



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 4, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. Village at Coffman Park, Phase 3** **Post Road**
15-116AFDP **Informal Review (Discussion Only)**

- 2. NE Quad, Subarea 3, Wyandotte Woods PUD – Hawthorne Commons**
15-118FDP **Wyandotte Woods Boulevard**
Final Development Plan (Tabled 7 – 0)

- 3. Vet Clinic** **6131 Avery Road**
16-005CU **Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)**

- 4. McKittrick PUD, Subarea 1** **5165 Emerald Parkway**
16-006AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:31 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, Jennifer Rauch, Claudia Husak, Michael Hendershot, Alan Perkins, Logan Stang, Marie Downie, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, 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.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, read the case procedures and determined that cases 3 and 4 are eligible for consent. Ms. De Rosa said she had a quick question for case 4.

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said she wanted to take cases in the following order 3, 4, 2, and 1 because she believes the majority of the audience is present for case 2. [Minutes reflect the published agenda order.]

- 1. Village at Coffman Park, Phase 3** **Post Road**
15-116AFDP **Informal Review**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for informal review and feedback for a future Amended Final Development Plan for a residential development of 41 condominium units and all associated site improvements on the remaining 9.5-acre vacant parcel as part of the Village at Coffman Park residential development south of Post Road, east of Discovery Boulevard and north of Wall Street. She said the Commission will not take a vote tonight on this application.

Logan Stang presented the proposal and said Staff has outlined questions for the Commission to consider, focused on architecture and site layout. He said the Final Development Plan was approved in 2005 for 66 detached condominium units, which also included the three live/work units and a community center. He presented Phase 1 that exists on the site today including 11 condominium units and the community center. He presented Phase 2 that is 11 proposed condominium units per the approved Final Development Plan. He explained it is currently at the building permit stage where two have been issued and work has started on the site. He presented Phase 3 that is the focus of this application this evening. He said the proposal is for 41 detached condominium units; the original approval was for 43, including three live/work units.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed layout and explained the applicant is going to focus on unit layout, open space, and pedestrian circulation. He illustrated the replacement of the three live/work units for regular condominium units, which does not have a large impact on the site. He demonstrated the loss of two units and two large open spaces related to the creation of loop roads as opposed to the alleys proposed. At the time of the original approval, he explained the developer dedicated the parkland just north of this property along Post Road, which met the open space requirements and that any additional open space would be a private amenity, however, Staff is still concerned with the loss of this private community amenity. He said the original approval had two pedestrian connections to the parkland. He noted that one is removed from the northeast corner but access from the other connection is more challenging for the residents to reach the parkland as well as the multi-use path. He pointed out where the pedestrian crossing conflicts with vehicles.

Mr. Stang said the applicant has provided revised architecture drawings after the packets were delivered to the Commission. He said they have a presentation available if the Commission would like to review them tonight, however he will cover what was originally proposed.

Mr. Stang presented three models with a number of elevation options for the 41 units. He said Staff is concerned with lack of diversity, especially since the first two phases that encompass 22 units had five different models to choose from, all with elevation options.

Mr. Stang presented the existing units, 1.5 – 2 stories in height where the exterior materials define the massing compared to the proposed models that are single-story units and the exterior material changes are subtle. He said Staff is concerned with the proposed third phase that is to make the community look complete with cohesive character even with the 10-year gap difference from the last phase. He presented the existing area, which also includes the barn-like structure that is the community center and more examples of the different models proposed with pictures of a similar product at another location to illustrate how they would look lined up on the street setting.

Mr. Stang restated the questions for consideration:

1. Is the proposed layout and circulation suitable for this site?
2. Is the transition between the phases appropriate?
3. Does the proposed architecture provide enough diversity?
4. Other considerations by the Commission?

The Chair asked the Commission if they had any questions for Staff. [Hearing none.] Bob Miller requested to see the additional materials and others agreed.

Gary Smith, G2 Planning and Design, 720 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, said they are the planner and landscape architect for the client and the design team. He reported they reviewed the 45 comments received from Staff and singled out four or five to discuss this evening. He said there was an approved plan with this project but Romanelli & Hughes was not comfortable with that product that was basically designed by someone else and tried to adapt that product closer to their own. He said they questioned

the marketing needs for the live/work units and are requesting to replace those. He said their goal was to bring the architecture and site character as close as possible to what exists.

Brad Schoch, Romanelli & Hughes, 148 W. Schrock Street, Westerville, said they understand the diversity comment so they have added a unit to the proposal.

Gary Smith presented the latest revised model illustrations, which Staff has not had an opportunity to review yet including corresponding options for Benevento, Palastrina, Monitola, and Salandra models. He said they have added more stone and reviewed the product requirements that included the shutters and window boxes. He explained the photos that Mr. Stang presented earlier were from another development called Highland Lakes in Westerville, Ohio. He said they have modified the elevations to bring them closer to what was built on this site.

Chris Brown inquired about the spacing of the units. Mr. Schoch confirmed 10 feet was the space between the models shown earlier from another site and this revised plan has separations of 10 – 12 feet.

Mr. Miller asked for the reactions from the homeowners association in terms of their feedback to the applicant about the separation between the buildings.

Mr. Smith said they are working to secure a letter from the HOA and are working with the HOA to make sure they are comfortable with the plans.

Amy Salay suggested that anyone that has not visited this neighborhood should because it is delightful in terms of architecture and the level of detail is terrific. She encouraged the applicant to stay with more stone and detail like on the existing units for elevations on Post Road or Wall Street. She added end unit sides should be more detailed like the fronts.

Mr. Smith offered to program that as part of the diversity requirement by identifying those specific lots.

