

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

AGENDA

1. **BSD C – Home2 Hotel** **5000 Upper Metro Place**
15-059BSD-DP/SP/MSP **Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**
Site Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Master Sign Plan (Deferred by Applicant)
2. **BSD C – Home2 Hotel** **5000 Upper Metro Place**
15-062PP/FP **Preliminary Plat/Final Plat (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0)**
3. **Ridgeview Subdivision, Lot 7 – Artrip Residence** **207 Marion Street**
15-082FP **Final Plat (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0)**
4. **Training**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:28 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Christopher Brown and Stephen Stidhem. City representatives present were: Philip Hartmann, Vince Papsidero, Jeff Tyler, Alan Perkins, Laura Ball, Paula Choep, Tammy Noble, Joanne Shelly, Devayani Puranik, Marie Downie, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the August 6, 2015, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the August 20, 2015, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes, Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the September 3, 2015, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said Case 3, Artrip Residence was eligible this evening for the consent agenda. She invited questions from the Commission for the consent case. Amy Salay said she did not require a formal presentation; she just wanted to inquire about the front setback. Tammy Noble clarified that the remainder of the subdivision's front setback lines are 75 feet. She said Staff has agreed that if any of the property owners come forward in the future requesting the same setback modification, that Staff would be equally favorable.

The Chair determined the cases would be heard in the following order: Case 3, 1, and 2.

**1. BSD C – Home2 Hotel
15-059BSD-DP/SP/MSP**

**5000 Upper Metro Place
Development Plan/Site Plan
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for the construction of a new four-story hotel with 126 suites and associated site improvements on a 2.57-acre site on the south side of SR 161 and on the west side of Frantz Road between West Bridge Street and Upper Metro Place. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Development Plan and Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said the Master Sign Plan request is deferred to a future date.

The Chair swore in witnesses that intended to address the Commission regarding this case.

Devayani Puranik said the Basic Development Plan and Site Plan were approved May 7, 2015. She said the Final Development Plan, Site Plan, and Master Sign Plan were presented to the Commission and were tabled. She said City Council provided input on August 24, 2015, regarding a desire for traditional materials and colors; a cornice connecting the architectural elements for consistency; trees; and the color on the interior of the tower. She explained that if the Commission approves the Development Plan, Site Plan, and Preliminary and Final Plat, both cases will be reviewed by City Council as there is an economic development agreement involved with this case.

Ms. Puranik provided a summary of the Planning and Zoning Commissions actions requested this evening.

Ms. Puranik presented the location of the site. She said the Development Plan consists of an existing 2.57-acre commercial site (to be split into two lots); a four-story, Corridor Building (80,481-square-foot hotel with 129 units); 1,900 square feet of Open Space; 122 shared parking spaces; and a two-story, 14,000-square-foot office building (Phase II). She said the Landscape/Open Space Plan meets the requirements and includes 1,900 square feet of Open Space, two pocket plazas located along Frantz Road, and a connection to a multi-use path on Frantz Road. She added the applicant proposed transplanting 20 existing mature trees.

Ms. Puranik presented the façade materials on the SR 161 (north façade) and noted the glass that has been introduced as well as the Frantz Road (east façade), which had not changed. She explained the material colors used for the identification of stone, brick, glass, fiber cement board, and EIFS do not reflect the actual colors proposed; this is for illustration purposes only. She said the south and west facades were shown in the same manner.

Ms. Puranik presented an overview of the Parking Plan, which she said had not changed since the last presentation. She noted that 135 spaces are required and 122 spaces were provided in addition to 12 spaces for bicycle parking.

