



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

APRIL 7, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. NE Quad PUD, Subarea 3, Wyandotte Woods – Hawthorne Commons**
15-118FDP **Wyandotte Woods Boulevard**
Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 3)
- 2. BSD Sawmill Center Neighborhood – Charles Penzone Grand Salon**
16-015BPR **6671 Village Parkway**
Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 3. Village at Coffman Park – Phase III** **Post Road**
15-116AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)**
- 4. Perimeter West PCD, Subarea 1 – Kumon Math and Reading Center of Dublin Avery**
16-016AFDP/CU **6860 C Perimeter Drive**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 7 – 0)
Conditional Use (Approved 7 – 0)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Chris Brown, Amy Salay, Robert Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, and Stephen Stidhem. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, Jeff Tyler, Aaron Stanford, Matt Earman, Michael Hendershot, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

The Chair said Mayor Peterson was there to perform the oath of office. Mayor Peterson said City Council appreciates the service of the Commissioners. He swore in Ms. Victoria Newell and Mr. Chris Brown for their re-appointments to the Commission.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to adjourn to an Executive Session for administrative business. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. De Rosa moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to elect Victoria Newell to serve as the Chair for the Planning and Zoning Commission. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to elect Chris Brown to serve as the Vice Chair for the Planning and Zoning Commission. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the February 18, 2016, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7- 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said certain cases on tonight’s agenda may be approved by consent. She stated the following cases are eligible for consent tonight:

- Case 3: Village at Coffman Park, Phase III Amended Final Development Plan
- Case 4: Kumon Learning Center Amended Final Development and Conditional Use

The Chair pulled Case 3 from the Consent Agenda as there was someone from the public that wanted to address the Commission. The Chair requested a motion to approve Case 4 on the Consent Agenda. She said the rest of the cases would be heard in the following order: 3, 1, 2 but cases would be recorded in the minutes in the order as presented in the agenda.

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

The Chair, Ms. Newell, said the following application is a proposal for 86 multiple-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 stated the Commission will be required to vote on these requests separately.

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

Jennifer Rauch stated this application was reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission on February 4 and March 10, 2016 and were tabled at the request of the applicant at both meetings. She reported the topics discussed were the setbacks, buffering, connectivity, stormwater, and the entry pond.

Ms. Rauch presented the aerial view of the site, which is south of a single-family residential development and north of Dublin Scioto High School. She presented the proposed Site Plan and pointed out the single access point off of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard. She said the proposal includes: 19, one-story buildings, which contain 86 units of one, two, and two-plus bedrooms; and a community center that is on the north side of the main entrance into the development. She noted parking is provided within the unit or driveway and a small public parking area is adjacent to the community center. She added the proposed development is identified as a 55 and older market.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant has modified the proposal to eliminate the setback encroachment, which have resulted in changes to the site layout. She noted a portion of building A has shifted and split to create a new building T, but maintains the cluster layout; building C has been significantly modified to a lineal layout along Hawthorne Way; the end units were eliminated to create a new building S with access off Willow Way; and the end unit and driveway at the north end of building C was eliminated, which has improved the aesthetics upon entering the development. As a result, she said a more meaningful open space has been created in the area adjacent to buildings C and S and includes a significant tree that will continue to be preserved.

Ms. Rauch pointed out the proposal meets the development text requirement for perimeter buffering along the north, west, and south sides when adjacent to single-family or school property that must contain a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material at 75% summertime opacity.

Ms. Rauch indicated that Staff has requested the applicant explore grouping garages for buildings C, F, H, and P, to create more consolidated driveways and green space to minimize the number of garage views.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed elevations for building I, as a representative of the architecture. She said the building height is below 20 feet high to meet a maximum permitted height of 35 feet. She described the elevations as a high quality contemporary design with the incorporation of stone, Hardie-Plank, and metal panels.

Ms. Rauch noted the additional connections including the school site to the east and the existing multi-use path to the west. She said the connection with the school site on the east side is currently under construction and will connect through the proposed development and then north between Lots 186 and 187 of Section 8. She said the applicant will be required to provide a 25-foot access easement at the northwest portion of the site to the City to maintain the 8-foot wide shared-use path that will be constructed as part of the site development. She reported the applicant has revised the proposed layout and provided an integrated connection from the external path into the site.

Ms. Rauch said the retention ponds remain in the same locations in addition to permeable pavers and underground storage for stormwater management.

Ms. Rauch reported the applicant and Planning Staff conducted a site visit within the last two weeks to verify the number and quality of trees and areas of trees that provide the most benefit to the site and proposed site design. She said the proposal indicates the preservation of trees in certain portions of the site. An updated tree preservation and replacement plan was provided for review with the proposal she said, which identifies 20 trees of 24" diameter or greater. She said the plan shows two dead, 9 remaining, and 9 removed with the proposal.

Ms. Rauch presented graphics of the streetscape perspectives and the rear of the units to illustrate the decks with railings and the patios. She also presented a section view illustration of the mounding and landscaping proposed for between the Hawthorne Commons units and the existing single-family development. She presented the applicant's illustration of the landscape buffer at the time of installation and then after the trees have matured. The proposed elevations of the community center were also presented. Lastly, she presented the proposed sign illustration that noted the location at the development entry that includes text "Hawthorne Commons" on top and "Treplus Communities" underneath with a line between the two lines of text. She reported the sign meets the Code requirements for size, height, and location. She noted the sign design includes an anodized cabinet mounted on a stone base that coordinates with the architectural style of the proposed development and will be externally illuminated.

Ms. Rauch said one Minor Text Modification is recommended for approval:

“To permit a modification of the previously approved architectural styles to the submitted architectural elevations, subject to approval of the proposed Final Development Plan.”

Ms. Rauch said the Final Development Plan is recommended for approval with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Legal to finalize deed restrictions to provide age restrictions for future tenants;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff on opportunities to group garage locations on buildings C, F, H, and P;
- 3) That the plans be revised to incorporate a sidewalk on the north side of the entrance drive connecting Wyandotte Woods Boulevard to the community center;
- 4) That the applicant provides a 25-foot access easement at the northwest portion of the site to the City to maintain the 8-foot wide shared-use path that will be constructed as part of the site development;
- 5) That the applicant and owner continue to work with the City on coordinating the details of the access easement, path construction, and plant materials for the connection of the path from the school site through to Wyandotte Woods Boulevard;
- 6) That the final layout and location of the eastern path is field verified to minimize any impacts to the existing trees in the vicinity;
- 7) That the applicant incorporates passive amenities such as benches and/or informal paths within the small open space areas, to the extent possible;
- 8) That the final revisions to the plans regarding the alley width and turning radii will be required with the building permit submission, subject to approval by Washington Township Fire Department;
- 9) That the applicant ensures tree replacement for the site occurs in accordance with the Code or obtains approval of a tree Waiver from City Council;
- 10) That the applicant addresses the site-grading concerns identified within the report, subject to approval by Engineering;
- 11) That the portion of landscaping located around the entry pond is completed by Fall 2016 or with the occupancy of the community center building, whichever occurs first and a fountain be added to the entry pond; and
- 12) That 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 invited the applicant to come forward.

