



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

JUNE 9, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block** **Mooney Street**
16-038BPR **Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**

- 2. BSDSRN – Bridge Park, H Block** **Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street**
16-039BPR **Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**

- 3. BSD SCN - Charles Penzone Grand Salon** **6671 Village Parkway**
16-015BPR **Basic Plan Review (Approved 6 – 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, Bob Miller, Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, and Amy Salay. Deborah Mitchell was absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Philip Hartmann, Donna Goss, Nichole Martin, 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: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 5 - 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 that no cases were eligible for the consent agenda tonight. She determined to take the cases in the following order: 3, 1, and 2 and the minutes will reflect the cases recorded in the order as they were published in the agenda.

- 1. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, G Block** **Mooney Street**
16-038BPR **Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a mixed-use development, including two buildings containing residential units, office and retail uses, and a parking structure. She said the site is south of Tuller Ridge Drive, north of Bridge Park Avenue, west of Dale Drive, and east of Mooney Street. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Nichole Martin asked if cases for Block G and H could be heard together as the sites are adjacent to one another. The Chair introduced Block H as well so both cases could be heard simultaneously.

**2. BSDSRN – Bridge Park, H Block
16-039BPR**

**Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a residential condominium development consisting of approximately 75 townhome units. She said the site is located with John Shields Parkway to the north, Dale Drive to the east, Mooney Street to the west, and Tuller Ridge Drive to the south. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Nichole Martin noted G Block is located in the Bridge Park development, south of H Block, west of Dale Drive. She explained an informal review is not required but since the Basic Site Plan Review will be going to City Council per a development agreement, this informal review provides an opportunity for the PZC to provide feedback for Council's consideration.

Ms. Martin provided a brief history of the Bridge Park development. She said Blocks G and H are the fourth and fifth blocks of development in Bridge Park. She explained G is in a transitional area between some of the previously approved projects in C, B, and A blocks. She said H will have a very different feel from the other blocks of development.

Ms. Martin said two buildings are proposed for G Block labeled as G1, which is a 72,000-square-foot, six-story, mixed-use building and Building G2/G3 as a 300,000-square-foot, 5-story, fully residential wrapped parking structure. She stated that 0.33-acre of public open space is proposed along Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge Drive while 0.84-acre is required. She explained the main plaza is proposed between buildings G1 and G2/G3 and accounts for the majority of the public open space provided within the block. She said the plaza design aligns with the Block C plaza to the west to provide a cohesive connection between the two blocks. She said there are also two smaller open spaces provided, accessible from the residential units in G2/G3 building.

Ms. Martin said G1 contains retail on the first floor, office on the second floor, and a mix of 48 residential units (efficiencies, 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms) located along Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. The G2/G3 building, she said, contains 406 parking spaces and a mix of 132 residential units (micro units, efficiencies, 1 and 2 bedrooms) on all four sides. She said the fourth floor will provide a private residential access between buildings G1 and G2/G3. She presented the floor plans for both buildings. She noted the façade materials: G1 depicts three different colors of brick and glass as primary materials for the retail and office located on stories one and two and stories three through six introduce two different metal panels with subtle façade articulations as well as private residential balconies. G2/G3 depicts two different colors of brick primarily present on the lower stories of the building. She said fiber cement siding, fiber cement panels, and metal panels are introduced on the upper stories; red fiber cement panels are depicted where the façade is inset for residential balconies and the parking garage entrance. She said the western elevation along Mooney Street is the only location where individual residential units (6) have access to a public street, not through a common entrance. The individual units she noted have entrances oriented to the side and are masked by brick-clad planters.

Ms. Martin said there are two vehicular access points for the garage: one on Mooney Street and the other on Dale Drive. She noted the pedestrian and public access points.

Ms. Martin concluded her presentation on Block G with the following discussion questions:

1. Does the proposal provide an appropriate transition given the surrounding development?
2. Does the Commission support the proposed architectural style and building materials?
3. Is there adequate open space provided in appropriate locations?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Ms. Martin said Block H is located north of Block G, directly west of the Sycamore Ridge Apartments and directly south of the Grand facility. She said a new public street is proposed (Larimer Street) to connect Mooney Street to Dale Drive and provide vehicular access to the auto courts in the development. She said public and private open space is provided. She explained there are three pairs of buildings (H1, H2, and H3), each split in a north/south direction to provide access to the auto courts and garages. She explained that part of the site is the John Shields Greenway so the applicant has determined the appropriate amount of dedication required. She indicated the proposal shows some steps to the front entries extending into the Greenway and the applicant will have to work with staff to reconfigure these areas. She explained Code requires 0.34-acre of public open space for the proposed development of H Block and private open space is proposed between buildings H1 and H2 for exclusive use by residents. She said the proposal shows ground level parking under all 75 units and will include one- or two-car garages, depending on the size of the unit. She said currently 153 spaces are provided within enclosed garages and at adjacent streets for the 75 units and all garages are accessed through an auto court with a permeable paver system with an ingress/egress in one location for each building off of a secondary street.