Ms. Puranik explained each of the 10 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Street Frontage §153.062(N)(a)(2) – RBZ: 15-feet required; Building set at 30 feet requested
2. Street Frontage §153.062(N)(a)(5) – FPL Coverage: 75% required; 0% requested
3. Vehicular Canopy location §153.062(L)(1): Vehicular canopy location at the rear façade of the building required; side façade requested
4. Street Façade/Number of Entrances §153.062(E)(1)(3) - SR 161: 1 per 75 feet of façade required; none requested
5. Corridor Building – Transparency §153.062(O)(5):
 - o Street Facing Façade - 30% required; SR 161 (north façade): 2nd story 23%, 3rd story 23%, and 4th story 22% requested
 - o Street Facing Façade – 30% required; Frantz Road (east façade): 4th story 26% requested
 - o Non-Street Facing Façade – 15% required (west façade): 2nd story 12%, 3rd story 11%, and 4th story 10% requested
6. Corridor Building - Blank Wall Limitations §153.062(O)(5): Maximum 15 feet horizontal required
 - o Frantz Road (east façade) at the 4th story requested
 - o West facade at the 3rd and 4th stories requested
7. Window Detailing - Lintels or Sills §153.062(H)(f): Windows in masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and projecting sills required
8. Open Space – Proportions §153.064(G)(1)(b): 3:1 ratio length to width required; 5.6:1 ratio length to width requested
9. Street Trees §153.065(D): Street Trees along SR 161 and Frantz Road
10. Landscape Islands §153.065(D)(5)(C)(2): Minimum width of a landscape peninsula or island shall be 10 feet with a minimum area of 150 square feet required; 10 feet to 6 feet tapered islands with 312 square feet – 2 islands requested

Ms. Puranik explained each of the five conditions for the Site Plan Review:

- 1) That within the first three years of transplanting existing trees, the applicant replaces each failed transplanted tree with a 4-inch-caliper tree (location and species to be determined by the City Forester) to maintain the same number of trees as illustrated on the approved landscape plan;
- 2) That the applicant provides the exterior lighting photometric plan prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant provides cut-sheets for proposed exterior lighting fixtures including wall mounted fixtures prior to building permitting;
- 4) That the applicant provides a Pedestrian Circulation Plan required by §153.065(I)(3)(b) prior to building permitting; and
- 5) That the applicant works with Staff to determine the suitability of the proposed interior color for the tower element at SR 161 and Frantz Road and incorporate all Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council input within three months following the issuance of the occupancy permit.

Ms. Puranik said the ART recommended approval to the PZC for Thin Brick as a primary material. She noted Code 153.062(E)(1)(c) states that the permitted primary building materials shall be of high quality durable materials including, but not limited to: stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, and glass.

Ms. Puranik said the ART recommended approval to the PZC for a Parking Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant works with Staff to provide for one additional bicycle parking space.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for Staff. [Hearing none.] She invited the applicant to present.

Gary Sebach, 101 Mill Street, Gahanna, Ohio, said he would not go back through everything, but would review what was presented to City Council as well as where the applicant is today. He stated at the last meeting, the following was discussed: trees on SR 161; brand specific elements and colors; the contrast in colors; how to make this more "Dublinesque"; the removal of the beacon from the end; and signs. He indicated at staff's recommendation, the applicant has pulled the Master Sign Plan from this application.

Mr. Sebach presented the Site Plan and pointed out that the street trees and landscaping were changed per the recommendations of Staff to meet Code requirements. He presented the brand standard that the applicant started with, which is siding and EIFS knowing it was not Dublin. He showed a revised rendering to better reflect the colors of the brick and where the tower color was softened and presented the elevations with the modeled trees. He presented more traditional colors including red on red, which is a safer option per the comments from City Council. He said Council also requested an element for the top of the floating boxes and noted that SR 161 elevation did not have the dynamic effect that Frantz Road had. He presented the revised SR 161 elevation that has more glass at the lower level, added boxes in a different form, added windows, and added cap on elements that break through the roof for visual termination. He reported the final count on trees on SR 161 was 12 and 7 on Frantz Road. He indicated there is an on-going conversation with ODOT about the trees.

Mr. Sebach said thin brick needs a Waiver. He presented some thin brick images from the internet, including a building in Powell, Ohio, on Sawmill Parkway. He pointed out the close-up showing the thinness of the brick where it is routed just like regular brick and it is hard to tell a difference. He showed the brick turn before the window was installed. He said the applicant took the window sample that they had presented before, and created a mock-up to show the intent for head detail where a sub frame is created and the window is pushed back for appearance of a full-depth brick header and jamb.

Cathy De Rosa said she did not see any stone on this version. Mr. Sebach said there was never stone on this side.