Glen Dugger, 37 W. Broad Street, said he represents the applicant. He said he agreed with everything that was stated in the Planning Report and confirmed it was an accurate description of the site and proposal. However, he said there is no requirement in the underlying zoning that this property be used as a senior-type product. He indicated the applicant has agreed to provide that the property will be “HOPA” Compliant, so it will be a 55 and over community. He reviewed the 10 Final Development Plan criteria to emphasize the applicant’s revisions that meet the criteria for the benefit of the Commissioners that have not had the opportunity to attend each meeting where this application was reviewed:

- 1) Consistency with the approved Preliminary Development Plan
- 2) Traffic and pedestrian safety
- 3) Adequate public services and open space
- 4) Protection of natural features and resources
- 5) Adequacy of lighting
- 6) Signs consistent with the Preliminary Development Plan

- 7) Appropriate landscaping to enhance, buffer, & soften the building and site
- 8) Compliant stormwater management
- 9) All phases comply with the previous criteria
- 10) Compliance with other laws & regulations

Mr. Dugger concluded the zoning density is a maximum of 120 units per acre and the applicant is proposing 86 units per acre; one-story units each with its own garage; the applicant complied with the setback requirements; and this proposal is HOPA compliant.

Cathy De Rosa asked the applicant to highlight the top two or three significant changes in the plan from the March meeting to this meeting. Mr. Dugger replied there are none.

Chris Brown requested clarification on the density. Ms. Rauch confirmed the applicant meets the development text for height, setbacks, and density.

The Chair called for public comment and requested that the comments are concise and limited to under five minutes.

Amy Kramb, 7511 Riverside Drive, said she is the president of the East Dublin Civic Association. She asked the Commission to disapprove this application because she feels there are many criteria that are not met. She referred to criteria #3 – Open Space. She said technically it meets the percentage requirement but it is not useable space. She noted the great central useable space at Greystone Mews as comparison. She demonstrated that ponds are more useable if there are walking paths with benches surrounding it. She said this application has two retention ponds but they are steeply graded and not useable as they will be heavily landscaped and there are no walking paths. She said all the paths for this application are on the perimeter and suggested that units be moved around to provide more useable open space.

Ms. Kramb referred to criteria #4 – Protecting the natural resources. She said the trees are being eliminated, which is devastating and indicated she would have preferred the applicant have a tree preservation zone; it will be years before the replacement trees are beautiful.

Ms. Kramb stated the applicant is not meeting criteria #6 - Signs consistent with the Preliminary Development Plan. She said the Preliminary Development Plan did not have any specific details but that is a residential area and the metal cabinet sign proposed appears commercial additionally with the commercial name and logo. She questions where else in the City this would be acceptable.

Ms. Kramb said the applicant is not meeting criteria #7 - Appropriate landscaping to enhance, buffer, & soften the building and site. She indicated the landscaping is not appropriate on the western edge; there are two really long buildings separated by ±10 feet, which is almost a 600-foot property line on the western edge. She said the gap looks smaller than a driveway, which creates a harsh view.

Ms. Kramb noted criteria #2 - Traffic and pedestrian safety. She said there should be a connection to the school property on the southwest corner of the site.

Jerry Kosicki, 4313 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said there is a lot to like about this development – 55 and over product with a single-story design; the density at 86 units per acre rather than 120; the developers; and a plan that is a lot better than the four-story buildings proposed previously. He said the neighborhood is called Wyandotte Woods but a lot of trees have been cut down recently. He stated the neighbors would like the best trees on the site to be preserved and cherished but since so many are being eliminated, it does not meet criteria #4. He said because the project is a one-story design, it takes up a large footprint and lacks public useable space that is meaningful. He noted everything is jammed

into this proposal. He said he agreed with Ms. Kramb's comments about the retention ponds. He said the solid wall of buildings on the north side is visible to his neighborhood and it appears as a fort creating a forbidding barrier against their community. He said he agreed with Ms. Kramb's comments about the western edge and how it is overwhelming and unattractive while visible to every home on Clayton Court. He said this development is isolating and not welcoming to the neighborhood as it does not contribute to the connectivity of the City, failing criteria #2. He indicated this is proposed as intensely developed and crowded as Bridge Street is supposed to be and this is not in the Bridge Street District; therefore, criteria #3 is not met. He asked that the Commission disapprove this application.

Kathy Harter, 7825 Holiston Court, said she is one of the trustees of the neighborhood. She said she appreciates that the developer and the Commission have listened to their concerns because the neighborhood wants the project to be the best it can be. She said they love the 55 and over aspect of the project and the uniqueness of it. She said she is interested to see if the sign gets changed. She questions if this is too much that is being proposed overall and if there is going to be enough green space. She encouraged more landscaping for optimal buffering like around Kroger Marketplace and Lifetime Fitness.

Mrs. Venkatesh, 4063 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said their house is the first one near the pond and seeing seven or eight houses from their patio will appear like a fort wall. She said the trees are being removed and it will take years for the replacement trees to form a buffer. She stated this development is too crowded and will not fit within their community.

Mike Adelman, 4221 Clayton Court, said there are some positives with this application and he appreciates all the consideration being exhibited here tonight. He said the lower profile is appreciated as well as demographic of the empty-nesters. He said he is the representative for Clayton Court and they are struggling as to whether this development fits in with the Wyandotte Woods community and the City of Dublin. He encouraged preserving the green space as was the theme for Post Road. He said the western border will be quite visible from their backyards and it is intense from their perspective according to the renderings presented. He said that 600-foot run of building appears quite commercial and industrial and is not sure that is what they had in mind when they began building their home in 2013 and were so proud to move into Dublin in 2014.

Mr. Adelman said the landscape buffering for privacy of the existing homes is desired and hopes the developer can preserve as many mature trees as possible. He said he understands it is not the Commission's responsibility but hopes City Council will really consider the impact of granting a tree Waiver.

Mr. Adelman inquired about the retention pond as to whether it will be filled at all times or just service the storm runoff. He said the retention ponds out on Clayton Court were sold to prospective homeowners as a very visually pleasing pond with a fountain yet it has been more of a cesspool full of construction debris and other trash. He said it has been re-landscaped a couple of times just in the 16 months he has resided there and not at all what any of them had envisioned.

Mr. Adelman agreed the entry sign is too intense, appears industrial, and is not consistent with the character of Wyandotte Woods or other communities found in our City. He appreciates Mr. Dugger's willingness to modify the sign.

Daniel Zupnick, 4080 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said his concern is density. He said comparison communities shown all seemed to fit the guidelines they were looking for here. He compared the aspects of the Coffman Park case heard earlier to this one stating that 56 units would be better for this development as it is packed at 86 units. He said he liked the architecture of the building materials for the sign, which is forward looking but does not like the text. He stated this is not a "Treplus Community", it is a Dublin Community. He asked that the corporate nature be removed.

Sue Hutras, 7834 Silver Rose Court, said she appreciates all the time Mr. Dugger has spent with the neighbors but agrees with all the points that have been made by other neighbors. She stated she resides on one acre, backing up to woods, and this does not feel like her neighborhood. She said the density is very concerning with her neighbors along with the lack of trees and conservation. She indicated she would prefer to see a big buffer around the outside instead of pushing the buildings as far as they are permitted to the setbacks. She agreed to fewer units (like 56) and for benches to be added to the green space.

Rajeev Desai, 4071 Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, said he agreed this looks like a fort and there is too much to fit in here. He said they wanted to reside in a Dublin community because Dublin sets a high standard of living, including open space but this proposal does not follow a lot of the standards. He asked the Commission to consider this as if it were to be their neighbor.

