plantings in the plaza area in front of the building. Substantial screening has been proposed along the southeast side of the drive-through to filter views of stacked cars and the menu board.
Signs	The proposal includes one menu board in the southeast portion of the site. The proposed development text limits the size of the menu board to 32 square feet in accordance with Code. The proposal shows the menu board at 48 square feet, which must be reduced in size to meet the text.
Stormwater Management	Stormwater management for this Subarea will be handled similarly to the other areas of this development using parking lot ponding and controlled release at the one-year release rate to the existing pond along Avery-Muirfield Drive. Water quality will be provided by an underground unit prior to discharging to the private sewer.
Utilities	Existing water and sanitary sewer services are adequate to serve this proposal.

Analysis	**Final Development Plan**
Process	Section 153.050 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval for a final development plan (full text of criteria attached). Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.
1) Consistency with the preliminary development plan.	**Criterion met:** This proposal is consistent with the requirements of the proposed development text and preliminary development plan.

Analysis	**Final Development Plan**
2) Traffic and pedestrian safety	**Criterion met:** The plans provide for adequate safety and circulation for both pedestrians and vehicles. On-site walks are adequate sized to allow for parked vehicle overhang.
3) Adequate public services and open space	**Criterion met:** The site has adequate public services. No open space dedication is required.
4) Protection of natural features and resources	**Criterion met:** The proposed plans show additional landscape screening to enhance the site.
5) Adequacy of lighting	**Criterion met:** No changes are proposed to the lighting plan.
6) Signs consistent with preliminary development plan **Condition 1**	**Criterion met with Condition:** Any signs for the Starbucks tenant space will be required to adhere to the details in the development text. The proposed menu board must be reduced in size to 32 square feet.
7) Appropriate landscaping to enhance, buffer, & soften the building and site.	**Criterion met:** The landscape plan meets or exceeds Code and text requirements.
8) Compliant stormwater management	**Criterion met:** Stormwater management for the site is accommodated in the stormwater management plan and will be finalized at the building permit stage.
9) All phases comply with the previous criteria.	Not applicable.
10) Compliance with other laws & regulations.	**Criterion met:** The proposal complies with all other known applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

Recommendation	**Final Development Plan**
Approval	In Planning's analysis, this proposal complies with the proposed development text and preliminary development plan, the final development plan criteria and existing development in the area. Planning recommends approval of this request with one condition.
Condition	1) That the applicant revise the size of the menu board to 32 square feet prior to applying for a sign permit.

Details	**Conditional Use**
Proposal	This is a proposal for a drive-thru for a coffee shop for an existing retail center.
Development Text	The site is within Subarea A_3 of the Riverside PCD North Planned District. This application is based on the proposed rezoning to allow a drive-thru for this site as a conditional use. Drive-thrus are typically considered a conditional use in the Code
Operational Details	• The proposal includes 12 stacking spaces which meets Code. • The applicant has indicated that peak times at area Starbucks locations are 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. • While the data does not show the drive-thru use, it indicates total visits in 30-minute intervals at three different Columbus locations. • The highest number of visits is 65 at the East Broad Street location near Mount Carmel East hospital between 7:30 and 8 a.m. This would equate to about one car for every two minutes if they all used the drive-thru.

Analysis	**Conditional Use**
1) Will not have a hazardous or negative impact on surrounding uses.	**Criterion met:** Proposed operations are arranged to be contained within the site.
2) Will provide adequate services and facilities.	**Criterion met:** The drive-thru provides a convenient service for area residents.

Analysis	**Conditional Use**
3) Will not harm the economic welfare.	**Criterion met:** This proposed use contributes positively to the economic climate of the city.
4) Create no use or characteristic that is detrimental to the surrounding uses.	**Criterion met:** The use will not be detrimental to the surrounding area.
5) Vehicular circulation will not interfere with existing circulation.	**Criterion met:** The applicant has included landscape islands and pedestrian crossings to streamline on-site circulation. Stacking meets Code and is located away from other main activity of the center.
6) Not detrimental to property values in the vicinity.	**Criterion met:** This proposal will not be detrimental to property values.
7) Will not impede the development or improvement of surrounding properties.	**Criterion met:** This proposal uses are contained on site and will not impede development or improvement to the surrounding properties.
8) Vehicular circulation will not interfere with existing circulation.	**Criterion met:** The changes are proposed to provide additional parking.
9) Not detrimental to property values in the vicinity.	**Criterion met:** This proposal will not be detrimental to property values.

Analysis	**Conditional Use**
10) Will not impede the development or improvement of surrounding properties.	**Criterion met:** This proposal uses are contained on site and will not impede development or improvement to the surrounding properties.

Recommendation	**Conditional Use**
Approval	Planning recommends approval of the proposal with no conditions as it complies with the conditional use review criteria.

REZONING/PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN CRITERIA

The purpose of the PUD process is to encourage imaginative architectural design and proper site planning in a coordinated and comprehensive manner, consistent with accepted land planning, landscape architecture, and engineering principles. The PUD process can consist of up to three basic stages:

1) Concept Plan (Staff, Commission, and/or City Council review and comment);
2) **Zoning Amendment Request (Preliminary Development Plan; Commission recommends and City Council approves/denies); and**
3) Final Development Plan (Commission approves/denies).

The general intent of the preliminary development plan (rezoning) stage is to determine the general layout and specific zoning standards that will guide development. The Planning and Zoning Commission must review and make a recommendation on this preliminary development plan (rezoning) request. The application will then be forwarded to City Council for a first reading/introduction and a second reading/public hearing for a final vote. A two-thirds vote of City Council is required to override a negative recommendation by the Commission. If approved, the rezoning will become effective 30 days following the Council vote. Additionally, all portions of the development will require final development plan approval by the Commission prior to construction. In the case of a combined rezoning/preliminary development plan and final development plan, the final development plan is not valid unless the rezoning/preliminary development plan is approved by Council.

Review Criteria

Section 153.050 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval for a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan. In accordance with Section 153.055(A) *Plan Approval Criteria*, Code sets out the following criteria of approval for a preliminary development plan (rezoning):

1) The proposed development is consistent with the purpose, intent and applicable standards of the Dublin Zoning Code;
2) The proposed development is in conformity with the Community Plan, Thoroughfare Plan, Bikeway Plan and other adopted plans or portions thereof as they may apply and will not unreasonably burden the existing street network;
3) The proposed development advances the general welfare of the City and immediate vicinity and will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding areas;
4) The proposed uses are appropriately located in the City so that the use and value of property within and adjacent to the area will be safeguarded;
5) Proposed residential development will have sufficient open space areas that meet the objectives of the Community Plan;
6) The proposed development respects the unique characteristic of the natural features and protects the natural resources of the site;
7) Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, retention and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided;
8) Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress designed to minimize traffic congestion on the surrounding public streets and to maximize public safety and to accommodate adequate pedestrian and bike circulation systems so that the proposed development provides for a safe, convenient and non-conflicting circulation system for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians;
9) The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to such other facilities provides for the coordination and integration of this development within the PD and the larger community and maintains the image of Dublin as a quality community;
10) The density, building gross floor area, building heights, setbacks, distances between buildings and structures, yard space, design and layout of open space systems and parking areas, traffic accessibility and other elements having a bearing on the overall acceptability of the development plan's contribution to the orderly development of land within the City;

11) Adequate provision is made for storm drainage within and through the site so as to maintain, as far as practicable, usual and normal swales, water courses and drainage areas;
12) The design, site arrangement, and anticipated benefits of the proposed development justify any deviation from the standard development regulations included in the Dublin Zoning Code or Subdivision Regulation, and that any such deviations are consistent with the intent of the Planned Development District regulations;
13) The proposed building design meets or exceeds the quality of the building designs in the surrounding area and all applicable appearance standards of the City;
14) The proposed phasing of development is appropriate for the existing and proposed infrastructure and is sufficiently coordinated among the various phases to ultimately yield the intended overall development;
15) The proposed development can be adequately serviced by existing or planned public improvements and not impair the existing public service system for the area; and
16) The applicant's contributions to the public infrastructure are consistent with the Thoroughfare Plan and are sufficient to service the new development.

FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CRITERIA

The purpose of the Planned Unit Development process is to encourage imaginative architectural design and proper site planning in a coordinated and comprehensive manner, consistent with accepted land planning, landscape architecture, and engineering principles. The PUD process consists of up to three stages:

1) Concept Plan (Staff, Commission, and/or City Council review and comment);
2) Zoning Amendment Request (Preliminary Development Plan; Commission recommends and City Council approves/denies); and
3) **Final Development Plan (Commission approves/denies).**

The intent of the final development plan is to show conformance with and provide a detailed refinement of the total aspects of the approved preliminary development plan (rezoning). The final development plan includes all of the final details of the proposed development and is the final stage of the PUD process. The Commission may approve as submitted, approve with modifications agreed to by the applicant, or disapprove and terminate the process. If the application is disapproved, the applicant may respond to Planning and Zoning Commission's concerns and resubmit the plan. This action will be considered a new application for review in all respects, including payment of the application fee. Appeal of any action taken by the Commission shall be to the Court of Common Pleas in the appropriate jurisdiction. Following approval by the Commission, the applicant may proceed with the building permit process. In the event that updated citywide standards are applicable, all subsequently approved final development plans shall comply with the updated standards if the Planning and Zoning Commission determines that the updated standards would not cause undue hardship.

Review Criteria
In accordance with Section 153.055(B) *Plan Approval Criteria*, the Code sets out the following criteria of approval for a final development plan:

1) The plan conforms in all pertinent respects to the approved preliminary development plan provided, however, that the Planning and Zoning Commission may authorize plans as specified in §153.053(E)(4);
2) Adequate provision is made for safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the site and to adjacent property;
3) The development has adequate public services and open spaces;
4) The development preserves and is sensitive to the natural characteristics of the site in a manner that complies with the applicable regulations set forth in this Code;

5) The development provides adequate lighting for safe and convenient use of the streets, walkways, driveways, and parking areas without unnecessarily spilling or emitting light onto adjacent properties or the general vicinity;
6) The proposed signs, as indicated on the submitted sign plan, will be coordinated within the Planned Unit Development and with adjacent development; are of an appropriate size, scale, and design in relationship with the principal building, site, and surroundings; and are located so as to maintain safe and orderly pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
7) The landscape plan will adequately enhance the principal building and site; maintain existing trees to the extent possible; buffer adjacent incompatible uses; break up large expanses of pavement with natural material; and provide appropriate plant materials for the buildings, site, and climate;
8) Adequate provision is made for storm drainage within and through the site which complies with the applicable regulations in this Code and any other design criteria established by the City or any other governmental entity which may have jurisdiction over such matters;
9) If the project is to be carried out in progressive stages, each stage shall be so planned that the foregoing conditions are complied with at the completion of each stage; and
10) The Commission believes the project to be in compliance with all other local, state, and federal laws and regulations.



City of Dublin

14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/
Final Development Plan/Conditional Use
Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 - The Perimeter Starbucks
6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

0 150 300
Feet

N

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

RECORD OF ACTION

JUNE 5, 2014

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

1. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks Informal Review
14-045INF 6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

Proposal:	An informal request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru for an existing shopping center on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Request:	This is a request for informal review and feedback for a potential future rezoning and final development plan application.
Applicant:	Centre at Perimeter, LLC; represented by Paul Ghidotti, Daimler.
Planning Contact:	Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission commented informally on a request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru for an existing shopping center on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive. Some Commissioners preferred this location for a Starbucks Drive-Thru to a previously proposed site. Most Commissioners were concerned about the impacts of the proposal on parking, circulation, screening and potential noise. Commissioners suggested contacting adjacent neighborhoods who were previously concerned about commercial development north of Perimeter Drive. The Commission suggested the applicant revise the development text to limit drive-thrus to certain uses and requested operational details for a Starbucks drive-thru as well as stacking data and peak time use data.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

1. Riverside PCD North, Subarea 3 – The Perimeter Starbucks **Informal Review**
14-045INF **6510-6570 Perimeter Drive**

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for an informal request for review and feedback for a Starbucks Coffee Shop with a drive-thru for an existing shopping center on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections of Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

Ms. Husak presented this informal application and said that the site is to the north of Perimeter Drive where they received zoning approval in January 2013 to build the existing 14,000-square-foot retail building. She said the site required that zoning to allow the size of the restaurants and the combination of everything in one building.