Claudia Husak noted there was this condition too at the original Final Development Plan about having more stone for certain locations.

Victoria Newell asked why loop roads were created deviating from the original plan.

Mr. Smith said the intent was to keep the Site Plan as close to the original as possible. He indicated they anticipate the builder's customers to be empty-nesters, retired folks that do not want to maintain a large yard, and probably not a lot of families will move in. He said visibility of the front door will be important as well as emergency services. He said they felt so strongly about it from a marketability standpoint that they were willing to lose two units out of the development to accommodate the loop. He agreed they should probably have another access.

Steve Stidhem asked if they are public streets or private. Mr. Smith answered they are all private streets and they are connected to the alley.

Chris Brown asked if this is common landscape maintenance to which Mr. Smith answered affirmatively and stated it would be accommodated by the Condominium Association.

Mr. Stidhem asked about street cleaning. Mr. Smith said they are looking at that to see if they can contract with someone.

Ms. Salay asked if this would be a separate HOA. Mr. Smith indicated it would all be the same HOA.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about green space/open space. Mr. Smith said Staff's concern was the loss of the larger open space in the northeast corner. He said it is a nice internal open space and units will have direct access to the park adjacent to the bike path.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about making connections and asked if it would go all the way to Coffman Park. Mr. Stang said there is a bike path that goes along Post Road so the connection proposed will join the bike path, through the parkland, and that would be the intention of the other connection as well.

Ms. Salay asked where the pedestrian bridge is located that goes across the creek and over into the park. Mr. Stang pointed to it.

Mr. Smith said they would be happy to put that connection back in. Mr. Miller asked why they had taken it out. Mr. Smith said they have been trying to find the right balance. Mr. Stang said at the time of the original approval, there was a lot of landscaping elements that were supposed to be installed in the parkland as part of the Post Road treatment. He reported when Staff met with the applicant on-site, some of the features did not mix with the character that is out there today so they agreed that certain elements could be altered or removed. He said in the northwest corner, there was a proposal for a small gazebo that did not connect to any of the pathways and seemed out of place with the rest of the parkland.

Mr. Brown said it was interesting because one of the first planned new towns was Seaside, FL and at the end of every street there is a connection to the beach and there is some architectural element that connects the street to the beach. He indicated he is not sure how that got approved. He said he loves the current niche with a community center. He said it is the oddest layout he has ever seen, particularly with the park to the north but none of the homes are facing it – they are facing each other, pushed together.

Mr. Smith said it is very tight and quaint and initially developed and intended to provide a 'little village' feel to mimic old downtown Dublin. He said this has been in front of the PZC maybe 12 different times.

Mr. Brown noted at the southeast corner the units all face the street and there is a nice little rhythm going but it is the little stubs of four units that has a lot of drives around it he does not care for. He said the connection to Coffman Park is very vital. He said he is interested in hearing from the current residents and how they feel about the layout. He said the architecture is a huge improvement over what they were shown previously. Mr. Smith said they would add the connections back into the proposal.

Mr. Brown asked if this was as marketable as a different layout. Mr. Smith said for the type of product it is and being close together with an alley is probably as marketable as anything else. He said the site is so linear that the only way you could do that is to turn it around and organize it in very long rows. He said when this was started, they tried to create views and captured spaces. He said if this was oriented the other way, some of that would be lost. He indicated there is not a lot more that can be done more efficiently but is not sure from a design village feel it could be done a lot better.

Deborah Mitchell asked how many units are one-story and how many are two-stories. Mr. Schoch said one is a two-story model and three models are one-story. He agreed the units on the ends will need more attention paid to the exposed sides versus ones that are sitting right up against each other.

Mr. Smith showed how the corner units could be treated a little differently on the side if they faced a road, especially for the ones that have entrances on the other side. He said there are different height elevations to create diversity and believe they can be successful at navigating a diversity matrix.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about square footage for the units. Mr. Schoch answered 2,000 – 2,400 square feet.

Mr. Smith reported the prices would range from \$450,000 – 500,000.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Gary Gray, 6022 Kenzie Lane, said he was the original applicant in 1999 and they are excited about Romanelli & Hughes coming in as they are a great company and they have done a wonderful job of responding to our concerns. He said the only thing they would have continued to talk about is the diversity matrix. He said the land planning changes are fine. He said connectivity to Post Road is a good idea, he enjoys that as it goes right past his house.

Chris Cline, 6060 Post Road, said he has lived there since 1980 and their kids had attended all the schools. Through the years, he said he has been involved in community events and the folks he was involved with are now at retirement age. He said they discuss down-sizing but not necessarily spending less money and they want it built the right way. He pointed out where his house on three acres is located with relation to this proposed site. He said the parks in this area are extraordinarily breathtaking so he said connection is most important. He could not recall why they thought the live/work units were a good idea in the beginning because it does not make a whole lot of sense so the project is probably better without them. He said primary living on the first floor is desired. He said he does not find the tight street layout as an issue and is supportive of this proposal.

Rosalinda Childers, said she is the treasurer of the Homeowner's Association of Coffman Park but does not live there. She said she was involved with Phase 1 to get the units completed. She reported she works for Charles Ruma. She said the association has not been clearly addressed throughout this whole planning process. She asked how they are going to join the new units with the existing units. She asked if it was going to become a Master Association and how it would be administered. She said the concern is right now, 11 units have the burden of the pond and clubhouse at \$375 a month for dues. She said there are not enough funds to take care of all the maintenance. She said they are earning close to \$16,000 to \$20,000 a year in a deficit so it is very important whatever the decision is, that on the end, 63 units are joined in paying for the pond, liability insurance, and maintenance of the clubhouse. She said the way they have it right now, it is not feasible. She said they have been in front of City Council and they have been good enough to help maintain the pond for the last year by mowing and relieving them of that cost but they still have the watering, irrigation, and the maintenance of the walks, etc. She said she hopes the issue will be addressed and that at the end, 63 units participate and pay dues to a Master Association or however it is going to happen.