The Chair asked for further public comment. [Hearing none.] She closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brown indicated Mr. Dugger tried to go above and beyond to meet all criteria and meet with the community and recognized that it is one story instead of two. He said he struggles with the overall footprint and has from day one. He said he liked the idea of the proposal, the unique architecture, and the whole concept but it still seems very condensed. He said he understands what the neighbors are saying about the linear nature of the 600 feet on the west with only small gaps. He recalled some of the other cases the Commission has reviewed and thought of tree preservation. He reported he has walked the site several times and one of his jobs is running a tree farm so he gets the different things that are there. He said the nature and grade of the site makes it difficult to preserve a great deal; the legacy trees the developer is trying to preserve is appreciated. He said he struggles with the idea that they will actually survive even with the fencing in place because he has been around too much construction where bulldozers and other large equipment is used. Protecting trees he said is very difficult to do.

Mr. Brown stated he thinks everyone agrees the sign needs to change. He said he does not see an issue with pedestrian safety. He agreed the western edge is pretty harsh.

Mr. Brown suggested that in 10 years the neighbors would be thrilled to have this development once the trees mature and they see how it works. He said the problem is the applicant is following a pattern of a development where the refined details by the way they have been carried out (starting with the retention pond) have not been well executed. He indicated the applicant has to 'swim upstream' because of the predecessor's lack of detail. He said he thinks the intent of the applicant is to do this right and do it well but he is anxious to hear what his fellow Commissioners have to say because he is on the fence.

The Chair requested clarification from Staff. She said when we go through each of our review comments, we anticipate that the applicant will comply with all of them for getting approval. She urged her fellow Commission Members to use the review criteria and explain how they find it to be met or not met.

Ms. Salay said this is a difficult site and recalls there has been a lot planned for this part of Dublin but not without contention from the neighbors. She said she is favorable to this proposal overall – likes the architecture a lot; 86 units versus the 120 units per acre for density; and a 55-plus product that will reduce the impact on traffic and not many students generated to add to the school district. She indicated this is going to be a nice neighborhood from a pedestrian standpoint. She said anything developed here would be difficult to fit within this neighborhood. She said she appreciates the applicant working so well with the neighborhood and staff and appreciates the neighbor's participation. She said there is a push/pull with connectivity. She noted a connection added to the southeast portion would require more tree removal.

Ms. Salay confirmed the 55% lot coverage was accurate and acknowledged that was good. She indicated if there was a big apartment complex placed here, there would be a large parking lot and this feels more like a neighborhood to her. She stated overall she is supportive of the proposal but the sign needs work. She asked if the City Forrester could get involved so we have the heaviest duty tree protection we can get and have supervision at the site. She said there are a lot of accidents that can happen. She suggested the applicant plant the landscape buffer between the homes as soon as possible. She noted Mr. Brown's comment about "the neighbors being really thrilled with this neighborhood in 10 years" is really key. She understands living through construction in our neighborhood is never fun.

Ms. De Rosa said there is a lot to like about this application and is really pleased with the 55-plus aspect as more of it is needed in this community. She indicated she continues to struggle with the open space and the community aspect of this. She said they have been studying what makes senior housing effective, positive, and successful. She said she struggles with the pond not being accessible to the intended age group and in ten years, that is not going to change and open space really matters for successful engagement in a community. She concluded the architecture is lovely.

Steve Stidhem said he struggles with this application because of a lack of neighborhood support and it would be tough to vote against that. He suggested if a few units were removed and open space added many folks would be happy with that solution. He noted the way the sidewalks are laid out in this case makes sense. He said he is disappointed because the same feedback was received from the neighbors a month ago and yet nothing has changed. He indicated the approach to tackling the intensity issue is a little troubling. He said overall he does not have a strong opinion right now; there are positives to this application. He recalls what Mr. Brown has said in the past, which was to be careful with shooting something like this down because there might be something much worse coming in later that the neighbors will absolutely hate.

Deb Mitchell said she had a general comment that she would love to see someone with academic research, which there is plenty of, about the psychology and experience of what density means because she would love for those in Dublin to consider what people are learning about how we as humans experience density. She suggested density is thought of as a multi-dimensional experience and construct. She said the whole idea of too much density or not enough density is not just in terms of a number of points of experience on a lot or piece of land; it has to do with a lot of different dimensions including height, color, and atmosphere, etc.

With respect to this development, Ms. Mitchell said she is very hesitant when something is proposed that appears to meet the criteria and appears to be better than anything that has been brought before; she is troubled. She said there is an old saying "Perfect is the enemy of good". She said if something seems exciting on many dimensions but not all, she is hesitant to reject it because there could be something better.

Robert Miller applauded Mr. Dugger's efforts; communication skills have been excellent. He said he truly wanted to support this project primarily because what could go on this piece of land could be far worse than this. He said if the applicant can deal with the sign, that will help some; but the one criteria he is struggling with is the open space and he is not certain how that can be attained. He said connectivity is not an issue for him any longer because he does not know what this development would connect to. He referred to the Gordon Farms apartment complex; even though it does not feel like a fort-like setting, it is. He said coming up behind those buildings from the green spaces outside that property, one would have a hard time getting into that property as there are only a couple of entrances. He said he struggles with the open space usability, the same as Ms. De Rosa. He said if that could be addressed, he would be 100% in but to the neighbors he would say this is a 'pretty good' project as he is currently 95 – 98% there.

Ms. Newell said there are so many merits to this project. She said she has sat through several of the previous applications. She said the one proposal with the four-story apartment building was originally proposed as three stories. She said the Commission entertained the possibility of accepting four stories for the primary reason to preserve trees. She said when she looks at this site, it is the one natural resource amenity on this site that she struggles with. On the review criteria list, she said #1 - Consistency with the approved Preliminary Development Plan, she said if we take in that text modification, she believes the applicant is compliant. She has no issue with #2 - Traffic and pedestrian safety because this project will generate less traffic than if it were built out to the full permitted density and she was comfortable with having sidewalks on one side of the street and provided walkways within those areas including five-foot-wide walks that are more appropriate with this type of age group. She said when it comes to #3 - Adequate public services and open space she said the amount is adequate but is it useable. She said the applicant agreeing to add benches to that space makes it more usable. She said criteria #4 - Protection of natural features and resources is one she is really struggling with. She does not expect every tree on the site to be maintained but the applicant is intending to preserve 9 legacy trees at 24-inch-caliper. She emphasized the grading is a problem when trying to preserve these trees and is not convinced they will survive. She said outside of those nice trees, the property is getting clear-cut of all trees so she does not believe the proposal is protecting the natural resources. She said the applicant meets the requirements in our Code for criteria #5, #6, #7, #9, and #10. For criteria #8 she finds in the Planning Report that they are still working on stormwater management but the issues are presented as minor, she believes it will meet the Code. She summarized that criteria #4 is the only one she still struggles with. She asked if any of the Commissioners can convince her she is not in support of losing the natural resources.

Ms. Salay said a one-story project spreads out which is good and bad. She said it is difficult to imagine how the grading will impact the trees as she is not an engineer or an architect. She asked if the City's Forrester has looked at this plan to determine if it is realistic to preserve trees based on the grading plan and the way these units are going to be built.

Ms. Rauch said the main contacts have been our two landscape compliance officers within our department and she does not know if they consulted the City's Forrester but they evaluate trees and sites for development proposals on a daily basis. She reported their recommendation is new trees would be a greater benefit in terms of the species and condition of existing trees. In other examples, she said we have moved pieces of development around to try and preserve a particular tree but they did not believe that should be the case for this proposal.

Ms. Salay referred to the landscape plan where the trees that are to remain are green and those to be removed are marked red.

Mr. Brown inquired about the deciduous trees being planted around the border and the entrance. Ms. Rauch said typically the caliper is 2.5 inches, which is the City standard. Mr. Dugger clarified the trees at the entrance are 3 inches and the border trees are 2.5 inches.