Chris Brown inquired about the token windows added on the west side. He said he understands the applicant is trying to meet the Code but he prefers that area without the windows. Mr. Sebach said there is a lot going on with this building and they tried to break the rhythm, typically seen for hotels.

Mr. Brown inquired about a sign for the west elevation. Mr. Sebach said he was not prepared to discuss signs this evening as they will be determined based on the final architecture.

Mr. Brown restated he understands why the windows are there but he is not enamored with them. He said sometimes architectural mass is a good thing.

Amy Salay asked if the façade would be improved with larger windows. Mr. Sebach explained that given the internal floor plan, larger windows would not be possible.

Victoria Newell said three color schemes have been considered and asked Mr. Sebach if he had a preference and why. Mr. Sebach replied that when this project is viewed on their website, the brown and cream colored brick is presented because OHM Advisors believes that is a more impactful design.

The Commission asked to review all three color schemes.

The Chair invited anyone from the public that wanted to speak with regard to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. De Rosa said she loves the tower without the green light.

Ms. Puranik said based on City Council's comments, the applicant will start with the green color and the full impact of that color will be determined after the building is constructed.

Ms. Salay asked how that process would work. Ms. Puranik answered it was suggested that the Commission could vote on this with that condition of possibly changing the color later. Ms. Newell said she thought that was a fair way to handle this.

Ms. De Rosa indicated that now that the elevations have been shown with and without the green, she wanted to know what has been the brand's response to omitting the green. Mr. Sebach said the applicant would like to keep the green, but if in three months the Commission or Council decides it is too bright, they will change it. He added that it will not be as bright as it appears in the rendering and it will not be noticed during the day, but would be visible at night.

Mr. Brown confirmed the recommendation of disapproval of Waiver #6 of 10. Ms. Puranik clarified it was the blank wall for the west side. Mr. Brown asked what the other option would be. Ms. Puranik said windows were considered, but another detail could be introduced. Mr. Brown affirmed he was not in favor of the token windows as massing is not randomly broken up by adding windows.

Mr. Sebach said the applicant's attempt was to bring the box around with the 18-inch differential with a change of materials as well.

Vince Papsidero said that Staff struggled with the blank wall issue.

Ms. Newell said this will always be a problem in the BSD because it is very appropriate to have blank areas from massing within the building. She said she really liked how they massed the building substantially. She indicated she liked the original color proposals, which bring a more contemporary feeling, but is not opposed to the red on red color scheme, which is traditional. She said she will struggle with the green color used with the red brick as they are contrasting colors.

Mr. Brown agreed he liked the original color proposal as it was dynamic, but not jarring, particularly with the trees in front. He added as a gateway to Dublin, the original proposal shows we are "not stuck in the mud" and are moving forward while using traditional materials.

Deborah Mitchell said the red on red is fighting with itself, and more so with the green. She stated she liked the original colors.

Mr. Sebach agreed the green would be a challenge.

Ms. Newell asked Mr. Sebach what his second choice would be. Mr. Sebach explained the applicant looked at multiple manufacturers and decided upon red and light red brick because it plays into the design of the architecture. He presented brick samples and noted the red brick that was too orange.

Ms. Salay said the samples look similar but the rendering shows more of a contrast.

Ms. Newell again asked for Mr. Sebach's middle preference for color schemes.

Mr. Sebach confirmed the colors are Alexandria and New Bedford.

Mr. Brown indicated he was considering others' perspectives. He said there is a certain palette used in Dublin, but it can be overplayed. He said at one point both the Audi building and the BMW building were noted on SR 161 and there is no red brick, the buildings are contemporary, dynamic, and beautiful. He said an urban feel calls for a twist when close to the street.

Ms. De Rosa asked what color brick would weather better. Ms. Newell said all brick will begin to soil and that could be noticed easier on the lighter brick. She said cost is not an issue, but rather the contrast to consider.

Bob Miller asked Ms. Newell if she had an issue of thin brick over time. She replied the brick is being used a lot. She explained the brick is supported by anchors to the backup sub straight and allows for drainage. She said bricks can be cut to different specified widths and the brick does not have to be flat on a building.

Mr. Sebach confirmed that the air barrier is the same.