Mr. Smith said it is absolutely their intent to join all the new homeowners with the existing association.

Mr. Smith said the sidewalk around the intersection will do exactly what Staff is requesting. He said he understands the crossing patterns and the issues with the site lines, crosswalks and stop bars.

Mr. Smith requested feedback from the Commission on the issue of lighting. He said initially, it was required that each one of the units have a post light in the front and from a safety aspect, where there was not enough light, the street lighting would supplement. He asked if coach lights on the front of the house could be used instead of a post light but still supplement with street lighting.

Ms. Newell said she is not a huge fan of lighting up the entire world with street lights and believes lighting should be subdued.

Mr. Brown asked what is in the existing section. Mr. Smith said they have five-foot post lights at the front door of every house and also a porch light. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Smith what his opinion is of that. Mr. Smith said he likes it the way it is and there is nothing higher than that. Ms. Newell said asking for a post light is different than a street light.

Mr. Stang said the development text addresses the lighting as being the lighting on the house as well as the post lighting. He said the information provided by the applicant did not propose any lighting at the time because that was one of the concerns they wanted to discuss.

Mr. Smith said it is not a deal breaker; he thought it was a preference.

Mr. Brown said he supports the existing character carried throughout the new section and Ms. Newell agreed.

Mr. Brown said they all do not necessarily have to match. He said if they fit the character of the home and it is in front of in the neighborhood, it is an accent piece.

Mr. Smith said they were worried about the intensity of the lighting but there may be other ways to deal with that.

Mr. Brown said that should also be in the design matrix so it might not be in front of every unit but a good deal of them where it is needed.

Mr. Smith said they want to stay pretty close to what the homeowner's association is looking for, too. He suggested there might be more conversation to be had here.

Mr. Stidhem said he supports post lighting and the more a neighborhood is lit the better, especially when there are already post lights in the neighborhood.

Mr. Smith said Mr. Hughes said they will do that since it is the general consensus.

Ms. Newell encouraged the applicant to have 1.5 – 2 story structures along with the smaller ones to better match what is there. She said the applicant needs to carry the stone around to all sides of the structures; the stone base needs to be on all the units, even those that are sandwiched together. Mr. Smith indicated he thought that was more than what was required of the existing structures.

Ms. Husak said when the applicant returns for their Amended Final Development Plan they are required to show four-sided architecture of all of the elevations with all of the options the Commission would then need to approve.

Ms. Newell said overall she likes the project. She said she liked the green spaces that were removed but struggled with the benefit for the loop road. She said she is not in love with it and it seems the focus is more on the automobile rather than the pedestrian experience. She said she would like to see some of the charming character of the initial development in this phase as it does have a very "village-like" feel and provides comfortable walking even along the street and hopes that would continue with this final phase. She said she is not certain the loop roads really imparts the same feeling. She said she supported eliminating the three live/work units as this is not the right area in Dublin for them; they have been developed in the BSD.

Ms. De Rosa said she did not understand what the live/work units were but she thought it would be interesting to see a small bakery or boutique in the bottom. She indicated that was one of the interesting elements to this proposal; it contributed to the charm here. She said the current development is very charming and the applicant has done a lot of work on this phase to make it feel the same so she is supportive of the plan.

Mr. Smith said the biggest concern with the live/work units is the market value so we would end up with 38 units built in the front end of the development with the live/work units never selling. Ms. De Rosa said

she can kind of see that but thought the idea was cool for a village. As a planner, Mr. Smith said he appreciates the romance of the idea.

Ms. Mitchell said there would have to be a critical mass of retail of business for people to go there so three might be an awkward number.

Mr. Smith said in the smaller units they do work but they need to be in a downtown setting. He said that is why you see a lot of old homes converted to lawyers offices downtown.

Ms. Mitchell said she thought this plan was great. She encouraged the applicant to ensure the diversity matrix is spot on.

Ms. Salay said she was completely in favor of this. She said in a perfect world the open space would be left in but everything is a balance for her. She said more windows on the sides of units that are within 10 feet of the adjacent unit do not need additional windows.

Ms. Newell clarified she agreed about the windows but the stone water table just on the front facade is her issue. Ms. Salay agreed about the stone water tables.

Mr. Smith said the landscaping wraps the corner and almost come together at the corners so there will not be unfettered visibility between the buildings.

Mr. Brown referred to the upper left-hand corner of the model that had a three-bay window. He said the stone water table should wrap around to the south because that element stands out and the one to the right is clabbered with the stone water table and that should wrap around as well. He said there is nothing worse than seeing an architectural element pop out at the front as stone or brick and then it just stops when it returns. He loves the neighborhood and how the houses were modified; he said the diversity is important and is confident they will create a good matrix for it. He encouraged the applicant to continue the intent of the original development, whether that is post lights, carriage lights, mailboxes, or the walkways; it should respond like a single neighborhood. He said he does not know of any product in Columbus that has these Romanelli & Hughes lot lines. He said he lived in one in Indianapolis where the one wall was blank but landscaped for the neighbors view; he had a front, back, and one side yard and it was wonderful. He said he does not understand why that does not occur more because he could be looking at a blank wall with trees and other elements rather than looking in his neighbor's window. He understands our Code does not encourage that but he asked the applicant to consider that and bring something forward.