Mr. Dugger said he can provide the detail for metal fences they plan to use to safeguard the trees to be preserved to get them through the construction process so accidents do not happen.

Mr. Brown said if the applicant agrees to work with the sign and add a condition for the legacy trees to be replaced with a certain caliper tree if they die within five years, that the applicant is winning here.

Ms. De Rosa reiterated – "Good can be the enemy of great". She indicated she worries because Dublin consistently and repeatedly sets a higher standard. From a natural fit and open space criteria, she said it seems we are close enough that we should be able to get to that even better place. She asked where the benches are on the open space. She indicated she did not want to give up on what we want to achieve here but at the same time do not want to accept the substandard. She affirmed Ms. Mitchell's comments

which stated there has been a lot of research which shows what makes great communities that include visiting and connecting with open spaces, etc. She stated those criteria are in the Code for a reason and she believes they are important.

Ms. Rauch pointed to the areas that had been opened up where benches could be placed and the applicant has indicated they will do that. She also referred to the conditions regarding informal paths for certain areas.

Ms. Salay noted that Emerald Fields Park is basically across the street from this development and it is a community-scale park for everyone's use. She said there is also going to be a pathway that connects to the walking path that runs along adjacent to the school property on the east side. She emphasized she wants people to be able to walk to the school. She said for a 55-plus community, the school could provide many opportunities to enjoy the athletic events, plays, musicals, and art shows at the school.

Mr. Dugger concluded there is a fence along as part of the school to keep people out of the football stadium. He said he will meet with the school but indicated they will probably want to maintain the security aspect. He pointed out other paths that are not as direct for connectivity. He confirmed the ponds are going to be wet. He said they are agnostic about the sign at the entry. He indicated the applicant could work with Staff to design a sign with a stone base that matches the building exterior and could exclude the advertising text. He said they have proposed a chain-link fence to preserve trees during the construction process. He said they will provide bench detail throughout the site. He noted where the applicant could place a stone path, not a hardscape path.

The Chair asked what the applicant would like the Commission to do this evening. Mr. Dugger answered he does not have the opportunity to keep working on this. He said if there are to be any more changes or revisions within the nature that had been discussed, the applicant will have to make them on the fly.

Ms. Rauch restated the Minor Text Modification recommended for approval:

"To permit a modification of the previously approved architectural styles to the submitted architectural elevations, subject to approval of the proposed Final Development Plan."

The Commission discussed the sensibility of voting on the Final Development Plan before voting on the Minor Text Modification in case the FDP did not get approved. Ms. Rauch said the Minor Text Modification could be subject to approval of the FDP.

Motion and Vote

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

The Chair requested to see the criteria list. Ms. Rauch presented the list from her Planning Report and went over the conditions, noting the first 12 conditions stayed the same and are as follows:

- 1) That the applicant work with Legal to finalize deed restrictions to provide age restrictions for future tenants;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff on opportunities to group garage locations on buildings C, F, H, and P;
- 3) That the plans be revised to incorporate a sidewalk on the north side of the entrance drive connecting Wyandotte Woods Boulevard to the community center;

- 4) That the applicant provides a 25-foot access easement at the northwest portion of the site to the City to maintain the 8-foot wide shared-use path that will be constructed as part of the site development;
- 5) That the applicant and owner continue to work with the City on coordinating the details of the access easement, path construction, and plant materials for the connection of the path from the school site through to Wyandotte Woods Boulevard;
- 6) That the final layout and location of the eastern path is field verified to minimize any impacts to the existing trees in the vicinity;
- 7) That the applicant incorporates passive amenities such as benches and/or informal paths within the small open space areas, to the extent possible;
- 8) That the final revisions to the plans regarding the alley width and turning radii will be required with the building permit submission, subject to approval by Washington Township Fire Department;
- 9) That the applicant ensures tree replacement for the site occurs in accordance with the Code or obtains approval of a tree Waiver from City Council;
- 10) That the applicant addresses the site-grading concerns identified within the report, subject to approval by Engineering;
- 11) That the portion of landscaping located around the entry pond is completed by Fall 2016 or with the occupancy of the community center building, whichever occurs first and a fountain be added to the entry pond; and
- 12) That 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.

Ms. Rauch said three conditions were added based on the discussion this evening:

- 13) That the sign design be revised to incorporate the sign materials used for the single-family sections of the Wyandotte Woods Subdivision, subject to Staff approval;
- 14) That the applicant work with the City Forrester to install substantial tree-protection fencing throughout the site to ensure the maximum tree preservation protection is achieved; and
- 15) That the applicant work with Staff to install landscape buffer prior to the building construction to the extent possible.

The Chair asked the applicant if they were in agreement with the 15 conditions. Mr. Dugger said they agreed with the conditions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with 15 conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, no; Mr. Miller, no; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, no. (Approved 4 – 3)

Mr. Dugger thanked the Staff for working above and beyond on this application.

Ms. Newell announced she had a family emergency she had to attend to and departed the meeting. She said the Vice Chair would facilitate the rest of the meeting in her absence.

Mr. Brown called for a five-minute break.

**2. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone Grand Salon
16-015BPR**

**6671 Village Parkway
Informal Review**

The Vice Chair, Mr. Brown, said the following application is a proposal for the construction of a 12,000-square-foot building and associated site improvements for a site located within the Bridge Street Sawmill Neighborhood Center District on the west side of Village Parkway at the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and that the Commission will not take a vote tonight.

Lori Burchett reported this was reviewed by the Administrative Review Team on March 24, 2016, and they recommended the applicant bring this application forward to the PZC for an Informal Review before returning to the PZC with a Basic Plan Review. She explained the ART reviewed the Site Plan and noted many of the elements meet the Code as proposed or with minor revisions. She said the main topics for the discussion this evening will include: Street and Block Framework; Proposed Building Types; Materials; Site Layout; and Parking.

Ms. Burchett said the project is located on a portion of the existing Charles Penzone Salon parcel and the vacant portion to the south of the site is under consideration. She said the parcel adjoins private properties to the north, south, and west and the property does not have direct frontage on Shamrock Boulevard. She said the principle frontage street is Village Parkway, along the eastern boundary of the property. She said the property contains stormwater, right-of-way, and utility easements that somewhat constrict site placement. She presented the existing street view from the property facing both southwest and northwest.

Ms. Burchett stated the intent of this district is to establish a network of interconnected streets with walkable block sizes organized to accommodate multiple modes of transportation.

Ms. Burchett presented the BSD Street Network map and noted the (future) east/west neighborhood street that is illustrated on the map that dissects the subject property from Village Parkway to the adjoining parcel connecting to Hobbs Landing Drive East.

In the BSD requirements, Ms. Burchett said the maximum block length is 500 feet and the maximum block perimeter is 1,750 feet. As proposed, she said the block length is 1,020 feet and the perimeter is 2,700 feet. She explained that with the dedication of the right-of-way for the future potential development of a neighborhood street as shown on the Street Network Map, the maximum block length and perimeter requirements would be met. She said the block length would be approximately 350 feet and the perimeter would be approximately 1,240 feet. She stated an east/west Neighborhood Street right-of-way dedication would: allow the project to meet the block size requirements; and achieve the intent of establishing a network of interconnected streets in the district. She said preserving the right-of-way will allow for future connections without having to require the applicant to fully construct the Neighborhood Street at this time, particularly since there is another privately-owned parcel in between the subject property and Hobbs Landing Drive East.

Steve Stidhem asked if the future road would impact the existing building. Claudia Husak said the road will come real close.

