



**Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600  
fax 614.410.4747  
[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 13, 2016**

**AGENDA**

1. **Tartan West – Subarea J** **Terrazza Place**  
**16-051AFDP/PP/FP** **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 - 0)**  
**Preliminary Plat/Final Plat (Approval Recommended 6 – 0)**
2. **BSD SCN – Charles Penzone Grand Salon** **6671 Village Parkway**  
**16-071SPR** **Site Plan Review (Approved 6 - 0)**
3. **I-270/Tuttle PCD, Subarea 4A - Men’s Wearhouse** **5170 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard**  
**16-078CU** **Conditional Use (Approved 6 - 0)**
4. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2, Cap City Diner** **6640 Riverside Drive**  
**16-080WR** **Waiver Review (Tabled 6 - 0)**
5. **Shier Rings Roadway Corridor Character Study**  
**13-073ADM** **Administrative Review (Approval Recommended 6 - 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, Amy Salay, Bob Miller, and Chris Brown. Deborah Mitchell was absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Phil Hartmann, Claudia Husak, Joanne Shelly, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, Aaron Stanford, and Laurie Wright.

**Administrative Business**

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. De Rosa moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown. (Approved 6 - 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the September 1, and September 15, 2016, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the following case is eligible for the Consent Agenda: Case 3 - I-270/Tuttle PCD, Subarea 4A - Men’s Wearhouse. At the request of one of the Commission members, she pulled the case from the Consent Agenda. She said the cases would be heard in the following order: 3, 2, 1, 4, and 5 but would be recorded in the minutes in the order they were listed on the agenda.

**1. Tartan West – Subarea J Terrazza Place  
16-051AFDP/PP/FP Amended Final Development Plan/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the subdivision and development of 9 single-family lots where attached condominium buildings were approved south of Corazon Drive approximately 300 feet west of Tuscany Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.053(E) and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted the site is adjacent to the Club of Corazon and the stormwater pond that is along Hyland-Croy that services the Tartan West development. He presented the approved Site Plan, the existing site conditions, and the proposed Site Plan. He reported the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Final Development Plan for the development of five mid-rise condominium buildings and two private streets in July of 2005. He said the proposal is for the conversion of three vacant condominium sites into nine single-family residential lots for the construction of patio homes and associated site improvements located within Subarea J of the Tartan West PUD.

Since development standards do not exist in this subarea for single-family, Mr. Stang said a text modification is required to outline setbacks for the nine lots. In addition to the platting of the single-family lots, he said the proposal includes the dedication of two reserves amounting to approximately 2.2 acres to the City of Dublin in order to meet open space requirements for this subarea. He noted the remaining land will be owned by the Terrazza Homeowners Association, which will be made up of the existing condominium owners and the nine residential lots.

Mr. Stang stated the proposal has minimal impacts to the existing site as the infrastructure and utilities were installed with the construction of the existing condominium buildings. He indicated a portion of Terrazza South Court will be removed to create Lots 4 & 5 and some minor grading will take place throughout the remaining site. He said the applicant is not proposing to impact the eastern wooded area and has ensured tree protection fencing will be installed during construction.

Mr. Stang presented examples for the proposed architecture as it will be a similar style to what exists immediately south of the site. He said the patio homes will utilize materials such as stucco, dimensional shingles, standing seam metal roofs, cultured stone, and will be complementary to both the condominium buildings and neighboring residential units.

Mr. Stang explained Preliminary and Final Plats are required with this proposal due to the subdivision of the nine lots and the dedication of open space. He added there is a condition associated with the plats with regard to a bike path connection proposed from Calabria Place to Terrazza South Court and the applicant will need to provide a shared-use path easement for any portion of the bike path that is located on private property; the remaining portion of the bike path will be located on City property.

Mr. Stang said there are three motions before the Commission this evening:

1. To modify the development text to identify setbacks for the single-family lots as the following:
  - a. Front yard setbacks: 15 feet (20 feet along Terrazza Place)
  - b. Side yard setbacks: 6 feet
  - c. Rear yard setbacks: 25 feet (15 feet for Lots 7 – 9)
2. Approval of the Amended Final Development Plan, which staff is recommending approval with no conditions, pending the text modification; and

3. A recommendation to City Council for approval of both the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:
  - 1) That the applicant provide a shared use path easement to the City of Dublin for all public shared-use paths that are located on private property; and
  - 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Bob Miller asked for clarification for the shared paths. Mr. Stang explained the proposed shared use path per City standards will replace the existing fire truck access between Terrazza South Court and Calabria Place for the community. He said the applicant has worked with Washington Township regarding the removal of the existing grass paver fire truck access. He stated the applicant will be required to provide a shared use path easement to the City of Dublin for all public shared use paths that are located on private property.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the setbacks as the area appears very tight. She asked if the setbacks were consistent with others in the area. Mr. Stang explained they are a mix between the lot sizes that exist throughout Tartan West.

Victoria Newell asked how the architecture is going to be regulated. Mr. Stang said an Architectural Review Committee is built into the Tartan West PUD and they will review the architecture against the development text. He said the style was approved with this subarea. He confirmed this would be a single-themed community rather than custom homes.

Ms. Newell indicated the architectural theme should have been part of the development text being reviewed this evening. She also voiced concern regarding the permitted height outlined in the text as currently they are permitted a maximum of 48 feet. Ms. Newell asked for clarification if the text modification would also include reducing the height requirement. Mr. Stang said that there was no intent to change that requirement as changing it would result in the existing buildings becoming non-conforming. He said that they could modify the text to outline height regulations for the single-family based on the standard Zoning Code requirement of 35 feet.

Steve Simonetti, 7115 Calabria Place, Dublin, said he was the original developer of the community. He said the ability to theme these communities and stay flexible and shift a little bit with the themes is what enabled them to be tremendously successful. He indicated he has been very passionate about completing the community and doing it the right way. He said he has Bob Webb contracted to build these nine homes.