Mr. Miller thanked the applicant for his effort on this project. He said he would favor the red color scheme if it made the applicant give up the green, but he really liked the original color scheme. He said he was impressed that the applicant put the effort into creating a window sample/mock up. He stated he did not believe the windows added to the blank wall were necessary.

Ms. Salay indicated that Council was divided initially on color schemes, but then leaned toward the red on red. She said after the meeting, she was asked to imagine the brown and cream color scheme on a typical February, cloudy day in Ohio and how cold that would look versus the reds. She said another person said this project should be distinguished from Bridge Park East and thought this was a way to do that with a very contemporary building with more traditional materials. She said Council will hear the Commission's comments. She restated she clearly likes the red on red.

Mr. Miller said the reds are "safe". Ms. Salay agreed it is very safe and looks a lot like more traditional Dublin of which she prefers.

The Chair asked the applicant which color they want the Commission to consider. Mr. Sebach answered his number one goal is to leave the meeting with an approval. He said the result of a discussion he had with Russ Hunter earlier in the day, who is also an architect, was they felt like they had watered it down. He said they called it stew because it was bold and so they made it as subdued as possible. He said it was definitely a safer approach, but if that is where they need to be, he is comfortable with that.

Ms. Newell noted the contrast was missing. She said if the reds were used, she would like to see more of a distinction between the colors.

Mr. Sebach said their challenge has been the rigorous window path that comes with a four-story hotel.

Ms. Salay said she has been reviewing different hotels in the area for comparison and understands the challenge for interesting architecture.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the tower with the red color scheme. Mr. Sebach indicated the stone worked well with the red; it is not a bad choice.

Mr. Sebach said from the beginning, something bold was requested for this location – a signature look, but now we are being asked to pull it back. He said he could consider different brick colors later if he can get the approval this evening for the overall project.

Ms. Newell inquired about the window trim color. Mr. Sebach said a painted metal surface will reflect the sky.

Ms. Mitchell said what was supposed to be a “cool” building is now very traditional. She said the tower is fighting and not harmonious.

Ms. Newell said the goal is for the best architecture. The Chair asked to take a straw poll about the color schemes. A split screen was shown that had the red scheme on the top and the brown and cream scheme on the bottom. Mr. Stidhem reported he had attended the ART meeting and heard the struggles and back and forth discussion. The straw poll went as follows: Mr. Stidhem, bottom; Ms. Mitchell, bottom; Mr. Brown, bottom; Ms. Newell, bottom; Ms. De Rosa, top because the bottom might not age well; Mr. Miller, bottom; Ms. Salay, top. The Chair concluded the majority of the Commission prefers the original color scheme and asked how this could be written as a condition.

Russ Hunter, 555 Metro Place, said he too attended the ART meeting and witnessed the struggle about the windows. He said he agrees that the windows do not add anything. He stated he wholeheartedly agreed to the bottom choice. He said he understands the applicant still has to go before City Council and needs desperately to start construction. He indicated the applicant has been before the Commission ten times. He said he wants the lighter colors, but fears that Council will disapprove it simply because of the color scheme. He asked if there was a way to get this approved and get everything started, and if there is still a discomfort with the colors, that it does not derail the whole process.

Ms. Salay said it is part of the economic development agreement so Council has to “bless it”, whatever “it” is. She questioned how this could be processed.

The Chair said the Commission could potentially approve both color schemes, but state our recommendation that we prefer the lighter scheme to allow the applicant to move forward.

Philip Hartmann said the Commission approval could be handled the way the Chair suggested.

Mr. Hunter reiterated that he likes the bottom choice and he is okay if it reminds him of Bridge Park East because he is very proud of that project – that is Dublin’s future.

Ms. Newell said her perspective was that this is more “out of the box” and it is going to look new and fresh. She indicated there is a point in which adjoining buildings are not going to want to look the same. She said by being forward with this one, it opens up design opportunities.

Ms. Salay said future projects may not be part of an economic agreement so then the Commission would have the final say.

Mr. Miller indicated that from Council’s perspective that corner is special and he believes the bottom choice would speak to a special corner, but he is not opposed to approving both choices.