Ms. Husak said the proposed site originally included restaurant spaces at either end of the retail center with patio spaces on both ends and one of the major restaurant tenants elected to go into the center of the building which is Dewey's Pizza now open for business. She said Starbucks is asking to use a tenant space on this site for their coffee shop and include a drive-thru and the applicant would like some feedback on a use stand point and could this use be accommodated on this site particularly because the development text does not permit a drive-thru within the subarea and would require another rezoning.

Ms. Husak said they looked through different issues that could be presented and they came up with a plan to accommodate the stacking and the impacts to the site. She said they propose to eliminate the internal access point along the private drive from Perimeter Drive that loops around the entire site and connects the tenant spaces and the building within the development. She said the drive-thru is intended to be in the area along the eastern portion of the site providing 12 stacking spaces which is required by Code and loops around the southern portion and the area that was intended to be the patio with an awning overhang is now the drive-thru window. She said there is concern with the escape lane circulation with the parking spaces potentially backing out into the stacking lane as well as the exiting the drive-thru with the entrance of the center which the applicant provided a alternate design which provides a landscaped island that would separate the drive-thru from the parking spaces and still provide a drive isle and increase the landscape island to the north to separate the drive-thru exit more from the parking at the front of the shopping center and includes heavy landscape screening along the side to hide the drive-thru activity from Perimeter Drive.

Ms. Husak said there are two discussion questions for the commission on whether or not the Starbucks with a drive-thru is appropriate to the site and are there any other circulation considerations the applicant could make to eliminate some of the conflicts highlighted.

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, Ohio, working with the Daimler Group, the owner and managing member of this center, shared a little history important to this site regarding the rezoning and previous plans because it is unusual to be talking about a specific tenant by name. He said usually there is a building design and the tenants come and they figure out how they will fit into a space and if there are changes they come back for approval. He said they have a nice mix of uses with 10 year leases and there is a very strong lunch oriented users, with one dinner user, and a tenant for bunt cakes which closes at 6 pm. He said if they are able to get a coffee shop like Starbucks they will be open all day with drive-thru peaks during morning hours. He said Starbucks has tried for eleven years to find a location in this area.

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

Mr. Budde said he appreciates the summary of the history and likes the alternative plan with the use peak hours being morning when the other spaces are closed and supports the proposal.

Ms. Kramb said when she read through the minutes there was discussion to not have fast food or drive-thrus with the considerations being for the residents to the north and to avoid high volumes throughout the day. She said in this instance with a drive-thru busy in the mornings she could support and be comfortable because it is a Starbucks and would like to approve as a conditional use and restrict the drive-thru use only as long it is a Starbucks. She liked the alternative design and said there should be more striping for a walkway to the restaurant crossing the drive-thru lane and at the top of the drive-thru lane at the northeast corner to keep stacking from the access to the parking spaces. She said the original approval was for a certain number of patio square footage and wanted to make sure the text reflects the changes to allowable patio space. She said they needed to indicate where the ordering boards would be located and provide the other details related to speakers and lighting.

Mr. Taylor said this proposal seems shoe horned and jammed into this site and he is concerned with losing the access to the parking from the east. He said it seems like an awkward placement and forced on the site and does not like losing the parking with how much would be required on this site.

Mr. Ghidotti said they were able to secure a parking easement with Champaign to the east and that they exceed Code even with losing the 14 spaces by 12 or 14 spaces and they will have the ability to park 20 cars after banking hours to the east. He said there are discussions with the dental office being built to the northwest to allow parking on that site as well. He said with having complimentary uses with the various hours that each restaurant operates will allow them to minimize pavement and support the uses.

Mr. Taylor said they could talk about parking numbers and he could probably get happy with it but his biggest concern is the overall circulation of the site.

Mr. Ghidotti said the proposed access will match the neighboring center with two access points.

Mr. Hardt complimented the applicant on the building and was glad they went the extra mile on the building. He said it's exiting getting two larger sit down restaurants in this location with outdoor seating space which is lacking in this part of the community. He said what causes him pause is with losing a viable restaurant space and outdoor patio and is a shame. He said if there is going to be a drive-thru on this site they have made it work about as well as it can. He likes the new plan presented better than the older one.

Mr. Hardt said the traffic for Starbucks is all morning traffic and the pizza place is evening traffic and potentially the other restaurant is lunch traffic and that would work, but if the other restaurant was a breakfast place the traffic does not work.

Mr. Hardt said he lives in a condo on Post Road and if he is outside the only thing he hears is SR 33 and the prospect of hearing a drive-thru is an impossibility and is not anything he would be concerned about.

Ms. Salay complimented the applicant on the building. She visited Dewey's on Sunday and was disappointed they are only open till 4:00, but they are very busy and expected they will be at lunch time. She recommended they get in touch with the neighbors at Lowell Trace and Indian Run Meadows knowing that they would be interested in this project. She said if the speaker is done properly they will not be able to hear, but she has heard that residents in Lowell Trace can hear party's at BW3s patio with outdoor speakers and music.

Ms. Salay said she likes the alternative design and seeing that there are 12 spaces for stacking but the real world events shows that there is a need for more and a solution needs to be prepared prior to bringing this back as a formal application. She said knowing that Starbucks now sells food this will be a business that will have business through the noon hour and wanted them to be prepared for the

increase. She said this is a better location for Starbucks and is glad to hear about the parking agreements with surrounding businesses.

Ms. Newell said she has reservations for using this site with a drive-thru and the layout proposed in response to staff's comments is the best arrangement that they could accommodate. She said she would like to see screening using low stone wall features or a combination of landscaping nicely integrated with the building. She said she is concerned with stacking and that they will not just busy during morning hours they serve lunch fare and expects this location to be used frequently especially with students after school hours. She is concerned with changing the text to allow a drive-thru to certain uses and asked for operational details for a Starbucks drive-thru as well as stacking data and peak time use data.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said losing the entrance to the east is not a hurdle, but it would be interesting to see how traffic patterns would circulate through the parking lot and would not want access to the drive-thru lane from the adjacent parking area. She requested operational details for comparable Starbucks for busy times of the day. She said the building is well done. She said she thought it would be nice if this location would have outdoor seating.

Mr. Ghidotti said it will have some outdoor seating with two or three café type tables but they have not shown it and would welcome feedback on where it could be located.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not opposed to the drive-thru concept, but felt it had to be the right user and should be a conditional use type of application and limited to a coffee shop type use and not an ice cream or fast food type user and with the university coming there might be some opportunities in the area.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have good feedback and hoped to be back in the next 60 days with a formal application.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked the applicant and said they will look forward to seeing the application.

2. MAG PUD, Subarea A, Land Rover/Range Rover/Jaguar/Lamborghini
14-046AFDP Amended Final Development Plan - Informal Review
6325 Perimeter Loop Road

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the following application is a request for an informal request for review and feedback for a proposal for the a proposal for demolition of the existing 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 for the Lamborghini franchise connecting the proposed building to the main MAG building and all associated site improvements.

Claudia Husak said the applicant has filed an amended final development plan application and wanted to get some informal feedback from the Commission first on a couple of issues. She said this application is focusing on Subarea A of the MAG PUD, which was created in 2009 to accommodate the expansion of the main building to accommodate Volvo on this site and there was a subsequent rezoning to create Subarea B to allow for the BMW/Mini building and the Audi building to be constructed.

Ms. Husak said the Land Rover building to the north of the site is 7,335-square-feet and includes a test track and display area along the Perimeter Road frontage. She said main dealership building which accommodates a majority of the franchises for the MAG campus is about 111,000-square-feet. She said there are approximately 96,000 square feet of display area on the campus within Subarea A which is generally located in the fingers in the northwest and southwest corners of the site. She said the site also has 472 parking spaces for employees and visitors. She said the evergreen screening to the east of the

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

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

APRIL 17, 2014

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

1. Avery Square – Starbucks Outparcel **Hospital Drive**
14-024INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	An approximately 1,800-square-foot coffee shop with a patio, drive-through, and associated site improvements for the Avery Square Shopping Center on the north side of Hospital Drive, 500 feet west of the intersection with Avery-Muirfield Drive.
Request:	Review and informal feedback for the potential development of an outparcel for an existing shopping center.
Applicant:	Dublin Oaks Limited; represented by Charlie Fraas, Casto.
Planning Contact:	Claudia Husak, AICP, Planner II
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission reviewed and provided informal feedback for the potential development of an outparcel associated with the Avery Square Shopping Center. The Commissioners agreed that the proposed Starbucks is a welcome use within the community and could work well on this outparcel, however, the Commissioners stressed that without the modifications to the shopping center entrance, the existing congestion and hazardous conditions in this area do not create a situation where the Commission could support this use. The Commissioners suggested the applicant pursue the entrance modifications, design the building to match the center's architecture and propose a wall sign instead of a monument sign.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II

14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Conditional Use
Riverside PCd North, Subarea A3 - The Perimeter Starbucks
6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

1. Avery Square – Starbucks Outparcel
14-024INF

Hospital Drive
Informal Review

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this application for a request for review and non-binding feedback for an approximately 1,800 square-foot coffee shop with a patio, drive-through, and associated site improvements for the Avery Square Shopping Center on the north side of Hospital Drive, 500 feet west of the intersection with Avery-Muirfield Drive.

Claudia Husak said this is an informal review for a Starbucks for the Avery Square Shopping Center. She presented the site information and highlighted the area just west of Wendy's/Tim Horton's restaurants where the applicant is requesting feedback.

Ms. Husak presented the 2010 Approved Development Plan that had been reviewed by both the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. She said it was brought forward for approval of the Kroger fuel station. She reported during the review process there significant discussion with the applicant regarding the abundance of parking spaces within the area and explained the additional square footage permitted in the development text. She noted the applicant showed an outparcel within this proposed area but did not have a user, and set aside the parcel to be reviewed later as part of a Final Development Plan. She said at the City Council level, when the Preliminary Development Plan was approved, they agreed with that idea but wanted to make sure they would have a say on the layout and amended the development text to require Council approval of the Final Development Plan in addition to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). She reported the Preliminary Plan included access changes to the site where Hospital Drive provides the main access to the shopping center. She explained the access change was driven by Avery-Muirfield/Perimeter Loop Road intersection improvements, which will require a splitter island on Hospital Drive and an existing access point to be eliminated. She noted originally, the improvements were slated for 2014 but have been pushed back to 2017.

Ms. Husak presented detail for the proposal including a 1,800-square-foot kiosk for a Starbucks, a drive-through centric restaurant use, which the applicant would like feedback. She said the Code requires eight stacking spaces but 12 spaces have been incorporated into the design as well as an escape lane, patio area, overflow parking area, and landscape island ensuring the best circulation for drive-through service. She said the applicant proposes a monument sign that is not contemplated in the development text.