Brett Adams, 9137 Terrazza N. Court, said he lives in one of the towers Mr. Simonetti discussed and bought the original model when Crawford Hoying built the units. He said the residents of the condominiums just learned about this development when the Bob Webb signs went up; they are not opposed to development but was concerned that they were never notified by the HOA. He said originally 42 units were proposed and now there are nine, which affects the tax base and the number of people that are going to join Corazon and that club needs members to survive. Most importantly, he said a lot of other people would probably comment on this if they were given the opportunity.

Kathryn Emerick, 7139 Calabria Place, said they strongly support this home development; it would be a great transition between the condominiums and their cul-de-sac. She said they would prefer this to three large condominium buildings.

Bruce Burkholder, Isaac Wiles, 2 Miranova, Columbus, Ohio, said he had been working with the developer on this project and was surprised to hear that Mr. Adams just became aware of this project today. He

said the condominium association is quite aware of it and has been very actively engaged in negotiating the document that outlines the financial impacts.

Steve Stidhem said it is rare to have a debate over less density. He said he understands the point about potential membership but this is the right thing to do.

Bob Miller said the Commission rarely deals with the density issue in this way. He said he has a concern about the architectural standards that are going to be applied since the Commission does not really know exactly what they are going to look like. He said we can see what is there today product wise but he would feel better having some assurance in terms of what those controls look like. He stated this will be an enhancement to the neighborhood as opposed to additional towers.

Ms. Newell questioned the development text. She said it should be clear since the Commission does not have architectural elevations.

Mr. Simonetti emphasized there is an architectural palette created for the community and it describes each community and the theme for the community. He said they will stick to the required theme elements. He said the Tuscan architecture will be put in here and an Architectural Review Committee will review the plans and sign off to the City at which time they would do their own review.

Ms. Newell said she was struggling with the paperwork in front of the Commissioners.

Ms. Husak said the Tuscan architecture was approved for the existing single-family lots to the south and that is the architectural theme being carried forward here. She said it is written on page J3 of the development text. Mr. Stang said the development text for Tartan West is 150 – 200 pages in its entirety so the complete document was not supplied to the Commission for this review and the appendix has all the details and elevations.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification per the presentation:

- 1) To modify the development text to identify setbacks for the single-family lots as the following:
  - a. Front yard setbacks: 15 feet (20 feet along Terrazza Place)
  - b. Side yard setbacks: 6 feet
  - c. Rear yard setbacks: 25 feet (15 feet for Lots 7 – 9)
- 2) To modify the development text to require any single-family homes be limited to a height of 35 feet maximum.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide a shared use path easement to the City of Dublin for all public shared-use paths that are located on private property; and

- 2) 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. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**2. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone Grand Salon  
16-071SPR**

**6671 Village Parkway  
Site Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the construction of a 12,000-square-foot building and associated site improvements on a ±3.54-acre site on the west side of Village Parkway at the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Lori Burchett presented the process for this review. She said this project received Basic Plan approval in June 2016. She said there will be three motions tonight: Parking Plan; Site Plan Waivers; and a Site Plan Review with six conditions.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site. She explained the existing Charles Penzone Salon is on the same parcel to the north of the proposed structure. She noted that Dublin Village Center is east of the site and Greystone Mews subdivision is to the west.

Ms. Burchett said the Parking Plan is being requested to permit 85 parking spaces when 31 parking spaces are permitted within the zoning district for this use. She reported the applicant demonstrated a need for this plan based on actual counts at their existing salon. She said the Parking Plan was part of their original submittal but was not voted on at that time.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed modern architecture - a mixture of glass, wood, and metal elements. She said a sculptural feature will enhance the entry and also extend the front façade along Village Parkway. She said a public plaza with contemporary fixtures would also front Village Parkway and there will be walkways and spaces connecting to the existing pedestrian facilities. She indicated landscaping would soften the parking that is located at the side of the structure. She presented the elevations from each direction.

Ms. Burchett said 8 Waivers are being requested, this includes block length and perimeter, parapet height, materials, treatments at terminal vistas, blank wall limitations, vertical increments, and primary materials. She said 10 Waivers were approved with the Basic Plan Review. She explained the need for each of the Waivers. She noted each of the conditions requested for Code compliance for the Site Plan Review.

Amy Salay inquired about the blank walls on the west elevation as the two white walls appear awfully blank but understands landscaping could help with that. Ms. Burchett said she did not have a specific landscape plan but the west façade does not directly front the street.

Steve Cutler, attorney, 165 N. Sandusky Street, Delaware, Ohio, said he was here on behalf of Charles Penzone Salon. He reported the Penzones have been in the community for 25 years.

Charles Penzone, founder and chairman of Charles Penzone Inc., said they have been in business 47 years. He explained the past 25 years they have had a presence in Dublin and this is the flagship of their

company. He said a quarter century ago he planted his corporate flag in the middle of a corn field in this community. He indicated they built the world's largest salon and day spa and the people of Dublin came. He said they love the community and try to be good citizens. He said we all agree on five of the six conditions; the condition for the proposed right-of-way is the issue. He said the road would go through what they intend to be a corporate campus and it would eliminate 30 – 40 parking spaces and make it impossible for them to deal with.

Mr. Penzone said when they built the Grand Salon in 1991, they attracted a lot of media coverage and the number one question asked in every interview was "Why Dublin, Ohio? Why not New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles?" His answer was property to put 200 – 300 parking spaces were not available in those other cities. He said the property they are on was purchased a year after the Grand Salon to protect the parking. He emphasized what the parking means to them.

Mr. Penzone indicated the neighbors to the west are adamantly opposed to this right-of-way or potential street going through. He said the Stavroff group that could not be here tonight is also opposed to this. He asked that the Commission recommend approval for this application and exclude the right-of-way condition.