Ms. Martin presented an illustration using building H3 as an example. From the site plan, she said it appears that some of the units may have difficulty maneuvering vehicles in and out of their unit's garage.

Ms. Martin presented the architecture for the proposed Mooney Street and Tuller Ridge elevations. She noted the renderings show a contemporary architectural style emphasizing geometric forms with various roof heights, balconies, railings, and front stoops. She explained the illustrated building materials include glass, brick, wood, and cement fiber panels. To create architectural interest, she said, the applicant addressed facade diversity with two colors of brick to break down the massing of the facades into a pedestrian scale; horizontal and vertical facade articulations to further break down the massing; and secondary materials will be used to create building variety and diversity. She indicated the applicant is proposing a neutral color palette; however, specific building materials have not been chosen at this time and more detail will be provided in the future. She added metal sunscreens and decorative balconies that provide visual interest along the street.

Ms. Martin concluded Block H with discussion questions for the Commission's consideration:

1. Does the Commission support the proposed site layout and design of the units?
2. Does the proposed design and architectural elements of the buildings fit with the intended character of this area of the district?
3. Does the Commission have concerns with circulation and access within the auto court?
4. Should the greenway be the only public open space for the proposal?
5. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Bob Miller inquired about the auto courts from an engineering perspective. Ms. Martin said further maneuverability detail has been requested.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, said Ms. Martin did a really good job at going through all the details for these two blocks. He presented the Site Plan noting this is a continuation of the Bridge Park Avenue streetscape. He said the open space aligning with the C Block open space differ in design so they each have a unique identity. He said how the block differs from the other blocks is that it contains a completely wrapped parking garage. He pointed out the residential liners along C Block so it is important to maintain that character on the G Block.

Mr. Hunter explained that they have continued to push the architect so the buildings have a strong identity. He said the outdoor spaces were enhanced that included balcony space overlooking Bridge Park Avenue, second floor office space provides covered space on the ground floor so the restaurants that

move in will have a unique space. He noted how the materials weave, highlighting the horizontal and vertical aspects of the building.

Mr. Hunter summarized the Bridge Park experience. He said C2 is along Riverside Drive, C3 is under construction, and now they have worked their way up the development, creating unique identities for each of the buildings. He said they share common themes and materials but the uniqueness comes from the detail. He said the G1 building is a transitional building and on the edge of their property as it exists today. He noted there is a legacy product across the street (Dale Drive) of shorter heights so they paid more attention to that.

Mr. Hunter introduced a new product called millennium tile; it was installed on 5th Avenue, a branch of the Columbus Public Library. He explained it was originally designed to be a roofing tile but it is starting to be used on the sides of buildings and it has a reflective quality and it comes in different textures and colors. He said they would like to use it on the top of the building without using a strong cornice to bring down the scale.

Mr. Hunter said they are using a different architect for the condominium buildings in Block H and asked him to come forward.

David Keyser, dkb Architects, 52 E. Lyn Street, explained every unit will either face onto the public street or onto a public or private open space per the crescent configuration of the six buildings. He said the auto courts are accessed and primarily shielded from the public areas. He said the massing of the buildings is broken down to a pedestrian scale. He said some units have porches or balconies. He said one of their challenges was the 17-foot grade difference between Dale Drive and Mooney Street. He said it helps the units individualize with varying heights of stoops with steps moving up the Tuller Ridge elevation creating a pedestrian friendly relationship.

Chris Brown inquired about the taller towers. Mr. Hunter said there are larger units with roof terraces where that tower element pops up to the fourth floor.

Amy Salay asked if the stairs were divided. Mr. Hunter answered that yes the stairs are individualized.

Ms. Martin again presented the discussion questions for G Block.