Ms. Husak showed more detail for the circulation plan that included the existing drive as well as new drive that would be in place at the same time the intersection improvements occur. She noted there has been a lot of discussion at both the PZC and City Council level regarding the challenges this access point presents and the adjacent uses, specifically the Wendy's/Tim Horton's restaurants that gets quite congested, especially at peak times. She said this elevates concern of introducing another drive-through oriented business that would share the same peak periods. She explained the changes would need to occur for right-in, right-out access on Hospital Drive that will shift the main access and this was emphasized to the applicant to have a plan before returning for approval of a formal application for the outparcel.

Ms. Husak reiterated her proposed discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed outparcel development of a Starbucks drive-thru appropriate?
2. What further vehicular circulation considerations should the applicant make as part of this proposal?
3. Other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to step forward and state his name and address for the record.

Charlie Fraas, 250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 500, Casto, said he has a long history with this project. He said over the last 15 years, they have seen a lot of development around this area and found there is lot of demand for different uses, especially for a Starbucks in the morning with a right turn/right turn entry to get coffee. He explained when they came in for the Kroger gas station, they knew conceptually what they wanted but were not quite sure. He said this proposal is a great use from a size standpoint because it allows overflow parking and fits well within the center. He contends that Starbucks is the right type of tenant for their community involvement, local footprint, and a green business in both building materials and operations for sustainability, sharing the same ultimate goals that the City of Dublin has. He said they understand the architecture will need to comply with existing materials and design style that is used in the shopping center. He clarified it is not a kiosk, but a small restaurant that will allow for couches and chairs. He reported they have spent a lot of time revising the existing entrance, due to the impending roundabout but now that has been pushed back. He said the entrance was planned to be as far away from the intersection as possible entering from the back way, with stacking that required them to restripe a continuous right-in as a separate lane that allows for more stacking. He believes that both intersections will be used in the morning. He understands it is not a good situation as it stands today. He said their plan will disperse the traffic a different way and asked for feedback from the Commission regarding the layout. He said when the City constructs the roundabout the new entrance will really come into play.

John Hardt asked for clarification on the current slide on the outbound lanes as having one left turn and one right turn, with the previous slide showed a median in Hospital Drive.

Mr. Fraas said this was a temporary solution, until the intersection closes altogether. Ms. Husak explained she did not include it in her presentation because we are essentially saying there is not an intermediate step.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comment in respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted the discussion questions posed on the slide.

Amy Kramb said she would not support the monument sign because no others tenants were permitted this. She said they would be allowed the normal wall sign. She said she supports the Starbucks as a needed use but said the original entrance has to be closed. She was supportive of moving the entrance down to eliminate the conflicts with Wendy's/Tim Horton's congestion. She is not happy with a temporary solution. She said the intersection needs to be fixed.

Mr. Hardt thanked the applicant for coming in for an informal like this; there are not enough applicants that request the early feedback. He said he lives very close to the center and believes the site is over-parked and would welcome additional uses. He said he is supportive of the proposal on a conceptual level. He explained when the Preliminary Development Plan was reviewed previously, three major things were discussed: 1) gas station; 2) outparcel; and 3) drive-way realignment. He said tonight, we want to do all the positive things that bring revenue and do not want to do the one negative thing that does not have a return which is to move the driveway. He agrees with Ms. Kramb in that he does not know how this works with the current driveway. He does not believe that restriping to change the geometry, does not fundamentally change that everyone will be flowing through that one spot on the site. He said this needs to be explored by engineering and managed. He reiterated the building architecture needs to match the center. He agrees the signs need to be consistent with the other tenants. He said he would like to see this plan refined and developed further. He said in the Preliminary Development Plan there was a considerable amount of discussion about expectations for landscaping and the aesthetics of the whole area. He encouraged staff and the applicant to read through the history to ensure it meets those needs as the expectations are quite high.

Victoria Newell said she welcomes Starbucks to the community and said this is an appropriate use for this outparcel. She agreed with the other commissioners and said the design and signs need to match the center and be consistent. She said is not in favor of the monument sign, particularly in the location it is shown. She said the application is not rectifying issues of backup from the congestion produced by Wendy's/Tim Horton's, or Burger King. She stated that until we address the circulation in that center, you will compound that issue. She said she was uncomfortable with that little bit of parking left isolated and does not anticipate that will be used. She asked if that was needed in the parking count.

Ms. Husak responded the area was allocated for larger vehicle parking that use Wendy's during the lunch hour as an attempt to get them off of their site because circulation is so important there.

Ms. Newell said she was concerned with pedestrian traffic crossing the drive when you take into consideration that the Tim Horton's/Wendy's parking lot is filled to capacity; it is at the same peak time.

Ms. Husak said the striping was the solution to indicate a pedestrian crossing area. Ms. Newell said she understood why the striping was done in that manner. She said she is concerned with the small area of parking and would prefer it be landscaped.

Ms. Kramb said pedestrians need to be accommodated even for overflow parking. Ms. Husak confirmed there was a pedestrian crossing delineated across the drive aisle.

Ms. Newell said she was concerned people would not pay much attention to that, any more than they pay attention to the stop sign.

Mr. Hardt asked if Wendy's has an agreement to use that as overflow parking or is it just habitual. Mr. Fraas said because of the strict parking requirements at the time, areas did not have to be defined but the shopping center was entitled to give them extra parking.

Mr. Hardt vaguely remembers this situation and asked if there is a formal agreement in place, which would need to be worked out.

Richard Taylor said the biggest issue is the existing drive/new drive situation and he would like to see it corrected. He said there is going to be a lot of congestion no matter how we restripe or reconfigure that intersection. He said Mr. Hardt mentioned the previous entryway design and we did spend extensive time on landscape and signs. He recommended putting in an internal driveway and providing enhancements as the second phase. He agreed with the others, he would not support a monument sign and believes it is easy for Starbuck's customers to find the locations. He asked if the existing drive was eliminated, if that would provide an opportunity to completely rethink the geometry of the site, suggesting flipping it 180 degrees. He said this would accomplish a couple of things with that entrance being gone: 1) direct access to the main drive instead of going around the back side of the parking lot; and 2) the north end of the lot could serve as the escape lane, using the existing pavement. He said Starbucks could interface with the driveways at the perimeter of the large parking in the same way Burger King and Wendy's/Tim Horton's does rather than taking people all the way into the site and moving around and back out again; a net loss.

Mr. Fraas asked to get a summary of everyone's thought on that.

Mr. Taylor said he was in favor of the project and his favorite part is that we would introduce a significant area of green in an area that has none right now.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said Starbucks would be an asset to this site and is supportive of the use. She said the pressure that is on the existing intersection at Perimeter Loop is intense and this will increase that intensity on that intersection, which is already operating as an "F". She cannot in good conscience put

more pressure on an intersection that is operating as an "F". She said she would not support this going forward without a reconfiguration of that intersection and would not support holding off on landscape enhancements. She said it all needs to come in at one time for the benefit of the tenants of that center. She believes that is a high occupancy center with very little vacancies and when one tenant goes out, something comes in very quickly. She said more creative things could happen to utilize the drive aisles; she can easily see stacking of 15 – 20 cars in line for Starbucks. She understands the applicant has exceeded the stacking requirement but when this center was build, she is not sure if Starbuck's had even hit the Midwest. She said Tim Horton's does not have enough stacking. She sees a huge asset to that outparcel with the reconfiguration of the intersection because they can stack cars all the way to the drive aisle and they will. She agreed the building would have to match the center.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited the applicant to ask questions and get clarity.

Ms. Newell wanted to follow up to say she was not comfortable leaving the landscaping until a second phase. She said she has seen a number of trees that are dead within the islands. Ms. Amorose Groomes commented that there are a lot of ash tree failures that have not been dealt with yet. Mr. Fraas explained the trees were treated with fertilizer that killed them and they are in the middle of a lawsuit to remedy the situation.

Mr. Fraas thanked the Commission for their input, encouragement, and support for the application. He said unfortunately, they are not in a position to move that driveway as part of the condition with the tenants. He said if they cannot do it the way it is, they might have to wait.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said we would welcome Starbucks to the community in this location and hopefully they can figure out a way to make that work with the balance of the tenants.

2. Emerald Parkway Phase 8 – Office Building **Emerald Parkway**
14-027INF **Informal Review**

This case was postponed prior to the meeting.

3. Zoning Code Amendment – Notification and Adult Family Home Amendments
14-006ADMC **Administrative Request**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the application for a request for amending the Dublin Code of Ordinances (Zoning Code) Section 153.234(C)(3) to modify the notification requirements to be consistent with City Council Rules of Order; and Amending Chapters 153.002, and 153.073 to add requirements regarding Adult Family Homes.

Jennifer Readler said this case was tabled at the April 3, 2014 meeting with direction from the Commission for staff to meet with the residents and discuss in more detail, the residents' concerns that were voiced at that meeting. She said they had the opportunity to meet with the residents on April 9, 2014 and discussed the case law and the state and federal regulations that govern these types of uses. She reported the residents would like a larger dispersal distance than is being proposed in the Code Amendment tonight. She said while state law permits municipalities to limit the excessive concentration, it does not define the parameters so it was suggested that the residents get the City's assistance seeking verification for what that really means. She said they revised the Code Amendment so all the regulations are in one place.

Ms. Readler presented the proposed Code Amendment to:

- Add adult family homes as permitted uses in single-family residential districts, as required by the Ohio Revised Code (1-5 unrelated adults)

Chief Von Eckartsberg stated that they made a suggestion to the Prosecutor that the agreement be reviewed on a five-year basis, as the last agreement was put into place 20 years ago. There is no provision included for a required review, however.
Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher noted that a three-year renewal term was included in Ordinance 09-13.
Chief Von Eckartsberg stated that the County Prosecutor apparently responded to their request in regard to that agreement.

There will be a second reading/public hearing of Ordinance 10-13 at the February 11 Council meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA (resumed)
Mayor Lecklider moved approval of actions requested for the six items remaining on the consent agenda.
Mrs. Boring seconded the motion.
Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes.

Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes of January 14, 2013

Ordinance 03-13 (Introduction/first reading)
Authorizing the City Manager to Enter Into a Master Memorandum of Understanding with the Central Ohio Community Improvement Corporation for Land Reutilization. (Second reading/public hearing February 11 Council meeting)

Ordinance 07-13 (Introduction/first reading)
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Necessary Conveyance Documentation to Acquire a 0.130 Acre, More or Less, Permanent Multi-Use, Utility, Grading and Drainage Easement and a 0.031 Acres, More or Less, Temporary Easement from James D. and Molly B. Nester. (Second reading/public hearing February 11 Council meeting)

Ordinance 09-13 (Introduction/first reading)
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Emergency Mutual Aid Agreement with Various Jurisdictions Working in Conjunction with Franklin County. (Second reading/public hearing February 11 Council meeting)

Resolution 01-13 (Introduction/Vote)
Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Contract with the Franklin County Public Defender Commission for the Defense of Indigent Defendants.

Resolution 03-13 (Introduction/Vote)
Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement for Shared Fleet Maintenance Services.

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCES
Ordinance 01-13
Rezoning Approximately 2.9 Acres Located on the North Side of Perimeter Drive, Between the Intersections with Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive from PCD, Planned Commerce District (Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside North, Subarea A3) to Facilitate the Development of the Site with an Approximately 14,500-square-foot Retail Building, Including Restaurant Spaces and Associated Patios. (Case 12-073Z/PDP/FDP)
Ms. Husak stated that no changes have been made since the first reading of the ordinance. She and the applicant, Mr. Ghidotti are available to respond to any questions.

Mayor Lecklider noted that Mr. Maurer has pointed out that the proposed development text contains a 2012 date instead of 2013.
Ms. Husak responded that staff would obtain a signed copy of the text with a 2013 date.

Mayor Lecklider invited public testimony.