Chris Meyers, Meyers + Associates, said it has been a wonderful experience working with the Staff of Dublin. He said as a design team, the project has improved because of the process over the past year. He said the Waivers represent the thoroughness of the Bridge Street Code and how it creates a few unique circumstances for different properties. He repeated the neighborhood condition (right-of-way) is one of those. He stated the language of condition #5 is that the applicant will continue to work with Staff to come to a solution. He referred to the last review with the Commission when they discussed the intended Penzone Campus. He said one of the components that came up in that discussion was the fact that the existing entry drive to the existing salon, which they are utilizing for the new salon, falls pretty much in the same location where a right-of-way or a connecting road would or should go. He said it is everyone's intent on the design side to develop the entry so it has the look and feel of the conditions implied when it comes to the neighborhood streets. He said they are concerned with the passage through the campus into the Greystone Mews. He said they would like to allow connectivity to the community in the way of pedestrian or bicycle access; they are opposed to vehicular access. He said the road could disrupt pedestrian traffic amongst the buildings of the Penzone Campus. He said they envision a very walkable, outdoor campus.

Mr. Meyers presented some renderings, material samples, and a model of the proposed building.

Chris Brown asked if the Commission has any authority over that right-of-way. Phil Hartmann said we have been through this issue pursuant to the Bridge Street Code and a Thoroughfare Plan that required these blocks as determined by Engineering to create connectivity and approved by City Council. He recommended the Commission follow these plans because that is what City Council does. He said the applicant has a right to appeal to City Council as this is beyond this Board's concerns.

Ms. Salay asked what the applicant plans to do with the western façade.

Mr. Meyers explained that the west elevation internally is where the spa portion of the business is located including massage and treatment rooms that require privacy and darkness. He said the landscaping at the south and west corner wraps the parking. He said one of the urban conditions was to bring the parking and the hardscape at the walk area right up to the façade. He said they could introduce foundation base planting and more vertical landscaping to help minimize the solid appearance. He emphasized the result is really the impact of what is happening internally.

Ms. Salay agreed some landscaping and vertical elements could help disguise the west wall.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about past materials presented as she is no longer seeing all the planters and such and the landscaping seems to be considerably less than before. Mr. Meyers said they were still in the plans.

Mr. Cutler said he wanted to readdress the conditions as he believes the Commission has power per the Charter, Zoning Code, and Bridge Street Corridor Plan. He said the block and street requirement is a planning tool and the Thoroughfare Plan attempted to be attached to that is again part of a planning tool so therefore, he believes the Commission has the authority to act on that and at a minimum the applicant would like the Commission to voice any concerns about the fifth condition regarding the right-of-way dedication.

Bob Miller inquired about the parapet height changes and was concerned that the mechanicals would be visible. Mr. Meyers said they were 90% complete with the final engineering and all the products have been sized and specified. He explained the area wells in the roof components are designed to allow for upwards of six feet of continuous clear space above the units. He clarified there are no 18-foot cantilever walls.

Roger Ansel, 4232 Hobbs Landing Drive, W., Dublin, thanked everyone for making Dublin a wonderful place to live. He said having a roadway that would eliminate Penzone's parking that is necessary to his business, is not what they want coming into their community as they already have three access points coming into Greystone Mews. He said on paper it might have made sense but in reality it does not make any sense. He said they do not even want a bike path or pedestrian path.

Lee Breinich, 4254 Troutbrook, Dublin, said he loves the building proposed but does not want the road. He asked the Commission to vote no on this condition and obtain the opinion of City Council.

Ms. Newell said the applicant would need to bring this back in front of City Council. Mr. Hartmann confirmed it is the applicant's right to appeal that condition to Council and then Council would have a hearing just like this one. He said staff did a great job with the Planning Report and setting this up.

Joan Lastrange, 4234 Tuller Ridge Drive, in Greystone Mews, said she was in support of Mr. Penzone's proposal and supports her neighbors that believe this right-of-way is not necessary. She said she moved here a year ago just to be part of what the City is doing. She said prior to her move she read so many Council minutes. She said she also thinks this is something the Commission is capable of and since we are all here it would be nice to leave here knowing there is a possibility the Commission is against the right-of-way.

Bruce Birkholder, attorney at Issac Wiles, 2 Miranova, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the lawyer for the Dublin Village Center and the Stavroff family. He said he wanted to confirm what Mr. Penzone said is in fact accurate; the Stavroff family and Stavroff Group believe the road is unnecessary as it is a road to nowhere.

Richard Laciano, 4254 Tuller Ridge Drive in Greystone Mews said we are all against the right-of-way. He said whether the Commission does or does not have the authority to kill the right-of-way, he wanted to know the Commission's position on it and what the Commission would recommend to Council.

Phil Beckwith, Greystone Mews, said he did not have anything new to add as all the opposition had been stated but wanted to raise his voice publically to the opposition to the right-of-way for all the great reasons given.

Shelly Schwartz, 6705 Hobbs Landing Drive, E., Greystone Mews, repeated the road to nowhere leads to her front door. She said they have endured robberies and aggressive break-ins this summer and putting in this road that would come to the front door of a single girl living alone, and there are others and they

chose Greystone Mews because it was enclosed, quiet, and safe but the bubble was burst this summer when they lived in fear. She said they all now have security systems and she leaves hers on even when she is home because she is frightened. She emphasized the plan would send the road to her front door. She said she loves the services that Penzone's Salon provides and is there frequently and does not need a quicker route to get there. She asked who would use that road. She said if the road goes in, she would probably move.

Jenny Dipaolo, 6713 Hobbs Landing Drive, E., said this road would dead end into her front door and is vehemently against it. She asked when City Council approved this road.

Claudia Husak said the Street Network Map is part of the Bridge Street Code and it includes this street connection. She reported City Council approved it in 2012 and the recent updates made in 2014.

Ms. Dipaolo asked if this was a part of anything before 2012. Ms. Newell confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Dipaolo asked if this is having an impact and possibly jeopardizing her home and her ability to live there, why it was not brought forward in 2012. Ms. Newell answered it was brought forward; she said the Thoroughfare Plan and all of the Bridge Street Code has gone through many meetings in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said anyone in the City of Dublin would have had the ability to attend any of those meetings.