Mr. Smith said the real advantage to that is because it is really hard to make use of two, six-foot side yards so when you can move that building over to the property line, what you gain is 12 feet of your yard you can then do something with.

Mr. Smith concluded by stating the applicant received a lot of great feedback and he thanked everyone for their time.

Ms. Husak said this will require quite a few Text Modifications due to the removal of the live/work units.

The Chair said the Commission is really looking forward to their return.

**2. NE Quad, Subarea 3, Wyandotte Woods PUD – Hawthorne Commons
15-118FDP Wyandotte Woods Boulevard
Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for 86 multi-family dwelling units for an approximately 13-acre, vacant site and all associated site improvements as part of the Wyandotte Woods neighborhood in Subarea 3 of the NE Quad Planned Unit Development District. She said the site is south of the eastern portion of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard and west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. She said this is a request for review and approval of Minor Modifications to the Development Text and a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

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

Jennifer Rauch said the zoning was approved for the Northeast Quad in the 90's. She said the Development Text permits multi-family dwelling units with a maximum density of 120 units and this proposal has 86 units. She said the Final Development Plan proposed tonight is their final step of approval.

Ms. Rauch indicated the applicant would be pursuing a tree Waiver to be forwarded to City Council separately.

Ms. Rauch said this developer has been before the Commission twice in the last year to gain feedback to refine their proposal with the latest review in November 2015 when they discussed setbacks and a proposed encroachment, buffering, and landscaping. She said the Commission wanted more specific information about the building materials. She said there was a lot of discussion regarding stormwater management for the site that included the impacts on adjacent properties and the appearance of the retention pond at the entry.

Ms. Rauch presented the aerial view of the site showing the west and south is Dublin Scioto High School, a preserve area to the east, and Wyandotte Woods single-family section to the north including the pond for stormwater management.

Ms. Rauch stated this proposal includes 86 units with 17 one-story buildings that include 1, 2, or 2-plus bedrooms within each unit. She said the main access to this development is at Wyandotte Woods Boulevard that contains a median with a sign. She said there is a main road that loops around the central portion of the development with alley access to provide driveway access to the rear of the units in the center. She said the existing retention pond is staying in its current location and an additional retention pond is proposed for the center of the site. She reported the applicant has provided alternative stormwater measures in certain areas, including pervious pavement in the clustered areas for buildings A and B.

Ms. Rauch said connectivity for pedestrian access through the single-family portion to the west to the school site was a concern discussed at the last PZC meeting. She said there will be a future access point on the eastern side that will connect to the existing bike path, altering the location to avoid negatively impacting a significant landmark tree. She said the applicant is incorporating a sidewalk around the central portion of the site with appropriate connectivity. She noted the applicant has provided elevations and renderings in the packet to show the streetscape character comparable to a single-family neighborhood. She reported Staff has worked with the applicant to identify areas where the garage doors can be grouped together to provide consolidated pavement areas to allow for larger green spaces in front of the units to eliminate the driveway, green space, driveway, green space repeating.

Ms. Rauch said the setbacks and the encroachments into the setback are 14.4 feet maximum into the 35-foot required front yard (north), 16.3 feet maximum into the 25-foot required rear yard (south), 10.1 feet maximum into the 25-foot required side yard (east), and 14.7 feet maximum into the 25-foot required side yard (west). She said the applicant is maintaining the 25-foot setback adjacent to the single-family units and included the required landscape buffer between the two uses.

Ms. Rauch said there will be modifications to stormwater management for the existing pond to be worked out between the applicant and the owner of the site (Homewood). She said they have been working to finalize the details to address everyone's concerns and expectations to produce a high quality design for this proposal. She said Staff is comfortable with the direction they are taking.

Mr. Miller asked who owned the existing pond. Ms. Rauch answered Homewood owns it and will be doing the modifications that include the installation of the plant material.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has been working with Engineering to ensure the negative impacts on the school site are minimized or non-existent. She said a condition has been added to make sure that the final details are addressed.

Ms. Rauch indicated there are several Code requirements that have to be met for this site including interior landscaping as well as buffering along the north, west, and southern boundaries containing a mix of deciduous and evergreen material at 75% summertime opacity. She noted the majority of protected trees are located in the east and southeast portion of the site. She said the proposal includes the preservation of trees in certain portions of the eastern property line, as well as seven of the existing landmark trees. She reported areas of trees that provide the most benefit to the site have been identified ensuring more landmark trees are preserved. She said the applicant will need to request a tree Waiver if there are any outstanding replacement inches that cannot be accommodated on site, or a fee paid in lieu of replacement.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has included a number of landscape walls to accommodate the grade changes on this site; Staff will continue to work with the applicant to monitor the grading and minimize the length of landscape walls, particularly on the west side of the site.

Ms. Rauch presented elevations that included more traditional garage doors and materials of stone, metal detailing, and siding. She said the applicant has provided a section view of the existing single-family homes to compare with the proposed units that include the distance between with the buffering mounding required and the height of the unit to compare the scale of the two different areas.

Ms. Rauch said the community center has a similar architectural style and uses the same materials proposed as the individual buildings of the development.

Ms. Rauch described the proposed sign as having a metal cabinet with interior illumination and a stone base that meets the Code for size, height, and location.