Chris Brown said he understood this is just a draft but suggested Staff revisit the Street Network Plan due to the existing housing as well. Ms. Husak said the question is whether or not we are asking for the right-of-way to be dedicated as part of this application.

Ms. Burchett emphasized the future neighborhood street is a general location and no designs have been finalized by Engineering. Mr. Brown said the point is if the application meets the criteria with the right-of-way. Ms. Burchett confirmed, with the right-of-way, the application will meet the block requirements.

Vince Papsidero urged the Commission not to forget the importance of the grid that is being created with the Street Network Map in the Code. He stated that the distribution of traffic, the grid street pattern, and the resulting lot sizes all speak to the environment that is envisioned within the entire district.

Cathy De Rosa noted a driveway that comes into the back of that building, with two driveways coming into the current location. Ms. Husak confirmed the existing driveway location goes to the Penzone Salon. She explained the driveway to the north is off the site and provides access to the Stavroff parcel, which has overflow parking for Dublin Village Center.

Ms. Burchett said Staff analyzed the site and the building proposed against the requirements of the BSD. She said the proposed structure is a loft building type and this is the most appropriate type for the area of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood since it is not located on a shopping corridor or within a designated area where commercial center building types are permitted. She explained the loft style building requires a minimum of two stories, an entrance facing the street, and parking in the rear of the building. She said the proposal is for a single-story building and the applicant has made attempts to create height by increasing the interior ceiling heights and providing a small mezzanine area; exterior features include façade material transitions and a variety of roof types and heights. She reiterated the proposed structure is designed as a one-story building with architectural elements to reflect a two-story appearance. As submitted under the loft building type, she stated 11 Waivers would be required, including parking location, minimum number of stories/height, and frontage and entrance requirements.

Ms. Burchett said one of the discussion questions for the Commission to consider is:

Are potential Waivers to Loft Building Type requirements appropriate, particularly for the building height?

Ms. Burchett presented the east and west elevations; the materials include wood, stone, and glass. She noted the east elevation would be the view from Village Parkway. She pointed out a large blank wall on the west elevation.

Ms. Burchett said another discussion question for the Commission to consider is:

Does the proposal illustrate an appropriate level of architectural interest for the gateway into the Sawmill Center Neighborhood in the BSD?

Ms. Burchett presented the south and north elevations. She explained the south elevation is the view from the main parking area. She noted the entrance along Village Parkway (principal frontage street) does not appear to be the main entrance to the building and it is unclear whether or not it is functional as an entrance; the main entrance is proposed off the parking lot to the north.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering of the proposed floor plan with the main lobby entrance at the north.

Ms. Burchett presented the site plan layout as it would be connected to the existing parking and salon. She pointed out the centered building placement does not allow for flexibility of the site for future potential development opportunities. She said the open space areas are limited mostly to pedestrian walkways adjacent to the building and a small pocket park and plaza around the main parking area. She noted the proposed layout shows parking to the side of the structure, which is not permitted with loft building types. Additionally, she said there are site constraints that include stormwater and right-of-way easements that limit the developable area.

Ms. Burchett said more discussion questions for the Commission to consider are:

Looking at the form and layout of the building as the district evolves overtime, does the proposed layout and building type accommodate any future uses as infill development continues in the district?

Is there an opportunity for the applicant to consider alternative site layouts that better meet the intent of the BSD and Sawmill Center District standards?

Ms. Burchett said the parking calculations for the proposed use are a minimum of 24 spaces (2 per 1,000 square feet) and a maximum of 30 spaces (125% of minimum). She stated the applicant has proposed 93 spaces based on daily parking count data provided. She reported the ART had concerns with the significant amount of parking and its location along the side of the property, as well as efficient use of the property for future infill development opportunities as the neighborhood evolves.

Ms. Burchett asked the Commission to consider the following:

- 1) *Would the Commission support a request for a Parking Plan to exceed the maximum permitted spaces by 210 percent?*
- 2) *If the proposed siting of parking in the front yard is supported, is the proposed arrangement optimal for the long-term vision for the Village Parkway frontage?*
- 3) *Is there an opportunity to redistribute parking/relocate the building in a manner that would create the opportunity for an additional development site over surplus parking areas as uses change over time in the proposed building?*

Mr. Brown asked where the parking is Ms. Burchett is referring to. Ms. Burchett said parking located to the front is not permitted for a loft building type.

Amy Salay asked what Ms. Burchett would suggest if parking was to be relocated. Ms. Burchett agrees the site is constrained and understands there is a need from the applicant for the additional parking based on their daily-use data.

Ms. Burchett asked again if exceeding the parking requirement by 210% is appropriate or if there are other options such as shared parking.

Ms. Burchett referred back to all the discussion questions:

- 1) *Would the commission recommend dedication of right-of-way for a future neighborhood street as shown on the Bridge Street District Street Network Map?*
- 2) *Are potential Waivers to Loft Building Type requirements appropriate, particularly for building height?*
- 3) *Does the proposal illustrate an appropriate level of architectural interest for the gateway into the Sawmill Center Neighborhood in the Bridge Street District?*
- 4) *Looking at the form and layout of the building as the district evolves overtime, does the proposed layout and building type accommodate any future uses as infill development continues in the district?*
- 5) *Is there an opportunity for the applicant to consider alternative site layouts that better meet the intent of the Bridge Street District and Sawmill Center District standards?*
- 6) *Would the Commission support a request for a Parking Plan to exceed the maximum permitted spaces by 210 percent?*
- 7) *If the proposed siting of parking in the front yard is supported, is the proposed arrangement optimal for the long-term vision for the Village Parkway frontage?*

8) *Is there an opportunity to redistribute parking/relocate the building in a manner that would create the opportunity for an additional development site over surplus parking areas as uses change over time in the proposed building?*

Steve Stidhem said there is a business there now with a lot of parking. He asked what the future plan is for that property.

Ms. Burchett said the BSD allows for a mix of uses so commercial is one element permitted and personal services is a use permitted as well. She said the intention of the BSD Code is to look at the overall form and character of an application to determine if it meets the intent of the district's standards. She said the applicant could perhaps speak to the development of the existing site/salon.

The Vice Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Matt Dunlap, Charles Penzone Salon, said the company has been around for 47 years, and over 30 of those years have been in Dublin. He said the Dublin clientele are their core business and after reviewing different options from a real estate perspective, this would fit within the intent of the BSD from a community perspective and what the Charles Penzone Salons are trying to accomplish. He said the applicant is trying to create a corporate campus and the core of their strategy is a walkable, approachable campus for their team and their guests. He said the applicant is interested in opening a new flagship salon, which is why this application was proposed. He said the new salon will bring the latest technology operations and design. He stated the applicant is working with Myers and Associates with Advanced Civil Design and Chute Gerdeman. He indicated they are trying to create something that is 'revolutionary within the industry' and bring what is 'best in class'. He said in addition to the new salon the applicant would like to renovate the existing salon into a home office, which would bring 34 new jobs to Dublin. He said the additional growth plans consider a new academy, spa services, and offerings around wellness. He said they have a separate economic proposal being submitted to economic development. He said the company goal is to create a community feel for this development as this is the trend on the west and east coasts with more interaction between guests.