Ms. Salay said there were several meetings just to discuss the Thoroughfare Plan. She said they started talking about the Bridge Street concept in 2008 and have been working off of that plan ever since. She said this is the first project that our vision for a street network is running up against reality. She said when you split a property for a right-of-way the existing character of the neighborhood is changed. She said planning has been done from an ideal world and a future world. She said they expect this plan to morph but they have a grid style street pattern in the area so it is different from the rest of Dublin; it is more of a downtown and traditional block system. She confirmed it would be the Council's decision to amend the Thoroughfare Plan and allow this single property owner to get away from the right-of-way.

Ms. Dipaolo asked if there were any changes to the Thoroughfare Plan since it was approved in 2012. Ms. Husak said she was not aware of any changes.

Matt Dunlap, 1831 Roxbury Rd, Columbus, Ohio, said he is with the Charles Penzone group and he appreciates the partnership with staff. He indicated that they are one of the first applicants to be going through this process so the fact that nothing has changed yet. He said this is so early in the process of actually having realty meet Code. He pointed out that this has a real impact on people's jobs and their lives. He said he has been approached every day by professionals asking if this has been resolved yet as they want the new salon. He said he knows of one lady that will not buy a home in Greystone Mews because she does not know if this road will go through. He said he has heard the Commission state before that they are against this and he would really appreciate that kind of support and have it articulated. He said like the resident said earlier, it is frustrating to keep coming back and having the same conversations. He said it would be nice to walk away tonight knowing something was accomplished. He indicated that if Council knew of the Commission's support, they would see the logic. He concluded it is a road to nowhere, it would disrupt a corporate campus, and they are willing to have a bicycle path or pedestrian path for connectivity for a walkable community. He added Penzone's is willing to give it to the City for free but they cannot lose their parking and would have to go to a different location.

Ms. Newell said this is not one of the first applications to come before the Commission in the Bridge Street District. She said all the development along Riverside Drive has all been before the Commission and there are others.

Mr. Brown said the big issue is the right-of-way. He asked if there was anything else to address.

Ms. Newell said she was fine with the architecture and comfortable with the condition being added in terms of the landscape. She said the only issue for her on the table is the right-of-way.

Mr. Brown agreed the west elevation should have foundation planting to soften that side. He said he is very pleased with everything else proposed.

Ms. De Rosa suggested some artistic application to that wall as well to add interest because that is a trademark of Charles Penzone brand. She clarified it is not signage but an art treatment in front of the wall.

Mr. Brown said this body is subservient to City Council; they appoint the Commissioners and they in turn make recommendations to them on some issues that do not fall under the Commission's final authority. He said the Commission does not have final authority over the street grid and asked how we could get Council's attention. He suggested a fourth motion that the Commission recommends Council to review that particular right-of-way.

Ms. Husak said it is up to the applicant to appeal the Commission's decision. Mr. Hartman said it would be appropriate to make a motion that the Commission recommends an appeal.

Mr. Brown said sometimes the City thinks really long term and sometimes you preserve the right to do something so it is not necessarily done, especially while Greystone Mews sits there. He said it is possible that 100 years from now, someone buys it all up and erects a tower so the City can preserve that right. He said he does not see the City cutting a street through there in the short term but it is part of the plan to preserve that opportunity.

Ms. Newell indicated she has been on the Commission longer than the others and had participated in the Thoroughfare Plan. She says now she does not see how it would benefit the neighborhood given the various development that has come through but believes we need to be respectful of the Thoroughfare Plan. She encouraged the applicant and the residents to state their opinions in front of City Council.

Ms. De Rosa agreed that when long range planning was conceived, logic dictated that a number of street crossings were needed for appropriate block size. She said when reality and this opportunity is put forth, it does indicate that Planning may have not been connected to reality because of this particular outcome. She agreed it does not make sense to put the road through there and recommended Council consider that as well.

Steve Stidhem said Greystone Mews is a great area. He said the street does not make sense and does not like a road that would end in someone's front yard. He indicated that in the future, he predicts that parking will not be needed as technology will change.

Mr. Miller said he was 100% in agreement. He said in alignment with the residents, the right-of-way does not make sense and encouraged Council to take this under advisement. He indicated that he anticipates Council to apply the same type of logic the Commission has applied here; the Commission does not have the authority to make that change. He said he sees no value for that road to run through this property.

Ms. Salay said right now the road does not make sense but Council may want to preserve the right for the future. She said Council listens to their residents and are sensitive to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Brown said if the Parking Plan is approved as shown, the area in question is shown as parking and not a roadway.

Ms. Newell inquired about past development in terms of block Waivers. She asked why this case is perceived as different as those prior. Ms. Husak said she thought the block Waivers granted were for roads that were near but the blocks did not quite meet the size requirements. She said there was no elimination of roadways. Ms. Newell recalled a different scenario.

Mr. Hartmann said he did not recall that; he remembers roads being shifted. He clarified that if the condition is passed, the applicant has 20 days to appeal and then Council would have to hear that within 21 days.

Mr. Cutler said he appreciated all the support.

Mr. Hartman said the Street Network Map is not a flexible tool like the Community Plan; it is actually Code that was passed by Council that established the roadway connectivity.

Ms. Burchett said staff agrees the location is not specific to what is shown on the paper and that is why the condition stipulates working with staff to determine the location for the right-of-way. She clarified that there is a list of items staff can pursue Waivers for and there others that are not eligible.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Parking Plan:

To permit 85 spaces, which is 54 spaces over the maximum of 31 spaces permitted.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the following 8 Waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Lots and Blocks - Maximum Block Length - 500-feet (required); ±1,020-feet (requested).
2. §153.060(C)(2)(a) - Lots and Blocks - Maximum Block Perimeter - 1,750 feet (required); ±2,750 feet (requested).
3. §153.062(D)(1) - Roof Type - Parapet Height - shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet in height (required); parapet height varies from less than 2-feet to ±17.67 feet in height (requested).
4. §153.062(E)(2)(a) – Façade Material Transitions – Vertical transition shall occur at inside corners (required); east elevations on the same plane (requested).
5. §153.062(J) – Treatments at Terminal Vistas – Treatments shall be incorporated to terminate the view: a tower, a bay window, courtyard with sculpture, pronounced increase in building height, or other similar treatment incorporating a distinct vertical element (required); sculptural entry (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building Type – Blank Wall limitations – No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (required); blank walls on elevations (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building Type – Vertical Increments – No greater than every 40 feet (required); south elevation (±65 feet), west elevation (±50-feet), and east elevation (±80 feet) (requested).