Mr. Brown said driving east on SR 161, in New Albany, it is one red brick building after another and then there is a white brick building, which he believes is a nice change of pace. He said he understands that would be very jarring to Dublin.

Ms. Puranik said she would add a sixth condition under the Site Plan Review, to later state the exact color names.

- 6) That Planning and Zoning Commission's approval for the Site Plan permits both color schemes presented on August 24, 2015 ("Savannah" Crème and "Boston" Brown) and September 17, 2015 ("Alexandria" Dark Red and "New Bedford" Light Red) with a preference for Crème and Brown.

The Commission agreed with the wording of the added condition.

Mr. Brown asked if something needed to be added about the windows for the blank wall. He referred to number 6 of 10 Waivers. Ms. Puranik explained the Waiver is for a blank wall so it is fine as written.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

The Site Plan Waivers were reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Brown said the thin brick detailing should always be applied.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve 10 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Street Frontage §153.062(N)(a)(2) – RBZ: 15-feet required; Building set at 30 feet requested
2. Street Frontage §153.062(N)(a)(5) – FPL Coverage: 75% required; 0% requested
3. Vehicular Canopy location §153.062(L)(1): Vehicular canopy location at the rear façade of the building required; side façade requested
4. Street Façade/Number of Entrances §153.062(E)(1)(3) - SR 161: 1 per 75 feet of façade required; none requested
5. Corridor Building – Transparency §153.062(O)(5):
 - o Street Facing Façade - 30% required; SR 161 (north façade): 2nd story 23%, 3rd story 23%, and 4th story 22% requested
 - o Street Facing Façade – 30% required; Frantz Road (east façade): 4th story 26% requested
 - o Non-Street Facing Façade – 15% required (west façade): 2nd story 12%, 3rd story 11%, and 4th story 10% requested
6. Corridor Building - Blank Wall Limitations §153.062(O)(5): Maximum 15 feet horizontal required
 - o Frantz Road (east façade) at the 4th story requested
 - o West facade at the 3rd and 4th stories requested
7. Window Detailing - Lintels or Sills §153.062(H)(f): Windows in masonry walls shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and projecting sills required
8. Open Space – Proportions §153.064(G)(1)(b): 3:1 ratio length to width required; 5.6:1 ratio length to width requested
9. Street Trees §153.065(D): Street Trees along SR 161 and Frantz Road

10. Landscape Islands §153.065(D)(5)(C)(2): Minimum width of a landscape peninsula or island shall be 10 feet with a minimum area of 150 square feet required; 10 feet to 6 feet tapered islands with 312 square feet – 2 islands requested

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the following six conditions, which he affirmed he did:

- 1) That within the first three years of transplanting existing trees, the applicant replaces each failed transplanted tree with a 4-inch-caliper tree (location and species to be determined by the City Forester) to maintain the same number of trees as illustrated on the approved landscape plan;
- 2) That the applicant provides the exterior lighting photometric plan prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant provides cut-sheets for proposed exterior lighting fixtures including wall mounted fixtures prior to building permitting;
- 4) That the applicant provides a Pedestrian Circulation Plan required by §153.065(I)(3)(b) prior to building permitting;
- 5) That the applicant works with Staff to determine the suitability of the proposed interior color for the tower element at SR 161 and Frantz Road and incorporate all Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council input within three months following the issuance of the occupancy permit; and
- 6) That Planning and Zoning Commission’s approval for the Site Plan permits both color schemes presented on August 24, 2015 (“Savannah” Crème and “Boston” Brown) and September 17, 2015 (“Alexandria” Dark Red and “New Bedford” Light Red) with preference for Crème and Brown.

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Site Plan Review with six conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve Thin Brick as a primary material. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve a Parking Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant works with Staff to provide for one additional bicycle parking space.

The applicant agreed to the condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**2. BSD C – Home2 Hotel
15-062PP/FP**

**5000 Upper Metro Place
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for the subdivision of a 2.57-acre site into two lots for a proposed hotel and future office building on the west side of Frantz Road between West Bridge Street and Upper Metro Place. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Devayani Puranik presented the plat and pointed out the easements as well as the setbacks for the BSD.