Ms. Rauch said there will need to be two motions and votes this evening; one for requested Text Modifications and the other for the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Rauch said two Text Modifications are recommended for approval:

1. To modify the development text to allow the buildings to encroach as follows:
 - a) 14.4 feet maximum into the 35-foot required front yard (north)
 - b) 16.3 feet maximum into the 25-foot required rear yard (south)
 - c) 10.1 feet maximum into the 25-foot required side yard (east)
 - d) 14.7 feet maximum into the 25-foot required side yard (west); and

2. To permit a modification of the previously approved architectural styles.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan as it meets the criteria and the existing development standards with nine conditions:

- 1) The changes to the elevations outlined in the report be revised prior to the building permit submission.
- 2) The applicant will be required to ensure tree replacement for the site occurs in accordance with Code or obtain approval of a tree Waiver from City Council.
- 3) The applicant will be required to further analyze site grading in order to determine whether the limits of the proposed walls can be reduced.
- 4) The owner and applicant continue to work with Staff on the final details for the entry pond to ensure the landscape design and plant materials are consistent with the remainder of the site.
- 5) The portion of landscaping located around the entry pond be completed by fall 2016 or with the occupancy of the community center building, whichever occurs first.
- 6) A fountain be added to the entry pond.
- 7) The plans be revised to address the deficiency in the interior landscape requirements and the minor changes to the landscape plan outlined in the report.
- 8) The applicant revise the proposed grading around all structures to ensure building code requirements are satisfied by providing adequate drainage away from all structures.
- 9) The applicant continue working with Engineering to address all technical comments regarding stormwater management and continue to demonstrate all stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 are met as well as not adversely impacting the school property.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Ms. Salay asked for clarification of the west property encroachment of 14.5 feet into the setback. Ms. Rauch clarified it is encroaching a maximum of 14.7 feet and the encroachment is not for the entire west side yard due to the layout of the units.

Glen Dugger, Attorney, 37 West Broad Street, representing the applicant, Treplus Communities, said the pedestrian connection is under construction and the applicant changed the translucent garage door to a garage door that is in use in the subdivision immediately to the north. He said Homewood owns the property and is selling it to Treplus. He said Treplus will own the property subject to a retention easement, which will benefit the subdivision and the City as part of the stormwater system. He said landscaping will be installed by Homewood. He said if they were to get the approval for Sections 9 and 10 then the landscape plan would have been part of the review. He said the plan shows the increase in the pond basin in anticipation of the approval of Sections 9 and 10.

Mr. Dugger said he has the entire team present to answer any questions. He said this is a one-story development with an active senior community that is compliant with the Housing For All Persons Act. He said this is not anticipated to generate any children in the Dublin school system.

Chris Brown inquired about the retention wall on the west side of the site next to the soccer fields and asked if the community or the soccer fields were higher. Mr. Dugger replied the community is slightly higher and the property falls from the north to the south ± 12 to 14 feet; part of the wall addresses the grade change.

Sean Gillilan, E.P. Ferris & Associates, 880 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said the 30-inch maximum wall faces the community and not toward the school property. He said it is needed to break the grades to allow the community minimal steps as the residents go from the garage to the sidewalks.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the timeline and responsibility for the landscaping for the retention pond. Mr. Dugger answered Staff has written a condition without reference to whose obligation it is to complete the retention pond. He said the southern portion will be the responsibility of Treplus and the remaining northern portion will be Homewood's responsibility when their approvals are obtained once enlarging the basin and providing the landscaping on the northern portion.

Ms. Rauch said the retention pond needs to be completed and however the applicant works out the details is up to them; the timing has to be defined but is due by fall 2016.

Mr. Dugger said they will have to complete it either when the community center is complete or in the fall.

Mr. Brown asked why this pond is contingent upon the approval of Sections 9 and 10.

Claudia Husak said they have submitted the applications and are expected to be reviewed by the Commission soon.

Mr. Brown asked about the railing on the decks as there appears to be a lot of railing; he asked if it is required.

Jim Bender, project architect, 3040 Riverside Drive, Upper Arlington, said the deck design is consistent with a simple and natural look. He described the decks as weather-treated wood with various profiles including molded 36-inch railings and pickets spaced four inches apart, which is an ADA compliant. He added the decks are used to focus on the water views and the other units will have patios; there are more patios than decks.

Ms. Rauch said there was a petition and letter that was submitted by the neighbors that had been provided to the Commissioners. The Chair invited the public to speak.

Jerry Kosicki, 4313 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said they had to pull together very quickly to be able to make comments. He said they received an email last week from Jane Arthur saying they will be resubmitting materials to the City with the documents coming online on Friday afternoon that did not allow for much time. He said his neighbors did gather about 100 people to sign a petition. He said he and his neighbors appreciate the responsiveness of the developers to many of their concerns they have raised over the months since this project was introduced including the movement of the trash compactors, the enhancement of the entrance road, the use of pervious pavements, underground storage of stormwater, and the preservation of landmark trees.

Mr. Kosicki said the overall size of the project, the sheer volume of construction, and the intensive use of the land have been the main concern from the start. He said the size and scope of this project has not been modified. He said the proposal is problematic because of the overall tremendous footprint the 86 units will consume. He indicated it is due to the one-story building configuration, which is essential to the developers' vision. He said when the required roads and the retention ponds are added, very little usable open space remains. He emphasized the project does not fit on this site and does not fit in their neighborhood. He said some of his neighbors contacted them to express their concerns and have described the project as unattractive and crowded, lacking sufficient open space.

Mr. Kosicki said neighbors inquired about the idea of walkability when the proposal lacks adequate sidewalks on both sides of the streets. He said if the developers want to fit the project into the neighborhood he thinks adequate sidewalks are not too much to ask. He said at their last meeting, a couple of Commissioners rejected this line of argument and one described the sidewalks on one side of the street as a perk whereas he and his neighbors disagree. He asked the Commission reconsider because it is important to the neighbors. He said his neighborhood has a wide sidewalks that connect to a path but this development does not; he said it does not seem fair and they do not like it. He said

skimping on sidewalks just makes this apartment project similar to too many other crowded and ultimately dreary oppressive apartment projects that they have seen and lived in previously.