Mr. Brown stated he liked the new and improved version of building G1. He said as the whole project develops, other than the hotel, we have much of the same building vocabulary going on everywhere from Tuller Flats to C Block to B Block. He said the variation is not tremendous so he considers this new millennium tile as a dynamic element. He said he looked at G1 and G2 to see if they would be able to be converted to another use in the future. He encouraged the applicant to consider a different framing structure above the second level. He said he likes that the envelope is still being pushed with the architect. He stated Bridge Park is a very important drive and there should be building diversity for the pedestrian experience. He said the monolithic building mass has been broken up as dictated by the Code. He said there needs to be enough variation from façade to façade to façade that he currently does not see. He suggested the style of G2/G3 be changed. He explained from the panoramic view of the development, metal is all that is visible from the tops of each building, which he does not like. He said it is all urban contemporary architecture but between the building materials and the rhythm, there is too much sameness. He referred to Seaside, FL as a good example for variation. He said G1 is an important building because it is not on the river and transitional to other development of Bridge Park.

Victoria Newell agreed with Mr. Brown's comments. She said if she was just looking at one building and not in context with everything else, she would probably like it. She said it repeats a lot of what the Commission has already been presented with and was hoping for a new rhythm for these two blocks. She said G2 becomes very vertical per the elements so the massing is not right. She said it is busy and not

helping. She said nothing is providing a backdrop or a relief from the rhythm and patterns created. She suggested extending brick to the top of the building. She stated she did not know anything about the millennium tile and cautioned the applicant about tile not aging well as glazing starts to wash away. She requested more information about the material.

Mr. Hunter said it is a metal tile formed to have a shape to it and not glazed. He said some have a more galvanized look and some have more of a reflective sheen.

Cathy De Rosa asked what unique voice this building is trying to make. She inquired about the amount of glass.

Mr. Hunter said there is metal used with the glass. He asked for the Commission's feedback on the color blocking and the use of color. He said a lot more can be done with fiber cement panels as they come in a variety of color.

Ms. De Rosa said color brings energy.

Ms. Newell suggested more brick to get away from the repeat of pattern and bring relief. She said she was not opposed to bringing bright colors to a building as long as she can be convinced they will stand the test of time and keep it fresh and maintained.

Mr. Brown said he liked the glass and the openness of the corner.

Ms. Salay said she likes the idea of all brick. She asked if millennium tile would be a way to introduce color instead of fiber cement panels. She inquired about the red color for G2.

Mr. Hunter said specific bricks have not been determined.

Steve Stidhem said G2/G3 looks like a Tetris screen so he wants to see something different. He said he liked the red the way it was used.

Ms. De Rosa said she liked the park plaza between the two buildings, including the water elements and the different elevations.

Ms. Newell said she liked the plaza, too.

Bob Miller said he visited the site. He said he liked G1 and for G2/G3 he thought at first it looked boring but when he stood down on Riverside Drive, and envisioned what was going to be in front and going into Sycamore Ridge, he thought the design would work really well. He asked if there was any chance to bring any green into the roof for G2/G3.

Mr. Hunter said it is a flat roof.

Mr. Miller said he loved the architecture for Block H. He said it felt like two completely different separate projects. He was concerned about units fronting the greenway and others fronting the pool, while some units front on no open space. He said he understands the auto courts but there are too many units going into too small of a space. He indicated he envisioned a lot of congestion at the am and pm rush hours. He clarified that H1 and H2 looked like one project and H3 is a separate project separated by Larimer Street. He asked if the pricing would be consistent across all three buildings to which Mr. Hunter said they would. Mr. Hunter said there would be a consistent cost per square foot.

Mr. Hunter said the engineers at EMH&T calculated the turning radii of the auto courts.

Ms. Newell thought it was still an issue and believes residents will have trouble maneuvering and it will be tough for the applicant to make the corner garage unit work. She said the intent of the BSD is to make it feel walkable and is concerned with the public private space with the swimming pool. She said she liked the architecture and looks forward to seeing more detail about the materials, etc.

Mr. Hunter said the area is private but it is not gated. He said the pool is worth a conversation and per the Ohio law, there would have to be a gate.

Ms. Salay said she likes the architecture a lot and likes the idea of the pool area. She cautioned about making the auto courts too large but likes the islands in the middle. She did not think there will be an issue with too many cars coming and going at the same time. She said the buildings are gorgeous and will add an element to the BSD that has been missing. She said these designs far exceeded her expectations.

Ms. De Rosa said she liked the architecture and the balconies are interesting, not monotonous like other buildings. She said the courtyards felt European. She asked if the on-street parking would be reserved. Mr. Hunter said parking spaces would not specifically be reserved.

Mr. Stidhem said he liked the architecture and overall the plan was cool. He said it reminded him of San Francisco.

Mr. Brown said he liked the architecture and is not opposed to a pool but the public should be able to go east to west. He said there would be on-street parking on Larimer and he would like having a space right in front of this unit. He said the pool would be used, minimally, and questioned the amount of sun it would receive. He said he liked the taller ridge elevations and how they tumble down the hill like San Francisco. He asked how mail will be managed.