Ms. Puranik said approval is recommended to City Council for a Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Russ Hunter said he agreed with the condition.

The Chair invited anyone from the public that wanted to speak about this application. [Hearing none.] She invited comments from the Commissioners. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approval Recommended 7 – 0)

**3. Ridgeview Subdivision, Lot 7 – Artrip Residence
15-082FP**

**207 Marion Street
Final Plat**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request to revise a previously approved Final Plat for one lot to adjust a front building line requirement. She added the lot is on the south side of Marion Street, east of Monsarrat Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell made a motion, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Terry Artrip, 207 Marion Street, said he agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approval Recommended 7 – 0)

4. Training

Paula Chope, City Forester with the City of Dublin, said she is going to provide an overview of the Forestry Department, within the Parks and Recreation Department that also includes Horticulture.

Ms. Chope said she began her career with the City of Dublin in 1989, part-time, and became permanent in 1991. She said at the time, there were very few street trees – just over 3,000 that were all recorded on a spreadsheet. She indicated there was an active Tree and Advisory Commission in place, responsible for the Street Tree Ordinance that she follows today. She said her full-time staff is very experienced and they are all certified Arborists, including one certified Master Arborist. She explained her seasonal staff of 12 -14 (April – mid December) are guaranteed a 40-hour week, doing the bulk of the labor.

Ms. Chope said she started out with a strong desire for perennial design and was given small areas/pocket parks/neighborhood gardens as well as the cemetery to work as the larger parks were under the direction of Horticulture.

Ms. Chope explained the difference between the Forestry Department and Horticulture when it comes to trees. She said Forestry has to hand-dig everything due to the utilities buried whereas Horticulture can use augers so Forestry hand plants 2 – 3-inch caliper balled and burlap trees not bare-root trees. She said these replacement trees are planted in the spring and fall.

Bob Miller asked if the Developer is responsible for the trees and if/when the Developer changes, who then is responsible, the homeowner or the City. Ms. Chope confirmed the City would take over responsibility.

Ms. Chope said she determines planting periods to allow for the best guarantee periods and leaves a door hanger for the resident informing them of what kind of tree they can expect including some cultural facts and a phone number to call (for Ms. Chope) if there are any problems. She said she ensures trees are planted correctly and placed on an inventory. She said if they have lived for a year, the City takes over responsibility of replacement. She indicated the residents are encouraged to fertilize and mulch, but the City prefers to do the pruning and any stump grinding that is needed. She said when the trees are planted initially, the City waters the trees once a week using water bags because they found residents will over/under water the trees. She said the City does not like underground sprinkler systems which water the grass more than the tree.

Ms. Chope said in the spring, everything needs “to be done yesterday” – plant trees, annuals, and perennials; mulch; remove trees that have died over the winter; and stump grind trees they cannot pull. In the winter, she said a lot of planning takes place and the year-end statistics are analyzed to determine spending and ordering. She added they conduct seasonal staff interviews and attend conferences. She noted Forestry and horticulture man the sled hill and ice rink, providing a little overtime.

Ms. Chope explained that if the new trees die within the first year, the landscape company is called. She said all the trees are put on a pruning cycle depending on the tree species. She said her department is not allowed to climb, and permitted only to use 6 – 8 foot ladders and manual equipment. She reported the Streets and Utilities Department executes the chipper program.

Ms. Chope reported that 486 trees were removed at a wide range of ages and Forestry’s goal is to replace any trees that are removed.

Ms. Chope indicated the Emerald Ash Borer was found in 2008 and Wedgewood Hills was the first subdivision they started treating - full of Ash trees. She said Hard Road was also hit hard and only a few Ash trees are left in those areas. She said they saw a huge impact of the EAB in 2013 and 2014; noting the areas that needed many trees removed due to the EAB.

Victoria Newell said that list included her neighborhood and recalled all the Ash trees died at once.

Ms. Chope said permits have been provided to residents that choose to treat their trees instead of having them removed. She said an injection program was started in 2009, which is performed in the spring and summer with the temperature just right. She reported this has resulted in a good success rate. She said a fungus can attack Ash trees as well as the EAB.