8. §153.062(O)(4) – Loft Building Type – Primary Materials. The materials to be a minimum of 80% (required). West Elevation: ±50%; North Elevation: ±70%; East Elevation: ±55%; and South Elevation: ±60% (requested).

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Site Plan Review with 7 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide construction details of the surface parking lot and loading area prior to building permit issuance;
- 2) That the applicant provide retaining wall details or spot elevations of the retaining wall proposed for the parking area along the western property line to ensure compliance with the provisions of §153.065(1)(b)1-2: Fence and Wall Height and Opacity prior to building permit issuance;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to ensure compliance with exterior lighting requirements of §153.065(F)(1)-(12) – Site Development Standards – Exterior Lighting prior to building permit issuance;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure safe pedestrian circulation prior to building permit issuance;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to determine the location of the neighborhood street right-of-way dedication, at no cost to the City;
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with staff to satisfy landscaping requirements prior to building permit issuance; and
- 7) That the applicant include vertical landscape elements to diminish the view of the blank walls on the west elevation.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to recommend the applicant appeal the designated grid pattern to City Council for review. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**3. I-270/Tuttle PCD, Subarea 4A - Men's Wearhouse 16-078CU 5170 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal to request the general merchandise use for an existing 6,000-square-foot building on a ±2-acre parcel on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and northeast of the intersection with Blazer Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Claudia Husak presented the aerial view of the site. She explained the development text includes limited uses that are permitted. She explained that retail other than cell phones and a couple of items in the permitted section of retail uses and retail of clothing was not.

Amy Salay indicated the site is awkward and structures are shoe-horned in. She inquired about parking for retail operations when there are 12 – 15 employees working at one time. She said the McDonald's lot is very busy. She said if this business is successful, she anticipates a lot of parking conflicts. She concluded there just is not that much parking for that location.

Ms. Salay asked if the retail site is 6,000 square feet, how many parking spaces would be required. Ms. Husak answered that the Zoning Code would require 40 spaces but the development text is different.

Ms. Salay said it appears there are 28 spaces around the building. She indicated it seems as though we are shy of parking and always have been.

Steve Stidhem indicated the Verizon store probably did not have as many employees.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the connectivity.

Chris Brown said he has never had an issue parking there as a customer.

Ms. Husak did not interpret that the maximum number of employees would ever be there at the same time.

Sam Barnes, 30503 Salem Drive, Bay Village, Ohio, said he did not know much about the operation. He indicated parking would be far less intensive than the Verizon store. He said McDonald's business has changed greatly over the years too; most of their business (75%) is drive-through. He said the peak hours are in the morning and will offset the hours of operation for Men's Wearhouse. He said McDonald's evening business is not that great with the drive-through as their primary business. He noted there are 30 parking spaces associated with the multi-tenant building and there is other common area parking as well. He said McDonald's employees used to park off-site and many do not drive but rather take the bus.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building C2, Cap City Diner  
16-080WR**

**6640 Riverside Drive  
Waiver Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the installation of operable weather screens at a new restaurant on the first floor of building C2 of Bridge Park on the east side of Riverside Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the project site. She explained the applicant is requesting a Waiver Review for a material that is not permitted within the Bridge Street District. She said the applicant is proposing the use of weather screens, which will surround the outdoor patio space and be used during inclement weather and also during peak sun exposure. She said this screen would be mounted to the underside of the patio ceiling and also raised and lowered through a metal track. She stated the proposed material is a clear plastic panel, edged with a woven acrylic wrap fabric.

Ms. Burchett presented graphics of the patio space with the screens both raised and lowered. She said the applicant has provided examples of the material in other locations, which include the Rusty Bucket in the Easton Town Center.

Ms. Burchett said staff and the ART reviewed this request against the review criteria and determined the criteria were not met, therefore recommended disapproval of the Waiver.

David Miller, 515 Park Street, said he is the president of Cameron Mitchell Restaurants and they have been in business together about 20 years. He said between the vision of staff and Crawford Hoying Development Partners, they could not be more excited. He said they look at this location as a true destination for many years to come. He noted Cameron Mitchell has committed to three projects in this Bridge Street development. He said that should show the confidence they have in the City and Crawford Hoying to deliver a great product. He said he understands there are guidelines set that the Commission feels the applicant could utilize to design their patio. He said he has built over 70 restaurants with Cameron Mitchell and has been involved in the design for every single one of them since Martini, which is their third restaurant. He said he has learned over the years how to create a great ambiance and a warm and inviting environment. He stated they have designed many terraces and patios from Beverly Hills, CA to Boston, MA, to Naples, FL, to Dallas, TX, and everywhere in between. He indicated one thing he has learned about outdoor dining is guests love it and it creates such a synergy and energy to the restaurant's ultimate success. He explained they go through careful planning to provide an environment and take the intensity and the passion that they take to design their menu, the quality of product they put on their plates, to designing their patios.

Mr. Miller said he wants the Commission to consider what they have proposed in creating an outdoor environment that is truly open and transparent when it needs to be but has the opportunity to protect the guests when there is inclement weather. He restated they have done this in many communities; he referenced the Hudson 29 in New Albany, Ohio, and said they want to do exactly what they are showing here. He said New Albany was not excited about it initially either but once they convinced them the outdoor restaurant space would complement the buildings around, they accepted it and the terrace has become their biggest success at that location. He referenced Easton Town Center for incorporating restaurants amidst the retail to bring activity, excitement, energy, and the people on the street. He said patios and terraces provide a great urban environment in a suburban market. He said they have had great success with the Ocean Club at Easton for years. He concluded the patio is such an important element to Cameron Mitchell Restaurants that if they cannot build it right, they will not build it.