Mr. Hunter indicated the US Postal Service will require that the mail be consolidated. He said there is a building by the pool that would be able to house something like that.

Mr. Brown inquired about the alignment of Larimer Street and the connectivity to the east of this block.

Mr. Hunter indicated the developers want to introduce a grocer but it requires a service bay so this area works the best.

Mr. Brown said he anticipates this being a large empty-nester community and asked where larger units might go that have a lot of money. Mr. Hunter said he did not think this would be the only condominium product on the east side and they are contemplating other areas.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.]

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

**6671 Village Parkway
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the construction of a 12,000-square-foot building and associated site improvements for a salon on the west side of Village Parkway at the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066. The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission.

Claudia Husak said Aaron Stanford, our Senior Civil Engineer, is available to discuss some of the issues to be addressed this evening.

Ms. Husak explained the applicant presented this spa/salon proposal for a Case Review with the Administrative Review Team (ART) on March 24, 2016. She said Staff recommended an Informal Review to receive initial feedback from the Planning and Zoning Commission before coming with the Basic Plan Review application. The Commission she said, provided the applicant with several comments and recommendations and the revisions stemmed from that review are what is being presented this evening. She stated the Commission is being asked to evaluate the proposal for consistency with applicable Codes and policies and render a decision on the application. She indicated that several items, particularly with open space, landscaping, and signs will be addressed in further detail later in the application process as only limited detail has been provided on these items and staff will continue to work with the applicant on meeting these requirements as the project moves forward.

Ms. Husak said there are three motions as part of this application:

1. Basic Site Plan Waivers (10 proposed)
2. Basic Plan Recommendation (3 Conditions)
3. Required Reviewing Body Determination

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site. She pointed out the project is located on a portion of the existing Charles Penzone Salon parcel and the vacant portion of the site is under consideration. She explained the parcel adjoins private properties to the north, south, and west. She said the property does not have direct frontage on Shamrock Boulevard; the principal frontage street is Village Parkway along the eastern boundary of the property. She noted the property contains stormwater, right-of-way, and utility easements that constricts site placement options.

Ms. Husak said the Commission informally reviewed and commented on this proposal on April 7, 2016. She indicated many Commissioners were concerned that the proposal felt too suburban in the proposed location where an urban, walkable, and energetic atmosphere is envisioned. She said the Commission complimented the applicant on the material selected for the proposed building, while also commenting on a lack of excitement for the building different from what is envisioned for the Bridge Street District. She said the Commission reiterated the district's vision for a dynamic, exciting entrance off Village Parkway for this area. She indicated the Commission encouraged the applicant to create opportunities with lighting, sophisticated site furnishings and elements to create space that diminishes the parking lot presences in the site plan. She said the Commissioners also discussed the location of right-of-way for a neighborhood street in relation to the existing driveway and structure.

Ms. Husak presented the revised Site Plan where the applicant removed the 13 parking spaces facing Village Parkway – identified as a loading area; the orientation of the rear parking area was shifted to align with the rear property line; and a plaza space was added and reconfigured.

Ms. Husak presented the revised elevation as seen from Village Parkway. She noted there is a single consistent roof type designed to give a second story appearance; more glass along the front of the

building has been incorporated with façade transitions; a front entrance feature to extend the presence along Village Parkway was added; and the transparency along the frontage has been increased. She presented additional elevations for each of the four sides and explained the orientation. She indicated a Master Sign Plan will be coming forward unless the applicant revises the proposal to meet all sign requirements so the signs shown are not part of the proposal tonight.

Ms. Husak said 10 Waivers are being requested as part of this application. She explained that some of these Waivers should be grouped together under a single request and this is more for procedural reasons than the applicant not meeting the intent of the Code. For example, she said to allow for the one-story building, three Waivers are necessary.

Ms. Husak said the first three Waivers are to allow for the applicant to construct a one-story Loft Building type and these include minimum building height, articulation of stories on street facades, and ground story height.

1. Minimum Building Height – 2 stories (required); ±31-foot high, one-story building (requested).
2. Articulation of Stories on Street Façades – The building façades have been articulated to create the impression of a one- and one-half or two-story building on a one-story building.
3. Ground Story Height – 12 feet to 18 feet ground story height (required); ±31-foot ground story height (requested).

Ms. Husak said Waivers 4, 5, 6, and 10 allow for the applicant to meet the intent of the BSD Code while working with specific site constraints including an electric easement along Village Parkway.