Mr. Dunlap recognized a large issue around this proposal is parking. He said their teams have looked at operational efficiencies at length and the salon proposed will increase their utilization and much more operationally effective. He noted the existing salon is 18,000 square feet and they are trying to go down to 12,000 square feet with the proposed salon. He said they are trying to bring a cohesive environment where the outside is brought in with a courtyard and operate the business around that hub. He said they looked at three different parking ways to reinforce what they are requesting, this included spot checking for peak/non-peak periods; maximum capacity; and the traffic they generate - divided up on an hourly basis. He said they feel confident in proposing the need for 93 spaces; there are 68 parking spaces with the existing salon. He explained Stavroff owns the additional off-set parking and there is an agreement with them to share parking, which would give them some options but the issue is, if Stavroff develops, the applicant loses the parking. He said they are designing operationally to account for that. He concluded that the team is available to answer any questions.

Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates Architects, 232 N. Third St., Columbus, OH, said he is the architect of record. He introduced the team that has been working on this proposal for about one year as Penzone is going through a brand redevelopment/refresh. He reported that they met with the ART two weeks ago where it was suggested the applicant meet with the PZC through an Informal Review. He said there are basically three big topics.

The Vice Chair asked Staff to address: loft requirements as compared to other building types for clarification; parking; and finally the architecture in general.

Ms. Burchett said during the initial review, loft and commercial building types were explored. She reiterated the loft building type is permitted in the district and the commercial is not. She clarified the loft type requires the building to be two stories, which the ART struggled with as the applicant is trying to achieve height by including an interior mezzanine rather than a full useable two stories. She said there is a concern with not having the entrance or parking off the principle frontage street with the parking at the rear. She summarized the ART was weighing whether to request Waivers for the elements the loft building did not meet but meets the intent of the district or to request a Waiver for a commercial building type that is not permitted in the district. She reported they were less comfortable with permitting a building type that is prohibited in the district.

Mr. Meyers said the right building type regardless of the Code was part of the earliest discussions with Staff. He said the applicant tested the commercial type building but it did not fit the character or the parameters of the site. He explained the operations in the salon is a perimeter volume space for services. He said there is a 22-foot bearing line for the roof because Code calls for 12 feet first floor, 10 feet second floor as minimum requirements. He said this is an increase in cost but the applicant was excited about the opportunity to elevate the amount of windows and volume of that space. He said the mezzanine area is 1,500 square feet. He said the perception on the exterior will be the right scale for the context and meets the intent of the Code. He said a commercial building would have to be long and low.

Mr. Dunlap restated the applicant is trying to create a new flagship that is a scalable model as the other model is very ineffective to operate as guests and staff are spread out all over the place.

Mr. Meyers noted the issue of the perceived entry versus the actual entry. He said it is typical to park near the door. He said the façade treatment of this building also incorporates what happens behind it and the visual it presents on the principle frontage street. He said that whole area is very active as it is the color bar. He noted the doors on three of the four facades that provide access to the pedestrian right-of-way. He indicated this building is meant to activate some of the network of sidewalks and landscape and streetscape to connect it to the rest of the district. He confirmed it is a challenging site that pushes them inward: there is a certain geometry they have to work with; a stormwater easement; and high-voltage power lines. He said this is guiding some of the architecture.

The Vice Chair said the Commission can break this down but if they start with the parking; it is kind of backwards because the architecture is based on the layout of the site and how it connects to the parking.

Mr. Brown said he knows Mr. Penzone pretty well and knows Chris Meyers' work and he is a very talented architect. He said the loft building type not acting as a two-story space does not bother him. He said the Commission has discussed every block and how this district unfolds, it is opportunity. He said we are looking for a sophisticated eclectic, dynamic buildings, and to create an urban walkable neighborhood, so how it engages those streets and not just the parking lot is paramount. He said Village Parkway is intended to become a major thoroughfare. He said it appears like a building you could put in many other sites around central Ohio or elsewhere and that does not excite him. He indicated Mr. Penzone is a dynamic guy with dynamic art and dynamic spaces in his house and salons. He said the volume inside and large window elements are cool. He said he likes the stone and the wood but at the same time, it looks like it is a building that is plucked down on a suburban lot and not necessarily an urban, walkable district building.

Deborah Mitchell agreed. She said this looks a lot like a model and she understands the applicant wanting to create a model that is scalable that can be replicated. She indicated it reminds her of a really nice salon where she grew up, stuck in the suburbs and it was a cool place but it was in the suburbs and not connected to anything. She said this does not have any feel of urbanism and is not sure it captures the BSD connectivity. She said lots of glass is acceptable and agrees that going for the feeling of two stories when it is not really two stories is great. She said there is nothing drawing the people from the sidewalk view. She said there is huge potential but a scalable model can go in the suburbs of Massillon, Wisconsin;

Champaign, Illinois; or elsewhere. In the suburbs, she said it would be really cool but in the BSD, not so cool.

Cathy De Rosa reported she has spent some time in that existing salon and inquired about the wellness component and who the clientele is in this new version.

Mr. Meyers said, as an architect, it is thought of as a Charles Penzone campus and this is the first piece of it. He said when it comes to personal services, salons were just for getting hair and nails done and one would go to a doctor for clinical or therapeutic services or a medically related service. He said the thought is the industry has evolved to be very holistic when it comes to a wide range of services. He said Penzone Company has championed innovation in their entire operations. He said the planning is a utilization of the entire organization for its business operations, its flagship salon, but also the supplemental services.

Mr. Dunlap reported that Debbie Penzone just got certified as a yoga master so they are looking at many services like yoga and a juice bar, etc.

Ms. De Rosa said she asked her question because if that is the approach, she sees how it might look and feel like a spa experience on the outside through landscaping and lighting but not sure how that is incorporated in the building. She said she loves the concept and asked if that edgy vibe could be given to that corner. She said she was surprised and disappointed to see the loss of the arch. She said she does not see the connectivity to the walkway and is concerned about inclement weather for the guest leaving after having a treatment. She said a spa feel is not something we have in the BSD now and could be quite cool.

Mr. Dunlap referred to the graphic that illustrates the "prom entrance". He said there is a portico on a different rendering. He said the idea is to keep people covered when they need to be covered. He said they have explored different architectural designs/styles.

Bonnie Kyle, Chute Gerdeman, 754 Éclair Ave, design architect, said Mr. Dunlap is trying to refer to the earlier renditions that were more edgy and heavy on plank wood siding. She indicated it was suggested that they were taking the intent of the BSD more literal than they needed to; they may go back to the earlier designs as they may have compromised too easily. She said they are trying to keep within what Penzone is about but still abide by the BSD Code requirements of using a certain percentage of stone, glass, and wood.

Amy Salay inquired about parking in the front yard. Ms. Burchett said it is the whole parking area that is visible from Village Parkway.

Ms. Burchett said, based on the definition of the loft building type and where the parking is located, all of those parking spaces can be seen from Village Parkway, even screened, and would be considered to the side of the building. Ms. Salay asked if the preference was that the building be sited along Village Parkway and the parking moved to the rear.

Ms. Husak said it is not so much a preference, as it is a Code requirement. She said the proposal as is would require a Waiver.

Ms. Salay said it is a very square building, she likes the architecture, and it is edgy enough for her. She said she loves the wood and stone together and encouraged the applicant to go in that direction as it is more inviting and organic. She said looking at the building itself is one thing but considering future development that could include an academy and office building that create a campus, she is interested in how this building relates to Village Parkway because the intent of the district is for a walkable urban neighborhood. She said right now, this building is in the middle of an urban shopping center. She said

she is interested in the evolution of the site because that would influence how she feels about the proposed square building on the corner.