Randy Roberty, Design Collective, 151 E. Nationwide Boulevard, said he would speak to the qualities of the product itself. He said a lot of the issues with these screens seem to come from the fear of the material - the clear vinyl insets. He said they view these screens as more of an umbrella or awning type product rather than a building material because they are brought in after the building is already constructed and attached simply to the structure itself. He indicated they function as an umbrella would; raise and lower an umbrella to shield off and fend off the weather. He said it functions as a piece of furniture and an accessory. He explained the perimeter of the screens is a woven acrylic so they have eliminated the visible vinyl. He said the woven acrylic is approved all through Dublin via awnings and umbrellas. He said the clear vinyl itself is a high end, marine grade vinyl that does not yellow as seen in the lower end products. He stated Cameron Mitchell runs high end restaurants and they will not allow the screens to decay or look bad; they have a reputation and standards they are trying to maintain.

Cathy De Rosa asked if the proposed application is the same as what is at the Ocean Club today. Mr. Roberty answered it was but the difference is the Ocean Club is entirely vinyl, including the perimeter.

Bob Miller asked what other materials the applicant vetted for this location considering it is a prime spot for this development. Mr. Roberty said there are a lot of other options but not as flexible as this application. He said a more permanent solution would be a garage door, a NanaWall, an operable wall, or some sort of window system but the down size to those are you are no longer creating a patio but an interior addition at that point. He said all of those alternatives are going to require foundations, a wall below them, significant jams, or wall systems stack into nested panels so that takes up a significant amount of space. He said the clear site lines would be lost. He said they want an open patio that feels like a patio and has that energy and appeal to the guests.

Mr. Roberty presented the mock-up of the proposed product and explained it would nest behind the structure of the patio canopy so they would not be visible when raised, going away entirely.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the intent was to use the patio year round. Mr. Roberty answered he did not as the thin fabric will not do much to shield guests from the cold. He said the season would extend into the fall and early spring.

Steve Stidhem asked if there are heaters in the patio area. Mr. Roberty answered there are electric heaters for cooler days but will not provide enough heat in the dead of winter.

Victoria Newell asked if they intend to keep those closed all winter long. Mr. Roberty answered no, they would be raised up and maintained up as much as possible to keep this patio open. He said the primary function is to shield guests from weather. He said if the patio is full of 66 guests the screens can be lowered if a storm blows in. He said evacuating a patio is not a recipe for success.

Chris Brown asked if the screens would only be used if diners were present and not to close up the space at night or off business hours. Mr. Roberty answered that was correct.

Ms. De Rosa said she thought the screen at the Ocean Club was up pretty much year round. She said she has eaten in that patio in December. Mr. Miller said the screens are manual roll-ups at the Ocean Club that they did many years ago. He said the system they are proposing is the latest and greatest and it has been used the past couple of years. He said it is sophisticated with clean lines. He said with this system, you do not hardly know they are there unless they are lowered.

Ms. De Rosa said the screens at the Ocean Club in December do not work very well.

Mr. Miller said there are planter boxes at the base so it is not an insulated wall. He said the screens would be used 7 – 8 months per year and not for 3 – 4 months.

Amy Salay inquired how this product would shield from sunlight and direct sun on a western exposure. Mr. Roberty said typically there is a separate roller shade installed on the inside of this that would be similar to what you would see in a window to be raised and lowered to function in conjunction with this.

Ms. Salay clarified there is a separate product not being shown. Mr. Roberty said it is part of this system.

Ms. Newell asked if he was speaking about a Mecho shade to which he answered affirmatively.

Ms. Newell explained the Mecho shades have small perforations in them so they have percentages of opacity to them. She said when the screen is down, you can still see images through the screen.

Mr. Roberty said they are installed at the Rusty Bucket in Dublin.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the replacement cycle. Mr. Roberty answered typically 5 years.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said they are really happy to have Cap City as part of the development. He said Crawford Hoying is fully in support of the proposal and they have full confidence in them as operators to ensure this is quality, top-notch addition to the development. He said he likes that they are bringing expertise for patio environments to the Bridge Street project.

Ms. De Rosa asked if it is possible to say from this month to this month it is not allowed. She said it is not necessarily a good-looking product. She said if the goal is to only have these up during inclement weather, if limiting the time frame is possible.

Phil Hartmann said he thought time limits could be an option but the conditions need to be carefully crafted.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there were already rules in place about outdoor furniture in the winter. Ms. Salay said there are. She said they used to talk about required storage of outdoor furniture from November through April for example but then they started having these nice falls and the time extended into the Christmas season. She said they heard from restaurant owners wanting to have the furniture out for whenever they have a nice day. She indicated patio furniture is out most of the time in downtown Dublin.

Vince Papsidero said the Code prohibits outdoor furniture in the winter/off season in the BSD. He said the action tonight is to approve this as well as the conditions. He said they will take that into the Code update because this would be setting a new standard as this material is not permitted in the BSD, anywhere.

Ms. Salay asked what staff would suggest for a situation like this. She asked for an alternative material because the vinyl is not the most beautiful product in the world.

Claudia Husak indicated staff discussed how there are numerous patios within the City that have operated apparently successfully and dealt with the seasons and the only request that ever went forward along those lines was for Montgomery Inn and ended up with a more four-season room after appearing in front of the Commission. She said they had discussed the NanaWalls that even the developer is looking at for other patio spaces. She said they either wanted a more permanent type NanaWall system or do what everyone else does.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the NanaWall system. Ms. Newell said it is a name of a manufacturer but basically it is moveable wall partitions made of glass framed in wood or metal. She said they can slide across each other or accordion in.

Mr. Brown said the downside of that is that it is always there and it is a four-season room. Ms. Newell added it requires stacking space so when it is open those panels have to sit someplace.

Mr. Brown said he loves patio spaces; he would rather dine outside than in. He said this is the perfect location for a patio, being able to look over the whole park and see the pedestrian bridge. He indicated that is the best vinyl system he has seen, given it is in a track and not woven or laced around a pipe but it is still a vinyl product that he struggles with, particularly that location right on Riverside Drive.