Mr. Kosicki said previous plans included modest but usable open spaces and they have been eliminated. He said the current development plan tries to solve the overcrowded building program by splitting out the footprint of the project into areas on the periphery of the project, which is why the text modification is necessary. He said this strategy for fitting too many large buildings and other things on this site seems unprecedented and they are not familiar with any other places in Dublin where such problems have been solved in such an expedient way and it does not protect the interest of the adjacent single-family property owners. He said this proposal is simply too big for this site and should be scaled back. He said Treplus tries to protect the families immediately adjacent to the property by proposing the terrace mound, which is common where different kinds of zoning bump up against each other, but people bought their houses expecting Dublin's usual rules to be followed and imposing this project as currently described on the neighbors is unjust and the rest of the neighborhood stands with the immediately adjacent homeowners to strongly oppose this. He said that neighbors are anxious that the buildings will detract from the value of their properties. He asked that they do not add to the burden to these families. He thanked the Planning Commission for their thoughtful approach overall to the development of the City. He said they need this project to be of the highest possible quality and want to settle for nothing less and asked that they not approve the Text Modification.

Mr. Kosicki asked if the pond in the north part is being shown as modified when it is all done and how much bigger that is being proposed to the existing pond. Ms. Rauch answered the plan reflects the pond as modified.

Venkat Gundu, 4063 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, asked why the landscape wall is not consistent across for all the homes and inquired about the Text Modifications regarding set back encroachments.

Rajeev Desai, 4071 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, requested landscape improvements for all the homes and asked the Commission to oppose the modification.

Sajid Inayat, 4087 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said the footprint seems to be larger than expected. He said he wholeheartedly agreed with his neighbors. He said he is worried about the lack of open spaces. He said he has lived in different areas of Dublin for the last 19 years and this proposal seems to be one of the very special cases. He pointed out his home with respect to this project. He said it appears buildings H & F will be breathing down his neck. He again requested open space.

Brett Page, 7638 Kelly Drive, said he has been involved in this since the beginning when his house was the closest to this development. He recalled receiving notification about one month ahead of the meeting. He said he and his neighbors received notification for this meeting, last week. He noted there is a change in the notification procedure. He said they have had a long-standing relationship with Planning that included a lot of informal discussions he believes should be valued. He said they have not had any since the last meeting. He said with only a week's notice, they have been scrambling to review and identify the changes since the meeting in November 2015. He discussed the setbacks and requested a better view of what a line of multi-family units would look like built right up to the buildable line with just a mound between them and the single-family homes. He said he did not think that was typical of Dublin neighborhoods. He said even though the proposal is for a lower number of units the footprint is large. He suggested walkability issues could be solved if the site was laid out better, not so cramped and full, and sidewalks could be provided on both sides of the street. He said he understands the developers need for a certain number of units for this to be feasible but does not believe the applicant should be permitted a footprint that encroaches into the setbacks just to meet their needs financially. He asked the Commission to consider if they would like this development right in their backyard.

Kathy Harter, 7825 Holiston Court, said she is one of the trustees in Wyandotte Woods. She said when you go up the hill in our neighborhood, there is a progression and blending and that is what they are asking for here. She said at the top the trees are small but they are growing giving insight to the future. She said walkability, sidewalks, and connectivity to the paths are important to them. She said she was concerned about all the trees that will be removed and the applicant having the ability to obtain a tree Waiver. She indicated the feel of heavily wooded lots need to be preserved. She said she is also concerned about the noise levels from the high school. She said she hopes construction traffic does not come through Riverside Drive for the safety of the children.

Lisa Gray, 7810 Holiston Court, in the first phase of the development, said we built in Dublin for their great schools and a great place to raise children. She said we also count on the City to protect our investments as other building takes place. She said she is concerned that we have rules about setbacks but when a developer asks for additional space, we are putting those rules aside. She said she had a beautiful wooden swing set put in their backyard but then received a call from the City saying their swing set is two feet into the setback and it needs to be moved. She said they were still within their property line. She said they called back two weeks later to thank them for moving the swing set but said the Little Tikes castle in the backyard for the young girls should be moved. She thought that was ridiculous but the City said she chose to build in Dublin and they have rules to not only protect her investment but to protect the investments of the neighbors. She said she would be fined for every day the swing set or castle were in the setback if she did not move them. She said the Commission is asking them to accept this proposal's encroachments. She said she knew there would be additional development in their neighborhood when they built their house but she is upset that the City will break rules for developers that they expect homeowners to abide by. She emphasized the rules should be enforced for everybody; she said if not, potential homebuyers should be told that before investing in Dublin.

Sue Hutras, 7834 Silver Rose Court, in Wyandotte Woods said she agreed with everything her neighbors have said up to this point. She said the garage was the main focal point when this was first discussed and it still appears to be that way. She indicated she does not find a walk down a street appealing when garages are the first thing she sees. She said she feels sorry for the neighbors that about this development as they will lose their privacy. She said not only does this development encroach on surrounding homes but it encroaches on the athletic fields that are used all the time for lacrosse, soccer, and football.

The Chair asked if anyone else wanted to speak with regards to this case. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting.