Mr. Meyers said the applicant realizes they are the first in the intersection. He noted to the south they have the side of Lowe's and a power substation, on the west is a detention pond with a condominium neighborhood behind that, on the north is the existing Penzone building that is in need of an update, and to the east is the back of the Dublin Shopping Center. He said they are in the forefront of creating the first impression of the gateway into the whole eastern portion of the BSD. He indicated they are trying to solidify one of the key components, which is the business components that are based here in Dublin. He restated that Penzone has been at this location for a while. He said the legacy of the building is addressing this corner at the roundabout. He said they have created a linear pocket park instead of just a row of hedges but there are high voltage power lines overhead. He asked how they can provide a landing point for pedestrians and a way to occupy the frontage on the parkway to fill the façade where we do not have building to create frontage, density, and character along that edge of the property without necessarily designing a long linear building. He said part of the effort as they see as part of the district is the unification of landscape and site elements to the architecture.

Mr. Meyers said the applicant recognizes the parking is three times what the Code allows. He said the parking and access for people in a vehicle in this area, it is just not walkable quite yet, but they are trying to get it more walkable but people are still going to drive their cars to the salon. He said if one-third of their customers are not able to come to the salon and utilize the facility the business does not survive. He said there is a challenging component to finding the sweet spot between meeting the Code but also not hindering the operations of business and a lot of analysis has gone into this. He indicated this flagship salon will probably increase business so how the parking request is quantified is through daily operations, not even considering Mother's Day weekend, weddings, or the proms. He said that will require some parking at the existing location. He said cutting parking spaces down to 30 to meet the Code would kill the business.

Bob Miller asked if there is a master plan in consideration. Mr. Myers reported nothing official or documented. He said they are having conversations about working with the existing building and how it might be updated to create a language for the whole campus and increased services would entail more buildings or expansions of buildings. He said there is nothing to show where this is all headed quite yet.

Mr. Miller said this proposal does not have a campus feel because it is a huge parking lot. He agrees with Mr. Brown and Ms. Mitchell in that the building needs to be more of a Bridge Park feel as opposed to a suburban feel.

Steve Stidhem said it would have been nice to see some of the other designs the applicant had considered. He said he likes the look of the building; the wood and stone looks great.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Myers how he compares the design from where they started to where they are now.

Ms. Salay cautioned the Commission about using the description "more like Bridge Park" and requesting that because we do not want the applicant to look at Crawford Hoying's drawings and replicate that.

Mr. Meyers said as an architect, they are looking to meet the Code requirements but also have to look at what is developing in the BSD as a whole and meet the intent of the Code. He said the complexity of this little site is of all the stuff going on around it and some of it does not line up with the Code requirements in terms of numbers. He said this has been a challenge and that is why the ART suggested the applicant discuss the challenges with everyone who has a decision-making stake in this project.

The Vice Chair said the Commission is trying to provide good preliminary direction.

Ms. De Rosa referred to the applicant's examples presented and said her feedback is that this feels good to her for walkability, connectivity, and lighting. Mr. Meyers reported those five images were the winners of about 1,000 images that were presented to the whole design team and the Penzone organization. He said the Penzones are very particular about the aesthetic, style, and feel of this; the degree of detail in materiality and lighting; and the products of a bike rack or a planter; all are being heavily evaluated for creating an overall character and not just a character of a building that sits on a site that does not continue that same character.

Mr. Brown noted the problems with the site include the electric tower, which is a tough animal. He said the applicant is on the right track. He said the loft style does not bother him. He encouraged the applicant to consider: how this initial building would engage with Village Parkway; the master plan; what if any material changes are to be made; continuity from the new building to old as it faces Village Parkway with even some vertical elements; and ideas that are outside of the box. He said we cannot codify everything. We want to see a dynamic, exciting entrance to this whole development and knowing Mr. Penzone and the business, he is the guy to bring that. He said it is very tough to address the street in this particular situation.

Mr. Meyers referred to one of the drawings, and asked how the applicant can collaborate with Dublin for the adjoining parcel the City owns. He noted the main mass of trees and how a path could meander and connect through there. Mr. Brown said this is an element happening all over the City.

Mr. Meyers emphasized that if the applicant is only permitted 30 parking spaces per the Code, this project is probably not moving forward.

Mr. Brown referred to columns for the open space like what was seen recently in Arizona to possibly integrate the new building with the existing building and provide more parking.

Mr. Meyers said they cannot go too high because of the power lines.

Ms. De Rosa noted the 11 parking spaces at the bottom. Mr. Myers said those to the north at the right and those at the top could be made of an alternative product like a cobble paver instead of asphalt. He said it can be parked on but decreases a sea of asphalt. He said they would like to think that higher quality parking areas would mitigate a higher quantity of spaces.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the 11 parking spaces were eliminated, there is a really nice opportunity for a walking path. She suggested that if one goes to the salon to get their toes done, they will not want to walk a long way so she understands proximity to the door is important to this business.

Mr. Meyers suggested maybe instead of 11 spaces there are 5 spaces and the middle 6 are turned into a segment of the park creating a meshing of parking to the park. Ms. De Rosa indicated that could be interesting.

Mr. Miller asked what the position is of the City as this is a huge variance. Vince Papsidero agreed and we need to review the proposal to ensure we are not setting any kind of precedent knowing the intent of the District. He said a very detailed parking study is important and the Commission has to weigh the results with the overall design intent for the District. He said Staff and the ART struggled trying to get to a yes on the proposal because of the big issues to weigh such as two-story functionality of the building and the setbacks, even though we understand the site constraints.

Mr. Brown inquired about the parking lot layout and on the basis for a master plan - how this building would engage the other building in any way or would it ever. Mr. Myers responded there is a path on the west edge of the lot. He indicated they intend to have the employees park at that corporate area/existing building and leave the close proximity parking for the customers. He said if you are well to do, you are

getting dropped off so the routing of the entry drive is so the passenger side of the vehicle is at the door. He said signs and parking components are set up at the perimeter building for preferential parking at the front – accessibility, handicap, and bridal parties, etc. He said signs are not being proposed at this time as they are going through the brand re-configuration and the graphic of the brand is being considered. He indicated it is possible that branded elements might be placed on those blank walls.

Mr. Brown stated the sign code is very adaptable and there is an opportunity to win the Commission over by doing something really cool. Mr. Myer said the applicant plans on elegance.

Mr. Brown said the parking is tough because it really starts a precedent.

Ms. Salay said she is hearing the applicant say that they plan to soften the parking and that is what she is really interested in.

Ms. Mitchell asked how this is different from the suburban concept.

Ms. De Rosa referred to the floor plan. She inquired about a garden view from the large windows. She suggested there is a way to make it feel not suburban in that approach.

The Vice Chair invited public comment.

Roger Ansell, 4232 Hobbs Landing Drive West, said he is the president of the Greystone Mews Homeowner's Association. He reported they are happy to have Penzone as a neighbor. As a community, they have a concern with any kind of connection to Hobbs Landing Drive East as they do not see how that benefits anybody.

Lee Bryant, 4254 Troutbrook Drive, echoed what Mr. Ansell said. He said the future connector for those in Greystone Mews do not see a need for it and do not want it. He said they do not have an issue with the proposed parking lot if the Commission supports it. He said the Mews is in support of a stable company building out on the corner like Penzone. He said he is in favor of more walking paths that can also accommodate cyclists.

The Vice Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wished to speak with regard to this case. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Meyers said as they considered the overall Penzone campus, to respectfully take the network street that is part of the overall BSD master plan and have that as the ceremonial entrance to the campus and have it feed into the campus and allow a pedestrian/bicycle extension that goes to the residential neighborhood. He said this would result in connectivity of pedestrian/bicycle easy access and walkability without necessarily getting headlights of cars driving right into the front façade of someone that has enjoyed living in their condominium for a while. He said that would align with the intent of the BSD and the residents do not need to be impacted to the point it is a detriment, creating a convenience because now it is walkable.