Mr. Miller said they have a restaurant on Camden, which is a half a block from Rodeo Drive. He said they received similar comments like this when they approached them. He said we like Commissions because they have a bigger vision of what is happening than just allowing anybody to come in and build what they want. He said their standards were high and were able to get them over the hump as well. He said today it has been voted the best terrace of Beverly Hills, CA and now they have set precedent that others are following. He emphasized that pedestrian activity that is happening on the streets is what they want there. He said he understands the Commission's concerns but they have spent several hundreds of thousands of dollars on these systems all over the country. He said they actually found this system in Dallas, TX from a gentleman that did a lot of work on yachts. He said the vinyl lasts a long time and does not crack or fade. He ensured the Commission that if the system at the Ocean Club starts to break down, he is replacing it but realizes that not everyone has their high standards. He indicated that once you set precedent, you have to have ways to manage it.

Ms. De Rosa said we do not specify manufacturers but vinyl is vinyl.

Mr. Papsidero said staff would work at ways to define specifications that match whatever this material is in terms of thickness, color, edging, and replacement cycle, etc.

Ms. De Rosa asked if it would be realistically enforceable by staff to manage these.

Mr. Papsidero said it would need to be something that is easily administered and everybody was to do that.

Mr. Brown said there would need to be a definition of when they are rolled up and concealed versus when they are permitted to be down so it is during customer hours, when the temperature is over X or inclement weather so they are not down all the time.

Mr. Papsidero said they could meet reasonable standards but could not monitor temperature. He said some will be complaint driven as the City is not going to send Code Enforcement Officers out there to monitor the use of these screens.

Ms. Newell inquired about setting precedent since this is a restaurant. She said there will be a lot of different uses in Bridge Street and if granting a Waiver would apply to everybody.

Mr. Papsidero said without changing the Code, any other retail would want to use similar material that would require they request a Waiver. He said the ART would not go beyond that and would follow the same process.

Ms. Newell asked what would be wrong with that process. Mr. Papsidero explained that once the precedent is set by the Commission you would be hard pressed to deny a request. Mr. Hartmann said he totally agreed. He said he would be concerned but conditions can be set like how long they can be lowered and things of that nature.

Ms. Newell said the quality of materials would need to be stipulated and a manual system could not be permitted. Other possible conditions to consider were discussed by the Commission.

Mr. Brown noted that businesses in Old Dublin do not have that luxury.

Ms. Newell said she was also considering all other patios, not necessarily just those in the BSD.

Ms. Salay referred to the picture with the metal frame and asked for clarification on the system and materials.

Mr. Miller said he was not sure he could agree because he sees where staff decided criteria was not met. He said he is considering the amount of traffic that will go by that location and the importance of the integrity of the whole development. He said he cannot get past the fact there are solutions that can be put in place but are probably going to be much more expensive than what is being proposed. He said the precedence that would be set across the rest of the development is a problem and asking the City to regulate when these screens are up or down and when they are replaced does not seem reasonable.

Ms. Newell agreed that was a good point.

Mr. Brown said he does not disagree with Mr. Miller but he has considered how garage doors or NanaWalls would appear. He said he would rather have it open.

Mr. Miller said that whole elevation faces west; there will be the need to have some sort of sun screen. He said otherwise the space could not be used in July or August because the space would be too hot. He indicated he did not know what the solutions are but is not real keen on the vinyl.

Ms. Newell said there are other spaces that face the sun and they do not have any more shelter with an awning or no awning at all.

Ms. De Rosa said she is considering the vibrancy this could create in the very edges of the season. She indicated people do like to be outside with a streetscape and see activity. She said she is not certain this is the right material but finding something would be beneficial.

Ms. Newell said she agrees with Mr. Brown but once we do it here, we have opened that up everywhere, across the City, so we need to ask ourselves, if we are going to allow it at this location, we will invariably be allowing it at all patio locations.

Ms. Salay asked how we are going to feel about this everywhere in the Historic District. Ms. Newell said that is what she is struggling with. She said she loves the energy and wants everybody out on the patio and indicated we will end up with this potentially everywhere.

Ms. Newell said she did not feel further discussion this evening would get them any closer to a decision.

Brent Crawford, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, said as a landlord, they are very concerned about the look of the patio as well but they are very much for the screens. After going to see this in lots of different locations and finding the most successful ones have this in the country so it is not an unusual thing. He said if it is a beautiful, 70-degree day and the sun is not shining directly on the patio guests, therefore, the City would not want to see the screens down but if it is a driving rainstorm he does not think the people driving by would be concerned and people would not be walking on the street at that point. He thinks this will be a limited number of days per year this will happen. He said he wants the restaurants to be as successful as they can and to take away those days is a decent amount of revenue over time. Knowing lots of the other restaurant owners in Dublin, he said if they had the ability to do it they would. He said he knows they are successful otherwise but there is a reason Tucci's puts their big tents out on occasion on their patios; they want to pick up additional days whether it be sun or rain or whatever the case may be.

Mr. Crawford said if this is not approved, they would be obligated to tell potential tenants this type of cover would not be permitted and indicated that could be an issue for them, leasing to other tenants and some of the negotiations they have going on now.

Ms. De Rosa said Mr. Crawford said it would only be down during rainstorms so what about days to protect guests from the western sun exposure. Mr. Crawford said the sun as well. Ms. De Rosa said that would cover June, July, and August. Mr. Crawford said at 6 - 7 pm the patio will be in direct sun right into the side of that building so something would need to be there. Ms. De Rosa confirmed that is not really a limited time, to be clear.

Mr. Crawford reminded the Commission that there is a sun screen behind the acrylic.

Ms. Newell inquired about the opacity of the Mecho shades proposed. Mr. Roberty answered they have not yet determined the opacity, specifically.

Ms. Newell said when it is at a lower opacity, there will be more visual site through it; from a distance, one could still see people sitting there and see into the space but it still provides some effective sunscreen control. She said the higher that is, it will start to become like a blackout screen. She encouraged the applicant that if this product is something they are going to entertain for approval, that opacity needs to be down low at the 10 – 20% range. Mr. Roberty agreed. She added you will want to have that connection with the activity both from the outside and within the patio.