Wallace Maurer, 7451 Dublin Road stated that the great 19th century philosopher John Ruskin, sharing his views about architecture, said, "Show me your buildings – the ones you like -- and I'll tell you what type of society you are. I'll tell you what your moral and intellectual level is." He would like to read two statements from the fourth page of staff's memo, under "Final Development Plan Conditions:" The first statement is, "that the elevations be revised to replace the gable returns with a more appropriate style." The second statement is, "that the sea green junipers on the north side of the site be replaced with winter gem boxwoods." In regard to the first statement, the writer obviously has in mind an artistic or architectural principle or conviction and implies that this style is not adequate and should be replaced with something more appropriate. The question is, what is the collection of principles, ideas or convictions about architecture? In regard to the second statement, there is also an artistic or architectural principle judgment involved. Again, the issue is what exactly are these principles? He assumes that the response would be a stated preference for traditional architecture. However, the question remains -- what is the nature, objectives, and ultimate goal for the aesthetics of the architecture, and what does that reveal about the City's ideals?
Mayor Lecklider responded that he assumes that answer can be derived from the Planning & Zoning Commission minutes. He invited Ms. Husak to respond.
Ms. Husak stated that the clarification is provided in the Commission's minutes.
Vice Mayor Salay stated that there are three architects and a landscape designer on the Planning and Zoning Commission, and they typically provide that type of input.
Mr. Maurer responded that there are guiding principles involved, and he would seek further information from these individuals.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mrs. Boring, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Ordinance 02-13
Amending the City of Dublin Building Code.
Mr. Tyler stated that the Dublin Residential Building Code is based upon the 2013 Residential Building Code of Ohio, which is based upon the 2009 International Residential Building Code. That Code is developed through a consensus process involving members of the building community – architects, engineers, homebuilders, and government officials. When Ohio receives that Code, it is modified to meet the Ohio requirements through the Residential Code Advisory Committee. Therefore, when the Code is brought to local entities, it is has been through a comprehensive review. Dublin makes minor revisions to the base document to make it the Dublin Residential Building Code. This Code is very similar to the previous 2006 version.

Mayor Lecklider stated that he recalls there was a lawsuit in regard to that Residential Code. Is Dublin permitted to make some revisions to the Code?
Mr. Tyler responded that, as a result of that lawsuit, Dublin was permitted to make four revisions to that Code. Of those revisions, one is now being deleted due to the fact that it has already been included in the base document – it is no longer a Dublin-only provision.
Mr. Keenan asked if that is the carbon monoxide provision.
Mr. Tyler responded affirmatively. Dublin had the provision previously, but because the International Code has now included it in their version, the City no longer needs to include it specifically.
Mr. Keenan noted that Dublin has included it in the City Code for the past 8-10 years.
Mr. Tyler confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher asked if there will be increased costs to developers as a result of the Code amendment.
Mr. Tyler responded that in 2009, the State began its process to update the 2006 version of the Residential Building Code. At that time, there was no data indicating what cost increase would result from the new provisions that would be coming to the State. It required approximately three years to complete that process, and the State was satisfied that the safety provisions of the revised Code outweighed the increased costs, which

Ms. Grigsby responded that she does not have that information at hand, but can provide that to him.

2. Asked what employee groups are unionized?

Ms. Grigsby responded that the three groups that are unionized are the Police officers who are in the Fraternal Order of Police; the communication technicians/dispatchers who are in another unit of the F.O.P.; and the maintenance workers and mechanics that are in the United Steelworkers union.

3. Asked for more information about the position of specialist for public art conservation. He observes that this position is categorized as an implementer in the pay bands. He notes that this matrix has been carefully thought out and must have been a very collaborative effort. It is a substantive breakdown. What would staff consider the qualifications to be for a public art conservationist, and his/her relationship to art?

Ms. Grigsby stated that this position would perform two main functions: maintenance of public art and providing for timely preservation of the public art in place for the City; and contract administration for the City, related to art or other areas as needed. This position will have a dual role.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Salay, yes; Mayor Lecklider, yes; Mr. Gerber, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 01-13

Rezoning Approximately 2.9 Acres Located on the North Side of Perimeter Drive, Between the Intersections with Avery Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive from PCD, Planned Commerce District (Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3) to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (Riverside North, Subarea A3) to Facilitate the Development of the Site with an Approximately 14,500-square-foot Retail Building, Including Restaurant Spaces and Associated Patios. (Case 12-073Z/PDP/FDP) (Second reading/public hearing January 28 Council meeting)

Mr. Gerber introduced the ordinance.

Ms. Husak stated that the ordinance was reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Commission in December 2012 and recommended for approval. The application is a modification to development text to allow retail uses on a site within the Riverside Planned Commerce District. This district includes the retail building that currently houses Matt the Miller, Potbelly, and includes various medical buildings and the Primrose Daycare. She noted the following:

- The proposal is for a 14,500 square-foot building. Mr. Ghidotti, representing applicant Daimler Group is present. He has also developed the remainder of this PCD, and has had some interest from restaurant tenants about this site. Subarea A3 is the subject of the ordinance, and in the development text, only the standards and uses for this particular subarea are proposed for change.
- She shared the site plan as proposed and approved by the Planning Commission. It includes the retail building along the southern portion of the site, which fronts Perimeter Drive and has two access points internally to the site that are shared with the other uses within that Center. Two patio spaces are also shown on either end, and it is the intention for those two areas to be used by restaurants.
- An ample plaza area is shown to the north. This could include more informal seating, depending upon the type of uses in the remaining tenant spaces.
- The applicant meets the Code for parking. There are some more detailed sign standards within the development text for this particular area.
- She shared renderings of some elevations, noting there are more detailed renderings in the packet. Primary building materials are brick and stone, and materials also include siding. Some portions of the building will have standing seam roof in a dark burgundy color.
- The elevations also show the signs as approved by the Planning Commission. They are generally flat signs of wood material with track lighting beneath them.

In addition, each tenant can have a smaller blade sign that is more pedestrian oriented. Two wall signs are permitted for each tenant.

Vice Mayor Salay noted that the signs as shown have a uniform font and are externally illuminated.
Ms. Husak responded that the signs are externally illuminated, but do not necessarily have a uniform font. The font would not be uniform, but the colors would match the building materials.
Vice Mayor Salay stated that the text indicates that internally illuminated signs are permitted and corporate logos are incorporated. This seems quite "busy." She pointed out that what is being shown tonight is not reflective of what is indicated in the text. It is important to understand exactly what the product will look like. In reviewing the text, this is an option within the text, but it is certainly not the only option.
Ms. Husak responded that lighting, specifically, was a concern of the Planning Commission. They asked the applicant to eliminate in the development text the option of internal illumination. The text has been updated to reflect this, as shown on page 16. The lineal, fluorescent track light shown in these elevations is the only permitted lighting at this point.
Vice Mayor Salay noted that she recalls reading in the materials that internally illuminated signs are permitted.
Ms. Husak stated that it is possible that the other subareas would permit that at this point.
Ms. Husak noted in regard to colors that they would have to meet Code where the logo could be a color. There is not a limitation in the text, currently, that the text or any graphics on the sign could only be one color. If that is something Council wants to add, that can be considered.

- The Commission recommended approval with four requested changes to the development text, and those have all been integrated into the text provided to Council.
- Staff is recommending approval of the ordinance at the second reading/public hearing on January 28.

She noted that the applicant is present to respond to any questions.

Mr. Reiner stated that he is pleased that the applicant is providing more parking than what is required. Is that related to the potential for two restaurants?
Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Staff and the Commission had concerns about parking needs for restaurants with peak hour patrons. They encouraged the applicant to explore shared parking options and they have been able to have a positive outcome with Champaign Bank.

Mr. Gerber stated that in reviewing the materials, it appears the Commission encouraged the applicant to be creative with the signage. He asked Ms. Husak to elaborate.
Ms. Husak responded that the sign topic is sensitive to both staff and the Commission. There was discussion at the time of the informal review of the application about doing something different and creative. At the same time, however, the architecture is very traditional and in keeping with the area within which the development is located. Staff struggled with this issue. A commissioner had suggested that perhaps the applicant could move away from the gooseneck lights and do something different. The applicant has chosen to pursue this option. The Commission is definitely seeking signage that is different from what has existed in Dublin, but they are also sensitive to the areas in which this approach is appropriate.
Mr. Gerber asked if this was the result of direction from Council or something the Commission initiated.
Ms. Husak responded that it is a combination. The Commission has definitely seen planned unit development districts where applicants have tried to do something different or have had different needs. Signs have been a topic of discussion of late, and were a topic of a recent work session.

Vice Mayor Salay recalled that Council declined to have further discussion about signage in view of the more important priorities at hand. Her concern is that what she envisioned for

creativity and innovation relative to signs was specifically for the Bridge Street District and that Council believed it was a place appropriate for that creativity. Outside of that District, Council indicated they are pleased with the status quo in signage and the results that have been obtained with the current regulations. Her preference is to maintain the current standards for other areas, as "creative" is certainly a subjective judgment. The community is accustomed to a certain kind of signage. Outside of the Bridge Street District, she does not want a creative signage approach to be incorporated. This could have a domino effect.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she is confused, as what is being shown is the same type of signage that already exists in the area. The lighting may be different, but the other development took place many years ago and there have been changes to lighting types over the years.
Mr. Gerber agreed, noting that he merely wanted to affirm the direction that Council has given on this topic.
Ms. Husak responded that the Commission found this minor change acceptable for this building.

Mr. Gerber asked about logos, and if they can now be incorporated in signage throughout the City.
Ms. Husak stated that has always been the policy. The permissible colors for logo signage is what was modified by Code.

Mayor Lecklider asked if there was discussion about outdoor speakers or music for the patio areas.
Ms. Husak responded that such speakers are not permitted, as reflected in this text. Staff was aware of the proximity to residential areas to the north and the potential impact on them.
Mayor Lecklider explained that there were issues raised by Lowell Trace residents and those to the north about potential outdoor speakers at the BW3 restaurant at the time the development was proposed.

Mr. Reiner stated that he is pleased that the outdoor dining at the front is included for this application versus coming back for such approval at a later date.
Ms. Husak responded that outdoor dining is permitted up to a certain square footage. There is an overall square footage cap for this.

Paul Ghidotti, Daimler Group stated that this is the first project they are doing in Dublin in some time. This three-acre tract, in particular, has been quite challenging. Daimler Group developed the overall 24 acres and, in partnership with Ohio Health, developed the area bounded by Perimeter, Avery and Post, securing that approval in the first quarter of 2004. Over the past 9 years, they have developed over 100,000 square feet of office on the 24 acres -- the Avery Shops Retail Center, which is quite successful; the Champaign Bank; the Huntington Bank; and a successful daycare facility. They have struggled with these 2.9 acres, which is zoned for two sit-down restaurants. They have talked to 6-7 restaurants over the past 9 years and all have struggled with the size of the parcel they need to make a 5-6,000 square foot restaurant work. There would be little residual remaining for development of the parcel. They have worked with Planning staff, and went through the informal process in September. They received good feedback and returned in December to P&Z. Given the elevations and the architecture, there is little discretion as the neighborhood has already been developed and they are aware of what is appropriate in this area. Trying to deviate dramatically from that would be a mistake and would look out of place. Therefore, they have chosen a similar style of architecture, using the same architect who worked on the Avery Shops. In reviewing lighting, signage and other components, there was a request to do something different from gooseneck lighting, and the architect is therefore proposing band lighting, which will be uniform for each sign. The signs will be a wood board and will appear very similar to what exists at the Avery Shops, with the addition of one color. That would allow for someone to do a logo on the banded signs. There is more text included than with Avery Shops. He is hopeful that

Council is comfortable with what has been presented tonight. He offered to respond to any questions. They are looking forward to the construction and opening of this project.