The Vice Chair asked if this Commission would concur to have Staff and City Council re-evaluate that extension; they want to preserve the right-of-way.

Ms. Salay said when that is viewed as a building block on a map without taking the existing neighborhood into consideration, that street makes a lot of sense because it finishes a block and breaks up the long piece between the entrance to Greystone Mews on the north and Village Parkway on the south.

Mr. Meyers said his concern was the reaction of Mr. Penzone when the City is saying we want to have him develop this campus for his organization but want the right to be able to split it in half and put a road through it.

Ms. Salay said this is the conceptual street network plan.

Ms. Husak said that is why Staff posed the question. She said it probably does not take property lines into account in every instance.

Mr. Brown said there is not a road there, the other road terminates there, and the master plan design should respond to that determination.

Mr. Meyers said the Penzone master plan should fit into the BSD master plan but the entry component and connectivity and intent of what that is, is not necessarily to be able to drive a car from Village Parkway to the condominiums. He said the applicant needs to create a graphic that shows what that could be for the Commission to review.

Mr. Stidhem asked if we are considering solar panels for on top of that roof or at least wiring it so at some point we can put solar panels on top of that roof. Mr. Meyers answered yes as it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Stidhem suggested requirements for renewables need to be added to the Code.

Mr. Brown said the electric easement drives this.

The Vice Chair asked Ms. Burchett if she needed any other feedback from the Commission. She said she heard what she needed to from the questions that were provided.

Mr. Brown indicated what drives him on this whole thing is that it be a dynamic building, unique, and engage Village Parkway. He said he would like Penzone to be part of the identity for Bridge Street.

Mr. Papsidero said the street network map is really important on a larger perspective as a policy foundation for the district because the goal is to create a series of blocks and connections through. He said how it works with this application is an issue.

Ms. De Rosa reiterated she loved the whole spa approach and the idea of services that are geared toward healthiness.

Mr. Miller concluded the corner is going to be cool.

Mr. Brown concluded if there is a really cool and dynamic element, whether it fits in the current Code or Zoning, to bring it.

Ms. Mitchell agreed and said there is the Code and the BSD brand and the two have to come together in a really vibrant way.

**3. Village at Coffman Park – Phase III
15-116AFDP**

**Post Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Ms. Newell said the following application is a proposal for the development of 41 condominium units and all associated site improvements on the remaining 9.5-acres of vacant parcel as part of the Village at Coffman Park Residential Development. She said the site is south of Post Road, east of

Discovery Boulevard, and north of Wall Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of Minor Modifications to the Development Text and Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She said the Commission will be required to vote on these requests separately and is the final authority on this application. She noted anyone intending to address the Commission will need to be sworn-in.

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

Logan Stang presented the aerial view of the site and said this case was reviewed informally in February, 2016. He explained the Minor Text Modification request impacts all three phases. He presented the Approved Final Development Plan from 2005.

Phase 1: 11 existing condominiums per the approved Final Development Plan (approved as 12, amended in 2007).

Phase 2: 11 condominium units, currently at the building permit stage, per the approved Final Development Plan.

Phase 3: 41 proposed condominiums per this amended Final Development Plan.

Mr. Stang presented the revised Site Plan. He stated the original approval had designated three buildings located in the northwest portion of the site for live/work units. He said the applicant has shifted the parking from the west to the east to help block the view from Discovery Boulevard. He explained the reconfiguration of the open space layout and presented the proposed benches and landscaping. He said the applicant has indicated that tree protection fencing and the majority of the trees that will be preserved are along Post Road parkland. He presented the light fixtures proposed for every unit and the requirement for providing additional street lighting has been removed.

Mr. Stang presented a photograph of the existing phase, illustrations of the proposed architecture proposed during the informal, and the revised architectural graphics showing two additional models of which there are six in total and are fairly consistent with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Stang concluded there were two motions requested that included seven Minor Text Modifications with no conditions and an Amended Final Development Plan with nine conditions.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the seven requested Minor Text Modifications:

1. To modify the development text to remove the requirement for live/work units and any and all development standards associated with this use;
2. To modify the development text to remove the rental/leasing exhibit;
3. To modify the development text to remove the requirement for street lighting;
4. To modify the development text to remove any and all references and requirements for a Post Road retention basin;
5. To modify the development text to remove any and all references and requirements to Post Road landscaping associated with the "Post Road Theme";
6. To modify the development text to address conditions of approval from previous applications; and
7. To modify the development text to address exhibit and item references throughout the text that are impacted by the previously listed modifications.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan with nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure that all modifications to the text are addressed and documented;

- 2) That the applicant provide a window box detail and Site Plan indicating the location of window boxes for each unit;
- 3) That the proposed elevations adhere to the 50% stone veneer requirement for building surfaces directly facing a public or private street or courtyard, prior to submitting for building permitting;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to address all technical comments regarding location of curb ramps and site grading;
- 5) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to ensure the multi-use path along Discovery Boulevard is completed per City approved plans by August 31st, 2016, unless a later date is authorized by the City Engineer;
- 6) That the applicant continue to work with Planning to determine if a tree replacement fee is required and if so to pay the fee-in-lieu for deficiencies prior to submitting for building permitting;
- 7) That any existing trees be shown on the utility and grading plans along with tree protection fencing;
- 8) That the applicant provide a summary on the landscaping plan indicating that the proposed tree and corresponding requirement it addresses; and
- 9) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the landscape plans prior to submitting for building permitting.

Bob Miller asked what the "Post Road Theme" was since he was being asked to vote on that text modification. Mr. Stang explained there was a certain type of landscaping proposed all along Post Road but the theme never came to fruition due to multiple changes to the adjacent properties.

Ms. Newell stated a few gazebos were constructed along Post Road.

Mr. Stang noted the pump house that will have additional landscaping around it.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Gary Smith, G2 Planning Design, 720 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, said he is representing the applicant, Romanelli & Hughes. He indicated a lot of great feedback was received at the Informal Review and made corresponding changes. He stated the applicant agrees to all of the conditions.

The Chair invited public comment.

Ron Hall, 6014 Kenzie Lane, said he is president of the Homeowner's Association and in favor of this application.

Chris Cline, 6060 Post Road, said he and his wife are present as they are impacted by this development; they lived in the area since 1980. He indicated he is also in favor of this development.

The Chair invited further public comment. [Hearing none.]

Amy Salay thanked the applicant for including the residents in the process.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the seven requested Minor Text Modifications as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

The Chair asked the applicant if they were in agreement with the nine conditions to the Amended Final Development Plan. The applicant answered they agreed to the conditions.

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the nine stated conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

**4. Perimeter West PCD, Subarea 1 – Kumon Math and Reading Center of Dublin Avery
16-016AFDP/CU 6860 C Perimeter Drive
Amended Final Development Plan/Conditional Use**

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Kumon Learning Center Minor Text Modification. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve the Kumon Learning Center Amended Final Development Plan. 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. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Kumon Learning Center Conditional Use. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak thanked Lori Burchett for holding down the office when all the rest of the Planners attended the APA Conference in Arizona.

Cathy De Rosa asked if what was learned at the APA Conference could be discussed to determine what was applicable here.

Amy Salay suggested that City Council be included in that discussion. She said she was interested in what Planners took away from the conference as they were able to attend some activities that she did not attend.

Chris Brown said he would also like to talk about the art work, pocket parks, and signs that were there in Arizona as he took a lot of photographs.

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 10:42 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 5, 2016.