Mr. Roberty said they would use a combination of the drop screen and the Mecho shade to combat the concern of it being down too frequently. He restated this is a dual roller system.

Ms. Newell asked how Staff would condition this so the screens would not be down all the time. Mr. Hartmann said we have been through this with different products. He thought maybe this would need to be self-policing. Ms. Newell said the screens are automated so it is just a matter of flipping the switch. Mr. Hartmann said coming up with temperatures to regulate this would be tough for Code Enforcement.

Ms. Newell also pointed out that her fellow Commissioners have stated the concern about times when it is 11 pm at night and the restaurant is now closing for the evening, they need to be up and that needs to be clear. She said she aligns this with the regulations that call for businesses to have their lights turned off at a certain time. She cited the auto dealerships as an example where they are asked to turn off their lobby lights at a specific hour at night unless they are still conducting business.

Mr. Brown said it is actually defined when the patio is in use. He said if there are no customers out there, the screens are to be up.

Mr. Stidhem said he did not think Staff could condition it by dates.

Mr. Papsidero stated Staff has not heard about this sunshade until now, during this meeting. Ms. Salay noted there are no graphics showing the sun shades.

Mr. Roberty said he thought the sun shades were listed on the original plans submitted for the ART.

The Chair said the applicant has the ability to ask the Commission to table this proposal this evening to allow them to bring the sun shade in and show her fellow Commissioners that do not know what a Mecha shade looks like.

Mr. Roberty said they would like to table it and get a mach up of the sun shade as well, defining the opacity.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the request of the applicant to table the Waiver Review case. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **5. Shier Rings Roadway Corridor Character Study 13-073ADM**

#### **Administrative Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a roadway character study defining the future character of the Shier Rings Road corridor between Cosgray Road and Shamrock Court. Development character and transportation network recommendations to guide future public and private improvements along this roadway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a new Area Plan as an addition to the Community Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.234.

Joanne Shelly said she gave the Commission an overview of the plan in August. She ran through her presentation again.

Ms. Shelly said Shier Rings is one of the commercial corridors with mixed-use industrial, commercial, and warehouse uses, adjacent to some residential areas. She presented a map of the study area and explained the purpose is to provide policy and general design guidance for future roadway and land use improvements in the Shier Rings Corridor. She presented the project process and the goal is to get it adopted. She reported since she presented this the last time to the Commission, staff held an open house stakeholder meeting and a few comments were received primarily from residents at Ballantrae who were concerned about what was going to happen at their end of the corridor. She said the City is entertaining some opportunities with the West Innovation District. She said most people were happy to see the shared-use path and the sidewalks being more firmly implemented when development occurs.

Ms. Shelly said this study includes several business corridors and each of those have their own character and this is just a way to unify the road itself. She presented the analysis and explained there are two types of landscapes (wooded, and more manicured). She said historic homes are mixed in with office industrial. She stated the goal is to complete all the incomplete paths and provide the multi-use path system prevalent in the rest of the City. She said the recommendation is to expand the right-of-ways when necessary as determined by traffic studies.

Ms. Shelly said this will demonstrate to the potential developers the City's long range view of how property should be developed with regards to design, visual characters, and details will be implemented on a case by case basis.

Ms. Shelly said Planning is requesting that the Commission recommend approval to City Council of the Shier Rings Road Corridor Character Study for adoption as an amendment to the Dublin Community Plan.

Cathy De Rosa said it is very well prepared. She inquired about shared use lanes and bike lanes on the street. Ms. Shelly explained the shared use paths are an asphalt surface whereas sidewalks are concrete and slightly narrower and not as conducive to riding a bike. She said on one side of the street should be a shared use path and on the other side of the street there would be a sidewalk. She explained that the "bike paths" in the road Ms. De Rosa is referring to are actually sharrows, which are shared lanes; the standard street width is expanded to an additional four or five feet to accommodate a vehicle passing a bike if the bike so chooses to use the roadway. In the state of Ohio, she said a bike is legally allowed to use the road and occupy a lane so this allows the bike and a vehicle to share a lane when the vehicle wants to overtake the bicycles, for safety.

Mr. Brown indicated serious cyclists will not use the multi-use paths.

Ms. Shelly said there are four levels of comfort for cyclists:

1. Those that will never ride their bike in the roadway;
2. Those that will ride their bike in certain places like their neighborhood streets;
3. Those that are comfortable in a dedicated bike lane; and
4. Those that will go anywhere anytime.

Ms. Shelly said that through the Mobility Study, they plan to take people out on bike trips to show how to occupy a lane properly and talk about what are the right decisions moving forward in the future for bicycles as a form of transportation mode for our community; it does not work the same in every community. She said for Shier Rings specifically, there is a lot of truck traffic. She said there is an opportunity for a sharrow but for comfort level, they will probably just do a shared use path.

Ms. Shelly said the plan is to do a shared use path on the south side of the street and a sidewalk on the north side of the street and this would be consistent for the whole corridor and implemented as a site is developed.

Mr. Brown said given the current character, he is surprised a sidewalk is proposed as well as the multi-use path just because it is a more industrial area. He said he does not see people walking building to building.

Ms. Shelly said the thought is that if the paths are available, more people would use them.

Ms. Salay said she would like to see more landscaping around these large industrial buildings. Ms. Shelly said the document states new development needs to provide landscaping for the part of the building that faces the street at a pedestrian scale. She said beyond that would require a Code Amendment.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. De Rosa motioned, Mr. Brown seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Administrative Review of the Shier Rings Character Study with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Communications**

Vince Papsidero said there will be a Council Work Session on the West Innovation District and Area Master Plan. He said updates are being provided to Council and the Commission is welcome to attend. He noted the Area Master Plan for review and recommendation will be on the Commission's November 10<sup>th</sup> agenda.

Mr. Papsidero stated there will be a shared Board training for the Chairs and Vice Chairs on October 25 and BZA training is slated for that evening.

Mr. Papsidero said they are scheduling a combined training session for the Commission and the ARB on November 3, 2016, for an Informal Review of the Basic Plan for Riverside Park before it is considered by Council.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 1, 2016.