Mr. Keenan asked about ingress and egress for the fire department, especially in view of the experience with the nearby Huntington Bank. Has that issue been addressed?
Mr. Ghidotti responded that it has been addressed, noting that this site has much better access – both to Perimeter and to the private drive. There are three points of access along that private road system.
Mr. Keenan commented that he is not certain that a ladder truck could access this site, but he is satisfied with the response from the applicant.

Vice Mayor Salay commented about the signage, noting that her previous comments were not directed to this site specifically – but rather about signage in general and where the City is headed. She appreciates Mr. Ghidotti's details about the signage plans.
Mr. Ghidotti noted that on the blade sign on the north side – a projecting sign – there was much discussion about unique signage for some tenants. This was only to be viewed from the north side and would only be pedestrian in nature. It would not be viewable from the main streets. Until the developer can identify who the users will be, they are not certain of the appearance. The text does allow for some creativity, and there seems to be opportunity for something unique, yet appropriate.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher stated that she is pleased that the Daimler Group is once again developing in Dublin.

Mayor Lecklider stated Mr. Ghidotti has mentioned the size of the site and challenge for restaurant development. Is Mr. Ghidotti satisfied that this development proposal will work on the site and that there is adequate land to accommodate this square footage?
Mr. Ghidotti responded that having a single building versus multiple buildings results in savings. Secondly, there is some inline retail space that can help subsidize. Finally, when someone is willing to make the initial investment and a tenant can then enter into a 10-year lease based on square footage – this is more viable for prospective tenants. Given this, they have had good interest in this site, but have not signed any tenants at this point. They want to make sure that Council is comfortable with what is being presented. There is little available space in Avery Square and Perimeter Center, and there are many new food service users who have been the second or third generation user. There is a need in this area for more food service operators.

There will be a second reading/public hearing at the January 28 Council meeting.

STAFF COMMENTS
Ms. Grigsby reported that a memo was included in the packet in regard to video interviews with other government agencies and elected officials. Staff wants to gauge the interest of City Council in using videos for various purposes and occasions throughout the year. She asked that Council provide any feedback prior to staff identifying the various entities and individuals to be interviewed. The goal is to have more video available for City communication efforts.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented that she is supportive of using more video, as citizens are interested in more live production to obtain information. This is an interesting venue to bring forward. She emphasized that what is brought forward should focus on issues and not party politics. That will be an important consideration for the topics being explored and the speakers selected to educate the citizens about the topic.
Ms. Grigsby noted that staff concurs, and has discussed the need to be cognizant of elections and timeframes of the year. Part of the goal is to recognize partnerships created and some of the benefits to projects that will move forward, such as the I-270/33 interchange. Staff will take this comment into careful consideration.

Mayor Lecklider asked if the memo regarding Acting City Manager succession is for information only.
Ms. Grigsby responded that this is an annual designation that she is required to make early in each year.

Mayor Lecklider asked if there are any additional comments by staff regarding the snow removal efforts.
Ms. Grigsby responded that from her perspective, there are always challenges with snow removal. Staff did an excellent job in addressing the snow and ice situation. There were some complaints, but based on the number of residents, they were fairly minimal. Staff did an excellent job of ensuring the streets were safe and clear within a reasonable timeframe.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS/COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE
Mr. Gerber stated that the Council Special Committee regarding KIA Recognition met on January 2 at staff's request in order to clarify some direction given previously regarding design details. The minutes of the meeting were included in the Council packet. The project will continue to move forward.

Mr. Reiner:

1. Stated that he is interested in revisiting Dublin's water system in a comprehensive way. In the late 1980s, the City looked at the possibility of drilling wells at Darree Fields. It was found that there was adequate water supply to serve Dublin, as well as Marysille and Powell. It appears there is an aquifer running from Chicago to South Carolina, and it borders the western edge of the City. He is aware that Dublin residents pay a surcharge to Columbus for their water supply. He is interested in the City investigating the costs of drilling those wells and the costs of constructing a pumping station to serve a water system. With Dublin's current health initiative, he has done some reading and learned that the average person in Atlanta drinks water processed through a human being four times. In talking with some who were involved in the Darree Fields drilling, they indicated the water was of very high quality. It would be desirable to relieve the citizens of the tax burden imposed by the surcharges. He is simply proposing this be investigated so that the residents of the Dublin would not have to pay surcharges to Columbus for water.

Ms. Grigsby noted that there have been discussions over time about the 30 percent surcharge for water. Some of the current restrictions/limitations are that the water and sewer agreements with Columbus run until 2043. There are many considerations and issues to be addressed. Staff has had discussion about some other options to consider with regard to the 30 percent surcharge. Staff will continue to monitor and evaluate those to determine if there are viable options. Initiating a new City water system would be challenging at this point in time. The issues would be engineering related as well as cost. The evaluation of the aquifer Mr. Reiner references was done in the mid to late 1980s, and she is not aware if the conditions have changed. There are many elements to consider with regard to this topic.

Mayor Lecklider commented that he is not suggesting Mr. Reiner's idea does not warrant consideration in theory, but there is a contractual impediment for the next 30 years.
Ms. Grigsby responded that the current agreements with the City of Columbus for water and sewer services run through 2043. These were 50-year agreements when entered into.

Mr. Keenan added that much of this issue relates to the merger discussion that took place in the late 1980s. The township supported the merger proposal, but the City did not. Much of the information circulated at the time for the voters indicated a merger could result in a shutoff of the water supply from Columbus. The merger was defeated by the voters. He noted that the aquifers were explored at the time due to the merger proposal, and they confirmed a huge aquifer existing under Darree Fields and Homestead Park with a tremendous supply of water.

Ms. Grigsby added that part of the reason this was reviewed in the late 1980s was the fact that the City's water and sewer agreements with Columbus had expired and Dublin was involved in difficult negotiations with Columbus. The option of having a separate water and sewer system for Dublin was explored.

Mr. Gerber commented that the system is a large asset and resource, and a 30 percent surcharge for the suburbs is not equitable. If the residents of Dublin have to endure this for another 40 years, options should be explored.

Mr. Keenan stated that it is not only a surcharge for water usage, but for the water taps that include separate fees for Columbus and Dublin.
Ms. Grigsby responded that staff would need to review this. Many entities have higher tap fees. Marysville has its own system and their tap fees are considerably higher than Dublin's, and in some cases higher than Dublin and Columbus fees are together. Given the number of issues involved, she could not provide any recommendation on this.

Mr. Keenan added that this exploring the option of a Dublin water system would have been more feasible in the mid 1980s. At this juncture, with all of the investments in water towers and infrastructure, it would be very complicated.
Ms. Grigsby clarified that Dublin owns the water lines, but Columbus is responsible for maintenance of the lines. There would be many engineering issues to be considered to determine if there is any feasibility to this option.

Mr. Reiner noted that the 30 percent surcharge is outrageous and relieving the citizens of this burden would be a great step forward.

Mr. Gerber stated that, whether or not having a city system is possible, he would like to understand why there is a 30 percent surcharge for suburban users and what it is used for. There must be an economic basis for such a surcharge.
Ms. Grigsby responded that the surcharge is essentially used to subsidize the operations of the Columbus system. All of the suburbs who contract with the City of Columbus for the water pay the 30 percent surcharge. The 30 percent surcharge paid by residents of the various communities helps to support the Columbus system. If the 30 percent surcharge were eliminated, the rates would increase for all of the users of the system.

Mr. Keenan stated that his understanding is that the contract includes a provision calling for periodic review.
Ms. Grigsby responded that there is language about a review every five years. In 2010, the agreement was modified to incorporate the 277 acres by the Post interchange. Discussions can be initiated at any time regarding amendments.

Vice Mayor Salay added that Columbus is currently developing upground reservoirs to serve the community as it grows. This probably accounts for some of the 30 percent surcharge as well.

Ms. Grigsby stated that Columbus does all of the billing and collections for the water system and they handle all of the required mandates. There are many issues involved in operating the treatment facility for both water and sewer and Columbus does have the burden of responsibility for this and not the suburbs.

Mr. Reiner continued:

2. He congratulated Ms. Mumma and the Finance team for their financial reporting award. He is very pleased that the Finance Department has consistently have achieved this award.

Ms. Chinnici-Zuercher commented:

1. The City's "snow warriors" did an excellent job. It seems that most of the complaints related to the courts and cul de sacs, which are a lower priority in the established tier for snow removal. To have 44 complaints from the entire City is a very low number. The staff should be commended for the outstanding work they have done.
2. Noted that she will not be attending the OML Legislative Luncheon, although she serves on the Board. She encouraged anyone available to attend the legislative luncheon on February 6.
3. A music/noise issue was raised tonight regarding the proposed Daimler development project. The City has wonderful music and entertainment in the Historic Dublin area, and this is a draw for patrons, particularly in the warmer weather. The DCVB has promoted more outside Irish activities throughout the District. In view of the plan to build more residential development in the Historic Dublin area, there is a need to ensure from the outset that the developers understand there will be music and sound emanating throughout the District, and that the building plans may need to be adjusted to accommodate it. Outdoor patios have been requested in many areas of the City. She believes that, even in the Perimeter area, there is a desire for music and entertainment, although this is not permitted. Where there is interest in having outdoor venues, there is a similar interest in outdoor entertainment.

Ms. Grigsby responded that with urban development, it is understood there will be more activity and therefore more noise in the area. The majority of people who will move to the Bridge Street District and the existing Historic District will understand and should be aware of the plans for this to be an active area with these types of activities adjacent to their homes.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Timothy A. Lecklider
Mayor – Presiding Officer

Anne C. Clarke
Clerk of Council

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

RECORD OF ACTION

DECEMBER 6, 2012

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

3. Riverside Planned Commerce District North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter
12-073Z/PDP/FDP
Perimeter Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan

Proposal:	To develop a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building, including restaurant spaces and associated patios, in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North, located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan and review and approval of a final development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicant:	Daimler Group; represented by Paul Ghidotti.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

MOTION#1: To recommend approval to City Council for this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with four conditions:

1) That the development text be revised to limit the size of permitted restaurant use to 11,000 square feet (excluding outdoor dining patios) and that any additional restaurant square footage, exclusive of outdoor dining areas, require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
2) That the development text be modified to allow patio furniture be used when the weather permits outside of the permitted dates, subject to approval by Planning;
3) That the development text be modified to limit sign lighting to the proposed band lighting; and
4) That the development text be revised to adhere to Code for sign colors including logos and that window signs be prohibited, excluding informational window signs.

*Paul Ghidotti agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: This Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

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

RECORD OF ACTION

DECEMBER 6, 2012

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

3. Riverside Planned Commerce District North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter
12-073Z/PDP/FDP
Perimeter Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan

Proposal:	To develop a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building, including restaurant spaces and associated patios, in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North, located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a rezoning with preliminary development plan and review and approval of a final development plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicant:	Daimler Group; represented by Paul Ghidotti.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

MOTION #2: *To approved this Final Development Plan application because it complies with the* applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with five conditions:

1) That the plans be revised to change the color of the standing seam metal roof from grey to a deep red and the metal awning color be changed to match the metal roof, subject to approval by Planning;
2) That the applicant provide the shared parking agreement with Champaign Bank with the building permit application;
3) That the elevations be revised to replace the gable returns with a more appropriate style;
4) That the site plan be revised to increase the size of the landscape island to one parking space to the west along the parking area to the north of the building; and
5) That the sea green junipers on the north side of the site be replaced with wintergem boxwood.

*Paul Ghidotti, agreed to the above conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: This Final Development Plan application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

Mr. Goodwin said the character boundaries were added in black and the different colored designations of different development areas were eliminated. He said the Scioto River overlay is shown in yellow. He said if you click anywhere in the District on the map and it will pop up the name of the district and you will be able to zoom directly to that District. He said they have also added the text from the Vision Report for each the character districts.