Amy Salay indicated she struggles with this because the Commission has had multiple projects proposed for this site including apartments in four-story buildings in order to preserve the open space. She said this neighborhood is appealing for a lot of reasons; she loves the idea of a senior community that is needed in Dublin that will not produce children like a conventional apartment complex might to add strain to our school system. She indicated the one-story aspect of this project is interesting because it will not be as intrusive to the neighbors. She said she has some issues with the architecture as there is too much metal, the white trim will look stark against the chestnut, and suggested more cream and tan. She added she would prefer to see the sign externally illuminated.

Ms. Salay noted the one neighbor made a very compelling argument about the setbacks as she spoke about her children's play equipment. She said she respects the Dublin standards. She asked Staff to provide a justification for the encroachment requests.

Ms. Rauch said Staff weighed the same types of issues for appropriateness such as scale and types of use. She said the intent was to have a staggered encroachment, not the entire building encroaching in the setback.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the size of the garage doors meet the requirement for frontage in the Code. Ms. Rauch answered the garage door frontage requirement is part of the Appearance Code, which does not apply in this instance. Ms. De Rosa said she is not in love with this look either for seeing all the garage doors that would not invite walkability.

Ms. De Rosa asked if senior living is stipulated in the homeowner's agreement. Mr. Dugger said they committed in November 2015 that this would be a 55 and older community and work with the City's legal staff to ensure that is the case.

Philip Hartmann said it should be made a condition for approval.

Claudia Husak said there are legal requirements also; you cannot just categorically say it is a 55 and over community and nobody else can live there.

Mr. Dugger said that is why he is being very specific about his terminology. He said they are complying with the federal requirements, which is a very specific set of requirements and you cannot do more.

Mr. Hartmann said Mr. Dugger and he will work on the appropriate language.

Ms. De Rosa said the desire and intent is to maintain walkability and enhance that in the community. She said she is concerned with only having sidewalks on one side of the street, particularly upon entering the property. She said she would like to see conversation advance to implement that.

Mr. Dugger said he recalled the November conversation; some people on the Commission thought one side was perfectly acceptable and there were some that wanted two. He said their takeaway was that one was preferable because if you put it on the outside, ±60 different wheelchair ramps will be required to be ADA compliant.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there are opportunities to reconsider garage placement. She said if the intent is senior living walkability, does this design meet that.

Mr. Dugger said the applicant thinks it does.

Ms. De Rosa said we have heard a lot from the neighbors and she agrees this does not necessarily meet the optimal situation from the walkability perspective. She asked if there is flexibility or approach from garage door placement that could help solve this and get sidewalks on both sides of the street for improved walkability.

Mr. Dugger said they could start over. He said one of the challenges in this scenario is providing two garage spaces for every single unit, which is fairly extraordinary (18-foot garage doors). He said there is no getting around having the attached garage on the front of the unit.

Vicki Newell said she was one of the Commissioners that was supportive of the sidewalk on one side of the street. She reported we have other projects similar to this where the Commission has approved sidewalks on just one side of the street. She said her neighborhood just has one sidewalk so she is accustomed to that and would be supportive. She stated more importantly is to have the path be continuous with the movement logical to navigate the neighborhood. She said she cannot be supportive of the encroachments into the setbacks. She said the Commission has not permitted that anywhere. She said this does not meet criteria number one as she does not consider this a "minor" text modification. She said there is a lot of great merit to this proposal - built for seniors as one story and she can support the architecture but it is lacking in tree preservation. She said the proposal is to preserve the larger landmark trees but grading is still substantial and does not believe all the trees they are claiming will be preserved would survive; they are disturbing too much land. She said it is one thing to say 120 units can

go on this piece of land but the site still has to support it. She said even with 86 units, going over the setback lines and nearly clear-cutting the site is too much development on one site.

Ms. Salay said one of the speakers suggested eliminating the top row of units. She asked if that would be a possibility to provide room for play; walkability, connectivity, and open space could be obtained and moved out of the setbacks.

Mr. Dugger said the applicant is already at 71% of what is permitted. He said the units can be made smaller, becoming cheaper, and provide single-car garages. He said everything being suggested reduces the value and quality of the project. He said the "squishing out" into the setbacks occurred in one of the work sessions with Staff. He said the original plan complied with the setbacks. He said a minor encroachment was proposed to preserve more trees and manage stormwater that is problematic to this site and still end up with an economically viable project. He said they are not in the situation to ask for 86 units to settle for 75 units because they have tried to do something different and a single-story senior community has merit. He said undulating the buildings was a result of a great deal of discussion.

Ms. Salay said when that decision was made, she asked if the neighborhood was involved.

Ms. Rauch said this discussion point of the encroachment to the setback was included in the November 15th review.

Mr. Brown said he was not one who was opposed to one-sided sidewalks because he lived in a neighborhood such as that and it was predominantly older residents. He said the number of driveway cuts does not make for an inviting place to walk on that side, however. He said it is an apartment community and not a single-family home development. He said the one setback the applicant does meet is to the north, even though that is a wall of units over there but the more he looks at this site layout, he notices a lot is crammed in there. He said he understands this is a concession as this was at one time a four-story unit, trying to preserve space and going to single units more applicable to seniors. He concluded by stating he is not thrilled.

Ms. Newell suggested that once the number of units is reduced you make stormwater management better. She restated the land cannot support this quantity of units.

Mr. Brown agreed. He indicated the setback on the east side does not bother him as much as the south and west. He said a good part of the reason the Commission exists is that every standard cannot be applied to every piece of property and there is always a give and take for what is best for the community and developed to where it makes the most sense. He explained we hear those appeals and try to come up with a design solution and that is when there is a variance. He said a few less units and not impeding into the setbacks is desired but he does not know how to achieve that. He noted adding more hardscape in the way of sidewalks takes away green areas.