Mr. Miller noted Earlington Parkway that was saved, but asked if this is a long-term solution. He asked if removing every third tree to get another species growing could be considered.

Ms. Chope said Earlington Park is a success story. She said a plug is inserted every four inches and a calculation determines how many milliliters of the product are inserted based on the caliper of the tree. She said this is performed every two years. She said they hope research will find a permanent fix.

Steve Stidhem asked if there is a better long-term plan to consider.

Ms. Chope explained trees are assessed each time prior to another injection. She said if it is determined that the tree is too far gone and needs to be removed, the resident is notified.

Mr. Stidhem said if there are 20 Ash trees in a row, and all are injected, why would there not be a plan to remove every third or fourth tree to be proactive in replacing the canopy instead of the running the risk of losing all the trees at once.

Ms. Chope said Forestry does not like to take trees down. She said if a tree is healthy, it is cheaper to keep it and treat it than it is to take it down, stump grind it, and plant a replacement.

Amy Salay asked if the injections will continue to work long term. Ms. Chope answered she honestly did not know.

Ms. Salay asked if we should risk long-term use of injections or should removal of every third Ash tree in an area be considered. She added this strategy could save canopies.

Ms. Chope reiterated there are Ash trees that come out. She said she would continue this process the way they have been until City Council advises them differently.

Ms. Newell said all the trees on her street were replaced with a variety of trees that grow at different rates and are not producing a canopy.

Cathy De Rosa asked what tree species are being used now as replacement trees. Ms. Chope answered it depends on the area and what exists in the yard. She said in the past, the rule was uniformity, but with larger streets the varieties will be mixed up in case something like EAB, disease, or insects come through. She talked about several common things they are spraying/treating trees for currently.

Ms. Chope explained the sidewalk replacement program and how it can depend upon Engineering's initiatives. She said they try and prevent lawsuits of trees falling down.

Ms. Salay said the method of shaving off the bump instead of replacing the sidewalk was discussed at the CIP. Ms. Chope noted a few shaving projects.

Ms. Chope said Forestry is responsible for downspout repair as roots can make their way into downspouts, especially the perforated downspouts, so they no longer allow those to be installed.

Ms. Chope said Council has encouraged Forestry to help residents with their private landscaping. She said they make "house calls" essentially to help residents determine what their problems are. She said they do a lot of chemical applications and only stake street trees if it is an open area. As part of their education program, she said they leave door hangers for homeowners like if they find the homeowner is using too much mulch. She explained that only 2 – 3 inches is needed at any given time. She presented three door hangers that they hand out: 1) mulch; 2) pruning, and 3) new tree guide that covers watering, water bags, and tree stakes. She said they discourage residents from pruning the street trees as that is their responsibility.

Ms. Chope reported this is their 27th year as a 'Tree City USA'. She noted there are four criteria that need to be met: 1) Arbor Day celebration; 2) Street Tree Ordinance; 3) Tree Board or Tree Department; and 4) A minimum of \$2.00 per person spent on tree care. She reported Dublin spends about \$10 per person.

Ms. Chope said for tree selection and planting:

- Coordinate with Planning regarding the Street Tree Ordinance
- Coordinate with development design teams
- Right Tree – Right Place
- Diversity vs. Uniformity :
All new plantings will conform to the "10-20-30" Tree Species Diversity Rule – no more than 10% of any species of tree, 20% of any genera of tree, or 30% of any one family of tree.

Ms. Chope presented street trees from various neighborhoods to illustrate that uniformity cannot always be achieved. She said some trees will die, so the replacement trees will need to match the height and width of the trees existing on that street. She said when a different species is planted on a street they try to match up maybe a fall color or same growing habit. She reported Red Oak is the top tree being planted in Dublin right now, but Sweet Gum and Sugar Maple as well.

Ms. Newell suggested that when new trees in an area have been replanted with many trees that it would benefit the homeowners if they were informed as to why the trees were selected. She said the few Red Oak trees that have been planted in her neighborhood in place of the Ash trees do not look very good.

Ms. Chope said that once the Red Oak trees settle in, they are not a slow grower, but would inspect the trees on her street.