Mr. Goodwin asked the Commission go onto the site and look at the plan and click on the design points they have added images to the text. He said they have images of how architecture may frame a roundabout, the Greenville Liberty bridge as an example of an iconic pedestrian bridge, and additional images from Greenville as they have been inspiration of much of this project. He said they included projects throughout Columbus and some existing conditions within the area. He said this is a work in progress and do not consider any of the specific images or design points to be final. Mr. Goodwin said he would welcome any feedback or additional images that better represent the design points.

Mr. Goodwin said there were concerns identified internally of how to depict potential parks and open space areas on the Future Land Use Map (FLU Map), particularly with regards to private properties. He said the FLU Map shows primarily parks and open spaces areas in the western portion of the planning area that have yet to develop. He said the map shows the stream corridor areas, potential open space nodes that would be linked to the stream corridors, a greenway along the potential alignment for Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extending up north of SR 161, and large wood lots depicted as parks and open space. Mr. Goodwin stated while it is appropriate to target areas for future open space preservation, it is problematic to show as a land use designation called Parks and Open Space on the future land use map when the areas are private property. He said he is working on including an overlay that shows these areas with a park land use designation, but also allowing them to show a specific base land use.

Mr. Goodwin asked if the Commission had any comments on the Bridge Street Plan and if the Commission thought they were moving in the right direction with how to graphically depict the plan. Mr. Hardt said he agreed the Area Plan is moving in the right direction. He said understood the problematic nature of how green spaces area depicted and said the proposed overlay is a good solution.

Mr. Goodwin said moving forward he will continue to work through December into January to get to a final version and will be scheduling a public meeting to show the website in a real-time environment. He said the goal is to bring everything back to the Commission for a full review and recommendation to City Council and in February.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they would be voting of digital media and didn't know if they have ever done that. Mr. Goodwin agreed and talk to our legal department about how to move into an ordinance, as there will be a few pieces of the project that will need to be in a hard format, such as the Future Land Use Map and the Thoroughfare Plan.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone that is color blind attempt to use the website and if they were able to recognize the different colors distinctions. Mr. Goodwin said they are working with the website editor and making sure that this website is an accessible as it can be and there are various things they can do and they will have that discussion with them and with GIS editor and thanked her for bringing it up.

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Goodwin for his hard and tedious work on this project.

3. Riverside Planned Commerce District North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter
12-073Z/PDP/FDP **Perimeter Drive**
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

14-069Z/PDP/FDP/CU
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan/Conditional Use
Riverside PCd North, Subarea A3 - The Perimeter Starbucks
6510-6570 Perimeter Drive

Final Development Plan

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan which is a request to develop a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,800-square-foot retail building, including restaurant spaces and associated patios, in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North, located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive. She said this application will require two votes, the rezoning with preliminary development plan will forwarded to City Council for final approval and the Commission is the final authority on the final development plan. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Paul Ghidotti with the Daimler Group.

Ms. Husak said this site is on the north side of Perimeter Drive and is a 2.9 acre parcel that is currently vacant. She described the site and adjacent developments. She said the proposal is for a commercial building that could accommodate restaurants spaces on either end and has some in-line tenant spaces that could accommodate a variety of uses as outlined in the development text. She said on either end are patio spaces proposed for the building, there is a large plaza area to the north which could accommodate additional seating if warranted depending on the uses in the spaces and parking centered to the north, east and west. She said as proposed the plan meets parking requirements of 97 spaces and provided is 125. She said the applicant is proposing administrative approval for additional patio spaces as long as furniture and any other amenities complement one another and are of typical high quality design that is seen within the City.

Husak said there are sidewalks on all sides of the building that also connect to the south sidewalk along Perimeter Drive. The applicant has the option for shared parking with Champaign Bank and they are asking the applicant to do a more formal agreement. She said architecturally it is very similar to what was presented at the informal review with more traditional styling and elements, a lot of detailing on all sides of the building. She said they asked the applicant to break up the roof a little and do colored standing seam as opposed to a gray and the perspective drawings do address giving the standing seam with a more a rich dark burgundy red color. Carter Bean, project architect, showed a sample of the color.

Ms. Husak said they have worked with the applicant on innovative sign ideas and with the architecture and the surroundings they are looking at a plaque type sign design with the lighting suggested by the Commission that was approved for the Bridge Pointe shopping center. She said each tenant would be allowed to have two wall signs; one the Perimeter Drive elevation and one the interior elevation to the north, a blade sign would also be allowed on the north side. She said the wall signs have different options for the rounding and edges of the sign to do a bit more interesting so that they are not all uniform and the blade signs providing different options and allowing for a depiction of what the business might be on the blade signs if the use or tenant warranted.

Ms. Husak said they are recommending approval of the Preliminary Development Plan/Rezoning which represents the blue in the proposed development text that the applicant changed, which is the list of permitted uses, the patio and sign requirements which are different and unique to this Subarea. She said Planning also recommends approval of the Final Development Plan and all the details presented with the two conditions:

1) That the plans be revised to change the color of the standing seam metal roof from grey to a deep red and the metal awning color be changed to match the metal roof, subject to approval by Planning; and,
2) That the applicant provide the shared parking agreement with Champaign Bank with the building permit application.

Paul Ghidotti, Daimler Group, said they have shown what the Commission had hoped to see from the Informal. He said present is Carter Bean, the project architect and Andrew Gardner, Bird & Bull, site engineer. He said staff has done a wonderful job presenting the application and they have worked with them for the last three months and hopefully everyone is excited about what they are developing.

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

Ms. Kramb said that parking did not seem sufficient for unlimited restaurant space. Mr. Ghidotti said they could agree to a maximum square footage that is allocated to restaurants, but they struck out the limitation due to the Commission comments that they wanted to make sure they were able to attract the right restaurants.

Mr. Hardt said when they saw the informal there was a quantity of restaurant discussed and it was expressed to give flexibility. Mr. Ghidotti said the original text limited no more than 11,000 square feet of restaurant and it was modified and expressed not to have the patio square footage limit the ability to have more square footage, they designed conceptually two patios on each end, established the max square footage of the patios of 2,000 square feet and he does not think they get to 2,000 square feet and their experience is typically restaurant outdoor space and indoor space is not typically occupied at the same time. He did not think it was intentional to take out the maximum square footage and if there is a desire to put back in the 11,000 square foot, he has no problem doing that and it was not an intentional change by them.

Ms. Husak said staff's concern with the limitation of the square footage of restaurants is that any kind of place that would serve food or whether it was a ice cream or soda shop or something it would all be classified as a restaurant.

Mr. Hardt said during the informal he heard that this site was originally intended for up to two free standing restaurants and it was too big of a site for one and it did not work for two and they are looking to have two restaurants and fill the space in between with retail and the retail was the question because the text did not allow retail at this end of the development and he said there is a practical limit to how big any one restaurant is going to be, but he envisioned the stuff in the middle to be retail.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this came from their discussion about the coffee shop and the ice cream shop and the pretzel shop and those can come in as conditional uses if that is the mix that works.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the best solution to head off a major parking issue is to use the conditional use mechanism to come back through when a Smoothie King wants to come in there and the Commission can look at the numbers. Ms. Kramb said if they put the 11,000 square feet back in, it could be any number of restaurants and if they wanted to go over the 11,000 they would have to come back and get approval for the smoothie shop.

Mr. Fishman said there are different types of restaurants that have dancing which causes a different type of traffic that would change the character of the whole area and is concerned if it is one huge 14,000 square foot restaurant. Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they have two restaurants of similar size 5,500 square foot restaurant is not a monster.

Mr. Fishman said he does not have a problem with two 5,500 square foot restaurants he is concerned if it becomes one large 11,000 square foot restaurant. Mr. Taylor said if there is a cap for the total amount of restaurant and a cap for one single restaurant. Mr. Ghidotti agreed that concept is fine, his preference is not to have to come back for a 1,200 square foot Smoothie King, that example of someone that size coming back for an amended final development plan and go through that process they will lose that tenant.

Mr. Hardt said they are okay with 11,000 square foot of total restaurant, but if they want to go over that they have to get approval. Mr. Ghidotti agreed.

Ms. Newell said she thought that was a good solution and the development is going to look very nice. Ms. Amorose Groomes said there are solutions that they can engage and they could talk through what might be most efficient for them depending upon who is coming.

Ms. Kramb suggested revising the outdoor furniture text to reflect what the Commission had previously approved. Ms. Readler said they will add the condition to modify the language to make consistent with what was used.

Ms. Kramb said the text regarding signs says the creativity with signage is encouraged, but, it is not because there is prescriptive language and the signs are going to look just like every other sign. She said her issue is with sign illumination, reading the text that says "wall signs shall be illuminated either by linear fluorescent track lighting fixture as depicted in table "D". She wondered what the "or" option is. Mr. Ghidotti said they are trying to get away from the goose necks, so they did and the architecture of the building is limited so they provided for track lighting that will not be seen.

Ms. Kramb said the second sentence is allowing signs to be internally illuminated or back lit. Mr. Ghidotti said the wall signs have to be lit and there are three options for lighting and wanted to allow internally illuminated or back lit signs.

Mr. Ghidotti said the wall signs have to be lit, but there will not be lighting on the blade signs or projecting signs.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see a solution and make sure that the option for a more creative sign to be proposed to the Commission. Mr. Ghidotti said they tried to incorporate the concept for the projecting signs face they could have the good or service.

Mr. Hardt said there is something in the text that refers to window signs and that no permanent windows signs are permitted, and in this general area they do not allow window signs at all. Ms. Husak said they do allow temporary window signs in the area and not specified in the text.

Mr. Hardt said he would like this text or code regarding window signs to match the existing retail center.

Mr. Hardt said the wrong code section is reference for color limitation allowing the logo to be counted as one color allowing three additional colors. Mr. Langworthy said the correct section is 158(C)(4) refers to color.

Mr. Hardt said every other retail center within a mile of this project they have not allowed internally or back lit signs and given this building was to fall into line with the other buildings in the area and is not comfortable with the two alternative lighting methods. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed it is not an appropriate location for internally illuminated signs. Mr. Taylor agreed.

Mr. Budde said if they permitted this and this is the new Dublin and the new signage and new interests, why not and if the neighbors want to come and make some changes, that would be their prerogative and the Commission could help in creating this new look.

Mr. Hardt said the new look was for the Bridge Street Corridor. Mr. Budde said except for the City did not create the Nationwide Children's multi-color logo. Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is a more sign style issue. Mr. Hardt said it is an illumination style.

Ms. Newell said she agrees with Mr. Hardt and it should be kept consistent with what is in place with the surrounding businesses and is only fair. Mr. Fishman said he understood the "New Dublin" is strictly within the Bridge Street Corridor and they were concerned it would leak out of the corridor.

Mr. Taylor said a minor technicality with installation, signs are mounted flush to wall and where they are on the synthetic stone it would be better to stand off an inch. Mr. Ghidotti agreed.

Mr. Hardt said on the cut sheet submitted for the linear florescent tubes that the cold start ballast are an option and wanted to make sure they are used or they will flicker in the winter. Mr. Ghidotti agreed to order them as indicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said as discussed they will limit the restaurant space in the text 11,000 square feet and to exceed that would require Commission approval, some patio furniture out of season storage language to be incorporated. Ms. Husak said she added conditions:

3) That the development text be revised to limit the size of permitted restaurant use to 11,000 square feet excluding the outdoor dining patios and that any additional restaurant square footage, exclusive of outdoor dining areas, require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
4) That the development text be modified to allow patio furniture be used when the weather permits outside of the permitted dates, subject to Planning approval;

She said she also summarized the sign discussion.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have to use the illuminated tube that is referenced in the shell of the first part of section 6. He said they were trying to get away from the goose neck lighting and wanted to give people more flexibility and it will look more uniform and different from the area and will look nice and wanted to give creativity and allow for it. He said lighting and signage were the two areas they struggled with to take their comments and come back with what they thought the commission wanted to hear.