Deb Mitchell indicated there are a lot of things about this development she loves – architecture, boldness of the design, the need for senior housing, but her issue is not with the encroachment on the east side but it is troublesome on the other sides. She concluded by stating bravo on a lot of fronts but there is still a lot to the proposal that is problematic.

Mr. Miller said the developer did a really good job of hearing what the Commission was trying to say and bringing that forward. He said the piece the developer missed was the intensity on this piece of land. He indicated he was trying to convince himself that the encroachment on the north side made some sense but he cannot even support that because so much is jammed into this little space. He encouraged the applicant to consider going vertical to lessen the footprint; the number of units need to be decreased and this is too much in too little of a space.

Steve Stidhem said he agreed with his fellow Commissioners and the sidewalks were just fine with the exception of the northwest corner, which is really bad. He said he does not envision people from the housing units just walking around. He summarized there are too many units crammed in there and it is too crowded.

The Chair asked the applicant how he wished to proceed.

Mr. Dugger said he would like to table this proposal but said he could not assure the Commission the applicant can solve your problems with this. He said he will advise his client to endeavor to meet with Staff to do that but cannot assure the Commission they can accommodate everything that is being asked of them.

Ms. Salay encouraged the applicant to meet with the neighbors because they seem to embrace a senior community as a lovely addition to their community. She indicated it would be helpful to her if she heard the neighbors coming in to say they support this development. She said if after meeting amongst themselves, Staff, and the neighbors, at the end of the day, this just might not work out.

Mr. Miller said he supports Ms. Salay's comments. He noted just two weeks ago, the PZC received citizen input on the Bright Road Plan. He said he was impressed by how the community came together with concepts and ideas to try and find solutions.

Mr. Dugger said he has probably done close to 1,000 neighborhood meetings during his 30-year career so he is not a stranger to those and actually encourages those meetings because far too often, the people that know best are the people that live right there. He said we have gleaned from them what we otherwise did not know.

Mr. Brown addressed the neighbors and told them they were an impressive group of people, all very intelligent defending their neighborhood and property rights. He stated the owner of that property also has rights. He emphasized if the applicant meets all aspects of zoning, they have a lot of latitude to build something and you might not like that. He said it is in everyone's best interest to work together to find solutions. He encouraged the neighbors to keep an open mind. He said the applicant seems very willing to reach out and try to accommodate you and address your concerns the best they can but understand that there are ways to bypass this body if they meet all current zoning requirements and there could be a much higher density and something you don't like put in there. He thanked the neighbors for participating as it does matter.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to table the Final Development Plan at the request of the applicant. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0)

3. Vet Clinic 16-005CU

6131 Avery Road Conditional Use

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is to permit a vet clinic within an existing building zoned Suburban Office and Institutional on the west side of Avery Road, approximately 700 feet south of the intersection with Shier Rings Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. She noted the Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in. The Chair, swore in anyone intending to address the Commission with regard to this case. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use allowing a veterinary clinic to be closer to a residential zoning district than Code would permit. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes.. (Approved 7 – 0)

**4. McKitrick PUD, Subarea 1
16-006AFDP**

**5165 Emerald Parkway
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a request for a new ground sign and the re-striping of the existing parking lot for an office building in Subarea 1 of the McKitrick Planned Unit Development District. She said the site is on the south side of Emerald Parkway, east of the intersection with Coffman Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She noted the Commission is the final authority on this application and anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

The Chair asked if anyone intended to address the Commission with regard to this case. [There were none.]

Ms. De Rosa said this is a ground sign and knew that there use to be a building sign and wondered if they were not proposing a wall sign.

Linda Meneroy, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, Ohio 43054, representing the applicant, said the client has not suggested or asked for signage on the building; he just needs a ground sign for a tenant that is close to moving in.

Ms. Salay said the freeway frontage sign has a special provision in the Code that is allowed for an office tenant to be permitted a sign up to 300 feet.

Mr. Stang explained the size is dependent upon the number of stories and the setback from I-270. He said this building has four stories and is setback over 100 feet that permits a maximum of 300 square feet. He said that is what Verizon had on that building prior to this application. He said with the previous approval there was not a ground sign proposed because they only wanted the I-270 sign since the building was for the same tenant in this building and the adjacent building.

Ms. De Rosa asked what would happen if later on, one of the tenants would request a highway sign.

Mr. Stang said if they wanted to place the wall sign in the same location as the previous Verizon sign as the same size and height, it would be considered a sign replacement, which means they would be able to apply for a sign permit. He said if they wanted a different location on the elevation, they would have to come back to the Commission for an Amended Final Development Plan.

Ms. Salay asked if there is a requirement for a single tenant occupying a building or a certain square footage be occupied by a tenant. Ms. Salay recalled Council's intent to reward these businesses that had a significant presence in our community.

Mr. Stang said the Code says corporate offices and does not believe there is a percentage of floor space that would have to be occupied by a certain company or tenant.

Mr. Stang noted an error on page 4 of the Planning Report in regards to the compact parking spaces being proposed. He clarified: 226 spaces will be designed to Code, which is 9 feet wide and 19 feet deep; 452 spaces are proposed at 8.5 feet wide and 19 feet deep; and there are 14 ADA spaces that will be designed to meet the Code.

Ms. Newell asked if there were any more comments. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan, with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant will resolve all landscape deficiencies by the fall of 2016 per City Code, based on an anticipated comprehensive landscape inspection in spring 2016; and
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to review and address the amount of necessary pruning for the existing trees after sign installation.

Ms. Menerey said they agreed to both conditions.

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

Planning Items

[There were none.]

Communications

Ms. Husak said there were none.

Ms. Newell adjourned the meeting at 9:29 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 24, 2016.