Mr. Stidhem suggested that Forestry communicate with the HOAs as they have a good communication mechanism with their residents to pass on this information.

Ms. Salay suggested a huge web presence because they should not be so hard to find. She said communication goes a long way for relieving homeowner's fears.

Ms. Chope said Dublin has 3 – 12-foot tree lawns (average is 7 feet). She said Forestry's goal is to have large trees that can fit into large tree widths as smaller tree lawns cannot accommodate large trees due to insufficient soil mass. She anticipates some issues in the Bridge Street District because everyone wants large trees, but she is not certain there will be enough soil mass to support those large trees. She said smaller trees like a Crabapple, Japanese Tree Lilac, Dogwood, or a Cherry will need to be planted in those smaller areas.

Mr. Brown suggested proactivity in our planning. He said he understands there are so many challenges with tree selection, but tree canopies define Dublin. He said in Historic Dublin, where there is a power

line, an ornamental tree will need to be planted under it. He said if ornamental trees are planted on High Street where there was a tree canopy before, it is not the same Dublin. He indicated nobody in this body wants to see that. He asked how a canopy can be achieved and if soil mass needs to be figured in between the curb and sidewalk to get the bigger, taller, trees. He said if that is the case, Staff and the Commission needs to take that into account much more often.

Mr. Brown said he just planted four, four and a half inch-caliper Japanese Tree Lilacs at 18 feet tall with the tree canopy starting at five feet. He said if I am walking down the street and trying to engage retail, where the Commission has specified all this clear glass be used, if the canopy does not start above the clear glass, we are working against what we have planned. He said he does not want to see something that contradicts all this form-based zoning that creates visual areas.

Ms. Chope said another consideration for a commercial area is the amount of salt that will be used in the winter to keep the streets clear. She noted that evergreens cannot take the salt whereas the Ginkgo and the Ball Cyprus can handle the salt. She said trees are selected by what will do well in an area. She agreed that Ginkgo trees are very slow growing. She illustrated how the tree lawn sizes vary on High Street down by Biddies, as well as has utility lines overhead. She said they had to plant little Peach Hydrangeas because she did not have a Crabapple that would stay low enough. She said she does not want to plant tall trees only to have them topped by AEP because they need a clear line.

Mr. Brown said the Peach Hydrangeas will fundamentally change the character of that street.

Ms. Chope said the solution could be to bury the utility lines. Ms. Newell said she was in favor of burying utilities, even though it is a great expense. Ms. Salay said utilities can be buried in sections and gave Bri-Hi Square as an example.

Ms. Salay said homeowners do not want any trees removed but when they are told why, they are more understanding and so appreciative.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the current plans for the BSD need to be re-reviewed to ensure proper tree lawn widths.

Ms. Chope said she thought the majority of the tree lawns are adequate; there are just some streets that will be a little narrower.

Joanne Shelly noted the Thoroughfare Plan that identifies the different types of streets with differing character and widths. She said in Bridge Park Avenue core especially, structural soils have been incorporated within the sidewalks. She explained regular soil is placed where the tree root ball is and beyond that, under the sidewalks, extending out to the right-of-way line, there is structural soil.

Ms. Salay asked what structural soil is. Ms. Chope explained it is a commercial grade using different products together to provide more aeration into the ground so the tree roots can move a lot better and grow.

Ms. Newell recalled the structural soil conversations with the prior Commission and offered to circulate that information to everyone.

Ms. De Rosa asked if Ms. Chope felt good about what was going to happen in the BSD to which she affirmed she did.

Ms. Chope said her department is just getting so limited on the types of trees they can plant as there are challenges with disease, insects, and salt.

Ms. Chope reported she was on Bridge Street today and there are trees that are growing into the grates and it would be nice to have a grate that would break apart a lot easier to allow for the expansion of the tree.

Ms. Shelly said developers are given options for how they would like to handle their trees, whether it is in a tree lawn or tree pit and what happens on the surface. She said our preference is usually cobbles so they can be pulled up as necessary. She said developers in the past year at least have been advised to have grates that can easily be removed. She recognized there is a problem with tree grates in the Historic District.

The Commission told Ms. Chope she provided a very nice presentation and they were quite appreciative.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 5, 2015.