Mr. Hardt said the scalloped sign panels, wood sign panels with goose neck lighting fixtures are getting tired and would like to see more creativity as general statement, but this site is the last puzzle piece of an already developed site, they should stay the course and finish this. Mr. Ghidotti said that is exactly what Ms. Husak had told them in the early discussions after September, while they want to be creative it is hard to make a lot of changes with everything around. He said it is an infill site.

Ms. Kramb said they wanted to make sure they get the logo option. Mr. Ghidotti said they wanted to refer to both paragraphs.

Ms. Kramb said she really disliked the barn doors on the elevation with the pedestrian glass door next to it and with the awnings over it and looks awkward.

Ms. Kramb said the finials on the center section she does not care for and they are usually crooked and look small and never look right when built and would like to nix them. Mr. Taylor said there is bad precedent in the area for leaning finials.

Mr. Taylor said on the site plan the new entrance coming in from the north there is a planting island and a one and a half parking space when someone pulls out of will be into the entrance and thought they should expand the landscape island to avoid an accident. Mr. Ghidotti said that is why the island was placed there to avoid potential problems, and agreed to switch that space to a van accessible handicap space to avoid any issues.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see the return on the gables something other than little dog house returns and the trim style is simple and can be something other than the tucked under piece and the finials. Ms. Newell said she is not crazy about the finials, but since they are on the other buildings she felt they were appropriate.

Mr. Taylor said they always look good on drawings, but thought they should be replaced with something more appropriate gable return for the style of the building.

Ms. Newell said she is okay with the barn door detail because it is something newer and did not object to it. Mr. Taylor said he likes the barn door on the right. Ms. Kramb said it is the western side barn door and the other is a full door with a pedestrian door next to it.

Mr. Bean said they are working on another project where they are doing a similar treatment and instead of the man door being on the side it is in the middle to appear that the barn doors a slid open and this is the gap between. Ms. Kramb said that sounds better. Ms. Amorose Groomes thought it is a cool option.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated the sidewalks across the street frontage that connects and it was a response to her comment that it did not have much pedestrian access and appreciated the solution.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they have circled the entire property in sea green junipers and asked that they change the back side of the rear of the property and stop at the east and west entry points out with wintergem boxwood and appreciated that they have the plantings held back more than 5 feet off of the parking surface. Mr. Ghidotti said they had a different spec tree and staff suggested junipers as one of the options.

Ms. Newell said that boxwood is not a hardy plant for snow piled on them and wanted to know if that was a concern. Ms. Amorose Groomes said in the area that is in the back location because the push of snow would go in the different direction and far enough away from the drive lane to be clear of the salt spray.

Mr. Ghidotti said he is concerned with the location of the dumpster at the northwest corner and not sure if they should change the plant material north of the entry drives and if they could just change out the plantings at the north drive because of the screening is mirrored on both sides. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed to make the change on the north property line.

Motion #1 and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved to recommend approval to City Council for this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with four conditions:

1) That the development text be revised to limit the size of permitted restaurant use to 11,000 square feet (excluding outdoor dining patios) and that any additional restaurant square footage, exclusive of outdoor dining areas, require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
2) That the development text be modified to allow patio furniture be used when the weather permits outside of the permitted dates, subject to approval by Planning;
3) That the development text be modified to limit sign lighting to the proposed band lighting; and
4) That the development text be revised to adhere to Code for sign colors including logos and that window signs be prohibited, excluding informational window signs.

Mr. Ghidotti agreed to the above conditions.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

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

Motion #2 and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Final Development Plan application because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with five conditions:

1) That the plans be revised to change the color of the standing seam metal roof from grey to a deep red and the metal awning color be changed to match the metal roof, subject to approval by Planning;
2) That the applicant provide the shared parking agreement with Champaign Bank with the building permit application;
3) That the elevations be revised to replace the gable returns with a more appropriate style;
4) That the site plan be revised to increase the size of the landscape island to one parking space to the west along the parking area to the north of the building; and
5) That the sea green junipers on the north side of the site be replaced with wintergem boxwood.

Mr. Ghidotti, agreed to the above conditions.

Ms. Newell seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to thank the applicant's team for taking seriously their comments at the informal review and were able to get both the rezoning/preliminary development plan and the final development plan done, so hopefully it is a net gain. Mr. Ghidotti thanked the commission for their time and effort and apologized for the sloppiness in the text and that is not how they operate and he accepted responsibility for them and said it will not happen next time.

4. Tartan Ridge, Section 5-1 **9327 Burnett Lane**
12-080FDP/FP **Final Development Plan**
Final Plat

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application to develop one single-family alley lot within Subarea D1 of the Tartan Ridge Planned Unit Development. She said the site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Emmet Row Lane and Burnett Lane. She said this application will require two votes. She said the Commission is the final authority on the final development plan and City Council will have to approve the final plat. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Charles Driscoll.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they do not need a presentation and asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Final Development Plan - Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved to approve the Final Development Plan because it complies with all applicable review criteria and the existing development standards, with 2 conditions:

1) That the applicant revise the hedge installation graphic to reflect alley accessed lots prior to scheduling the plat for City Council review; and
2) That any fence for Lot 182 be selected from an architecturally appropriate palette to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the final development plan approval for the remaining alley lots.

Mr. Hardt seconded the motion.

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

RECORD OF ACTION

SEPTEMBER 6, 2012

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

3. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter **Perimeter Drive**
12-050INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	The potential development of a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building including two 5,000-square-foot restaurant spaces and associated patios in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North. The site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.
Request:	Review and informal feedback.
Applicant:	Paul Ghidotti, Daimler.
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Planner II.
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission commented informally on this application for informal feedback for the potential development of a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building including two 5,000-square-foot restaurant spaces and associated patios in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North. The site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive. The Commission generally agreed with the applicant's proposal and understood the challenges for the development of the site as originally zoned and the changes in surrounding conditions. The Commission appreciated the architectural concept for the building and encouraged the applicant to address signs innovatively.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Planner II

reason and he did not see any reason to change the text at all. He recalled that Dominion made sure that it was included in the text so that it would be there forever and look good. Mr. Fishman said he was stressed because the standards continue to be lowered for economic reasons. He said no matter how fabulous the shingle is, it is less expensive than shake. He said he would be in favor of changing the text if in allowing something like standing seam metal or something very attractive. He said the asphalt shingle would give the building a whole new look.

Mr. McAllister said he would be in favor of the composite shake.

Mr. Fishman said he would have to see the composite shake proposed before he would be willing to change the text to allow it. He said originally, it was specified that hand-split shake shingles were to be used but he did not know if the second application was hand-split shakes which last a lot longer. He said it was thicker, better, and required less maintenance, but it was more expensive. He said that in Dublin, many times for the second go around on shake roofs, a machine cut shake was substituted. He said they have to be very careful not to lower standards in Dublin. He said obviously, he was against the proposed shakes.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if this was the second shake roof on this building.

Mr. McAllister confirmed. He said a well-maintained shake roof usually lasted 30 years.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked the applicant if it was his pleasure to have the Commission table this case to allow him further research of roof materials and come back with other options.

Mr. McAllister asked if a composite shake had been previously approved by the Commission.

Ms. Amorose Groomes could not recollect one.

Mr. McAllister requested a tabling of this minor text amendment and amended final development plan application.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Taylor moved to table this minor text amendment and amended final development plan application at the request of the applicant. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Amorose Groomes said if the Commission needed to waive any time requirements, or if they are in a hurry, Planning would work with the applicant.

3. Riverside PCD North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter **Perimeter Drive**
12-050INF **Informal Review**

Chris Amorose Groomes introduced the following application requesting a informal review and non-binding feedback for the potential development of a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,000-square-foot retail building including two 5,000-square-foot restaurant spaces and associated patios in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North. She said the site is located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive.

Claudia Husak presented this case. She explained that the next step the applicant would take after this informal, non-binding discussion was a rezoning/preliminary development plan application. She said the

entire Riverside Planned Commerce District includes the Shoppes of Avery Square, Primrose Daycare, and several office buildings, which are mostly medical. She said this site is in the center of the PCD and the other vacant pieces within the District have approved final development plans but have not been built yet. She said the Community Plan shows this site as the General Commercial category, which is also the category for the eastern portion of this development district as well as the Avery Square Shopping Center and the area of the Giant Eagle Shopping Center, Perimeter Shopping Center.

Ms. Husak said the General Commercial District is described as including most of the existing and commercial development within the City and it is also described that a lot of the pattern of that development in the commercial district is very auto-oriented with uses such as retail, restaurants, personal services, offices, lodging and other auto-oriented services. Ms. Husak presented a subarea map and said that a majority of this site is in Subarea A1, which permits medical offices and regular offices, the Suburban Office and Institutional District in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said that Subarea A3 is the one that the applicant would be proposing to rezone to expand the uses permitted. She said currently permitted are all of the uses listed under the Permitted section in the SO, Suburban Office portion of the Zoning Code, which are mostly office uses and financial institutions. She said also permitted in the subarea currently are two restaurants limited to a total of 11,000 square feet. Ms. Husak said that there was a specific exclusion for drive-thru, drive-up windows.

Ms. Husak presented the applicant's contemplated site plan, which centered around a 14,000-square-foot retail building which could accommodate two restaurants potentially at either end. She said the applicant is proposing to open up the text to allow general commercial uses in addition to the uses currently permitted to mirror what the Matt the Miller's building is currently laid out as with a restaurant and different kinds of uses that would be permitted in a general commercial district. Ms. Husak said that would require a rezoning because those uses are not currently permitted within the current district. She reiterated that there was a cap on the square footage of restaurants permitted within this subarea. Ms. Husak said if the applicant wanted to have those uses opened up to allow all kinds of commercial uses, an ice cream or coffee shop or a use like that which could also be considered a restaurant could be envisioned. She said there is some limitation if the text is kept at the 11,000 square-feet of restaurant use.

Ms. Husak said if the patios are included as this proposal suggests with the restaurant, they would be limited in size because quickly they add up to 500 square feet each and they are at 11,000 square feet, the current cap for the restaurants. So a discussion point outlined was should the patios be counted as part of the restaurant space number, or is there the opportunity to allow patios to be bigger and more of an amenity and more integrated and potentially not be counted as part of an overall square footage number.

Ms. Husak said that they would look at something similar to what they have done at Giant Eagle and at the Kroger shopping centers with allowing a certain overall number of patio space by right with certain amenities that they have come to be used to in Dublin.

Ms. Husak said that the applicant also provided some conceptual elevations of this type of building. She said that the development text currently requires non-office buildings to have a more residential feel and style. She said the applicant is trying to mirror what has been the look of the Matt the Miller's building and other buildings that Daimler has developed around the area.

Ms. Husak said that Planning suggests the following four general questions for the Commission to discuss:

1. Does this proposal warrant a change to the development text to allow retail uses in this Subarea?
2. Would the Commission allow additional restaurants to occupy the retail spaces, which would exceed the number of restaurants currently permitted?

3. Does the Commission support excluding patio spaces from the restaurant size limitation?
4. Is the proposed architectural character appropriate for this development?

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 McNeil Drive, Dublin, with the Daimler Group, said the architectural style of this building was similar to the Wine Bistro building, across from the Shoppes at Lane Avenue. He said they thought this architecture was a step above that of the Matt the Miller building. Mr. Ghidotti said that in 2003, they partnered with OhioHealth on this 24-acre development and created a mix of uses, 100,000 square feet of office and medical office space. He said they had talked to five restaurants over the eight-year period since they started the development. He said every time a restaurant laid out a 5,000 to 7,000 square-foot restaurant, they found that after they met setback and parking requirements and did a freestanding building, that they needed 2.2 to 2.4 acres which left them with an unusable parcel. He said the second problem they encountered was that they could not afford to build a building that met the standard of the Shoppes at Avery.

Mr. Ghidotti said it was his impression most of the second and third generation space that had been developed at Avery Square and the Giant Eagle center have mostly been quick service restaurants which are wonderful to have, but they have not generated any real nice sit down restaurants other than Matt the Millers and The Rusty Bucket. He said two restaurants have come to them; one an Italian family-oriented pizza, pasta restaurant and the tenant previously mentioned that was on Lane Avenue would like to have a Dublin location.

Mr. Ghidotti said the reason why bringing the uses together and creating a single building make sense is that the type of uses he is talking about cannot afford a $2M restaurant, but they can afford to rent a restaurant like this. He said they can have complementary uses if they can make it one building when there is a restaurant that is only busy at night and a user that may be a neighborhood retail service that can provide a service that people will use during the day, but not necessarily at night. Mr. Ghidotti said they did not have anyone identified yet for what is known as a retail space or letters of intent signed for the restaurant spaces. Mr. Ghidotti asked for the Commissioners' questions and feedback so that they could come back with a plan that incorporated the things the Commissioners would like to see.

Ms. Amorose Groomes invited public comments with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Amy Kramb said that she was in favor of the building being shared with two restaurants, but not in favor of the retail. She was also fine with adding patio space not being included and/or adjusting the amount of square footage allowed. She said she was okay with the character of the building, but she was tired of seeing the same thing repeatedly and would like to see something new. Ms. Kramb said asked if the Development Text would need to be changed to allow the restaurant use.

Ms. Husak said the development text would not need to be changed to allow a restaurant at the site, but it would require a rezoning to add other non-office commercial uses.

Ms. Kramb said that she would be willing to change the development text to allow a larger square footage or somehow not include the patio space in the square footage.

Ms. Husak asked if Ms. Kramb would be in favor of allowing more than two restaurants.

Ms. Kramb said no, due to the strained parking in the entire development.

John Hardt said that he thought this was a good proposal and supported it. He said having dealt with similar sites in his profession, he could sympathize how a freestanding restaurant really did not work on this site, so the fundamental approach is okay to him. Mr. Hardt said that he was not concerned about the retail. He said the size they are talking about make them Mom and Pop shops. He said there was 100,000 square feet of retail across the street, so he did not see how this would markedly change the

character of the area. Mr. Hardt said that in the past, there had been some concern about retail creep going westward down Perimeter Drive, and he was sympathetic to that, but he was okay with this proposal for a couple of reasons. He said most of the land to the west is developed and he did not think there was a lot of opportunity for retail left. Mr. Hardt said that the Community Plan had this site being contemplated as being commercial and the offices to the west. He said if they leaned on the Community Plan, this was an appropriate use.

Mr. Hardt said there were two different related issues and one was the quantity of restaurants and the other is the area of the restaurants. He said he had the same concern as Ms. Kramb about the parking and he wanted to be convinced that they deal with that. Mr. Hardt said he was willing to consider some latitude in terms of the square footage and if it was 11,500 square feet, it would allow potentially one of the small retail spaces to be a restaurant. He said he agreed with the comments in the Planning Report regarding the patios. He said he was in favor of the patios because he thought we needed more of them. Mr. Hardt said he would like to see them incorporated into this project in a creative way. He said regarding the eastern restaurant, the entire area between the building and parking lot could be a patio, as long as it was done well, well appointed, and landscaped. He said he did not think it needed to be a 500-square-foot box.

Mr. Hardt said architecturally, he agreed with Ms. Kramb about being over this style and tired of it. He said he would love to see some more interesting, creative things happen, but probably somewhere else. He said on this site, the die has been cast and this is what we have. He said he had no trouble matching the existing center because he thought it was the appropriate thing to do and he thought this building did a good job of it. He said he was willing to look and consider more creative and different approaches to the signs, but on this site, it has been established and done and continuing it was fine with him in this case. Mr. Hardt said overall, this was a good proposal with some details left to be worked out. He said that as a resident of the nearby area, he would welcome the restaurants.

Victoria Newell agreed that the architecture has been established in the area and what had been presented looked nice and it matched. Ms. Newell said she could support having the restaurants in the area and agreed that if the outdoor patio spaces should be done well and creatively. She said she was concerned about retail in terms of how she perceived it would remain empty and add to the existing empty retail all around which was not a good thing. Ms. Newell said that there was not a means of getting foot traffic to the location, so more car traffic is being generated with it. She said the area gets very congested with traffic and she was concerned that more retail would add to the traffic.

Joe Budde referred to the south elevation and asked if something similar would be on the other side. He asked about deliveries and trash pickup.

Carter Bean, Carter Bean Architects, 4400 North High Street, explained that it was very similar to the existing shops where all the services come and go through the front door.

Mr. Budde suggested if they were building a 15,000 square-foot building, why not have three similarly sized restaurants if the retail created heartburn.

Warren Fishman emphasized that he would want to see the restaurant be very successful, and the big problems are parking and access. He said the parking lot is packed by Matt the Miller's Sunday Brunch customers. He said parking for retail customers may be a potential problem due to large restaurant crowds. He said he was in favor of the proposal for the restaurants, but had mixed feelings about the retail use. He said he liked the architecture. He said he thought there might be a parking and access problem having a high volume restaurant along with Matt the Miller's.

Richard Taylor said that as long as the parking situation was remedied, he was not very concerned whether there were two or three restaurants, patios or not, and retail or not. He said it was interesting

that when uses are set in the development text to look back at conversations that took place and try to figure out where that came from. He said that Mr. Ghidotti did a good job of explaining it to him. He said when there was nothing there, it made sense to limit the uses, but there is nowhere else for retail to go except here at this point. He said they were talking about small retail, so he had no problem with that.

Mr. Taylor said the architecture of the building looked fine. He said he would rather retail centers that have a common architecture have it be this Irish town theme than storefront, glass, and brick like is seen everywhere but Dublin. Mr. Taylor said they are facing the back of a retail center, so if the signs were neon, which are not allowed, they would not offend anybody because they would not face a residence or business. He said to get away from these scallop edged, colonial signs and do something interesting and creative. Mr. Taylor said not to just use channel letters. He said at Bridgepointe, they did not use gooseneck fixtures but used a light that lights more evenly and did not draw attention to the fixture so just the light is seen. He said he saw on the plan four identical signs with different words on them. He suggested four signs that reflected the businesses inside. Mr. Taylor said regarding the trade-off on the building size and patios, as long as the total number of parking spaces is addressed, there should be the opportunity.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she did not have any heartburn about the retail. She said there was not one vacant retail spot near Piada. She said that we may be a little underserved on retail right through there. She said if it was the right retail, it is healthy, and she anticipated that this would experience that same sort of evolution. She said she did not have a problem with two restaurants or the size. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see shared parking agreements, so at least the employees could park somewhere else. She said that there were many medical office uses that would have significantly different peak hours than the applicant's. Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the patio spaces are great, as long as they are treated well and their boundaries are treated well with landscape treatments and the proper fencing and all that creates an environment that is welcoming, rich, and warm. She said she was okay with architecture.

Ms. Kramb added a caveat to her opposition to the retail use was tied to parking. She said the problem she saw with retail was that parking spaces are assigned to them only. She said the shared parking agreements were a great idea. She said this is definitely better than the other plaza and easier to access.

Mr. Ghidotti agreed that the access for the Shoppes at Avery is awful on a private drive which was forced with the geometry to ensure that vehicles could only go in and not come out of there. He said this plan is completely different because the access points are already established and there are two points on both the east and west side where the two private drives come out to Perimeter Drive. He said it will be much easier to get in and out of this site. He said that although there are complaints about the access, Matt the Miller's revenue has increased double digits every year they have been open.

Mr. Ghidotti said regarding concerns mentioned about retail, he said the complementary uses of the restaurants and the retails are such that they really could not do 15,000 square feet of restaurant on this site. He said it would not work from a parking standpoint. He said the reason why they can try to make this work with this kind of complementary use is about daytime, travel times, and parking is that it works better. He said if the Commission is comfortable with this, they will come back with a use that is this size and type of use. He said there are no walls between each of the spaces inside, and if a restaurant needs 400 square feet or 5,200 square feet, they will make it work for their use.

Ms. Newell clarified her comment in regards to the retail. She said her concern was that it was isolated and there is no encouragement for foot traffic.

Mr. Ghidotti said at the Shoppes at Avery for FedEx they established three dedicated parking spaces at their front door for drop offs. He said most retail tenants love that because their customers can park at their front door. He said that might be an option.

Ms. Newell said she actually would like to see the retail foot traffic encouraged. She said when there are interconnected walking paths from one location to the other and it is a pleasant transition, people who go to restaurants want to wander before or after dinner or while they are waiting for tables.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there was nothing that required a vote and she concluded the discussion. She thanked Mr. Ghidotti and said the Commission looked forward to great things.

4. Midwestern Auto Group PUD – MAG Audi **5875 Venture Drive**
12-057INF **Informal Review**

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application requesting an informal review and non-binding feedback for architectural revisions to a dealership for the Audi franchise for the Midwestern Auto Group dealership campus. She said the site is located on the south side of Venture Drive, north of US33/SR161.

Claudia Husak presented this case. She said that the Commission reviewed an application recently for the BMW and Mini portion of the MAG campus to incorporate the Audi building as a free-standing building and at the meeting, the Commission requested that the Audi building come back for another review of the architecture because of concerns regarding the form of the building, the materials used not meeting the development text or complementing the campus. She said as a first step, the applicant requests informal review and feedback before filing a formal application for an amended final development plan.

Ms. Husak said that the MAG campus incorporates approximately 25 acres. She presented the site plan the Commission previously reviewed and said the building footprint in the center of the site remains the same size as before. She said the service reception area has been moved slightly to the west and the plaza in front of the building to the east has decreased in size a little. Ms. Husak said architecturally, the applicant has increased the height of the building to accommodate a second story, mainly in the service reception area with offices and the showroom, close to US 33 is a lot higher. She said while previously, the building was mainly glass, the applicant has incorporated metal and cement fiberboard to the building elevations. She said glass is primarily along the front elevation and a metal panel with a honeycomb pattern overlay has been applied in a manner to create angles and edges which was something that the Commission hoped in on as being prevalent on the MAG campus. Ms. Husak said while the building is still modular in its form, the application of the metal material was intended to mirror what the style is of MAG. Ms. Husak presented a sample of the proposed metal panel with a honeycomb pattern overlay.

Ms. Husak said that Planning had concerns about using the clear glass along the roofline to screen the mechanical units. She presented an elevation showing how the metal screening would look. She said on the elevations, a dotted line indicated a window where the metal backing would be cut out so that there would only be the honeycomb pattern over it so that you could see through it, but it would still be covered. She presented perspectives showing the building views from different angles.

Ms. Husak said the discussion points provided ask whether or not the applicant has addressed the Commission's comments and concerns from the last meeting with either the form of the building or the materials of the building.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has proposed two signs for the building. She said both signs require development text modifications as identified by Planning. She said the wall sign on the south elevation that faces US 33, is proposed to be a logo only without any letters or copy which requires a text modification to allow an additional wall sign in the subarea because the subarea was limited to two wall