4. Front Required Building Zone - Structure located between 0-15 feet from the front property line required: 23 feet requested
5. Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum of 75% of the front property line required: no Front Property Line Coverage proposed
6. Right-of-Way Encroachments - Awnings, canopies, eaves, patios, and projecting signs may encroach. The site has been designed with a street wall to meet the intent of other Code requirements.
10. Street Wall Standards - Street Walls to be located within Required Building Zone: Proposed street wall approximately 27 feet to the east of the nearest building façade

Ms. Husak said Waivers 7, 8, and 9 are to accommodate functionality of the proposed use.

7. Parking Location – The parking area to be located in the rear yard or within the building (required). Parking to the rear and side (requested).
8. Principal Entrance Location – Primary Street Façade (required); North Elevation (requested).
9. Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions – Maximum width 22 feet (required); ±24 feet off-street parking drive aisles (requested).

Ms. Husak said Aaron Stanford will discuss the street network.

Aaron Stanford said he is the Senior Civil Engineer with the City of Dublin. He reported staff met with some of the residents from Greystone Mews on Monday.

Mr. Stanford explained a comprehensive district-wide transportation analysis was conducted during the development of the BSD Code. He said the key conclusions of the Nelson/Nygaard report were:

1. A dense, grid-style street pattern was verified to operate well in an urban core context of the BSD;

2. Multiple grid connections help alleviate congestion so turn lanes would not be required except at key locations;
3. A dense, mixed-use development environment (as envisioned for the BSD), supported by a and multi-modal transportation system would likely result in about a 40 percent internal capture of vehicle trips in the District;
4. River bridges would improve overall neighborhood connectivity but would not relieve current or projected congestion for the Bridge Street/High Street intersection; and
5. Street Families classifications, rather than traditional roadway functional classes, were used to better convey the character of its streets and the BSD as an urban core, rather than as a more traditional suburban development model.

Mr. Stanford said one of the main goals of the Bridge Street District is Walkability - A measure of how friendly an area is to walking. He said the factors include:

- Presence and quality of sidewalks;
- Traffic and road conditions;
- Land use patterns;
- Building accessibility; and
- Safety, among others.

To understand how to provide a successful transportation system, supporting walkability, he said, transportation studies were conducted.

Mr. Stanford presented Zoning Code §153.061 – Street Types. He said the intent is to develop a transportation network that can accommodate multiple modes of transportation and that encourages and increases an areas' walkability. He said the street we are discussing tonight as it relates to this proposal would be a neighborhood street type. He explained this type of street is designed to handle low-medium volumes of traffic, to provide for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and typically connects residential uses to neighborhood-serving uses.

Mr. Stanford presented the Bridge Street District Street Network map that was a result of this analysis and became part of the Code §153.061-A. He explained the map is organized by street families:

- Corridor Connector Streets (Pink) are important for our long trips and convey the most traffic, while opening access to new streets.
- District Connectors (Yellow) are important to convey pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles through and between main areas of activity.
- Neighborhood streets (Green) are important to provide comfortable and convenient connections to pedestrians and bikes, while allowing vehicles to distribute across the grid.
- Alleys and service streets are needed for required access and maintenance activities within a site.

He stated this map reflects the existing infrastructure is over-laid with proposed street network grids. He said this is used in addition to the Thoroughfare Plan as a guide in determining the appropriate locations and alignments of new streets during the development plan approval process as required in Code §153.066.

Mr. Stanford presented the site in context with this street network map. He clarified this property does not extend to the property of Greystone Mews so the right-of-way dedication is not connected to the Greystone Mews community. He explained the dashed green line illustrates the neighborhood streets within the BSD grid.

Mr. Stanford presented a photo of John Shields Parkway as an example that showed some of the pavement finishes for a typical BSD street, which makes the pedestrian experience more friendly and walkable.

Ms. Husak reiterated that three votes were needed this evening for this application:

1. Basic Site Plan Waivers (10 proposed)
2. Basic Plan Recommendation (3 Conditions)
3. Required Reviewing Body Determination

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for 10 Site Plan Waivers:

1. Minimum Building Height: §153.062(O)(4): one-story building
2. Articulation of Stories on Street Façades: §153.062(G): one-story building
3. Ground Story Height: §153.062(O)(4): one-story building
4. Front Required Building Zone: §153.062(O)(4): site constraints
5. Front Property Line Coverage: §153.062(O)(4): site constraints
6. Right-of-Way Encroachments: §153.062(O)(4): site constraints
7. Parking Location: §153.062(O)(4): parking plan
8. Principal Entrance Location: §153.062(O)(4): building use
9. Off-Street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions: §153.065(B)(4): parking plan
10. Street Wall Standards: §153.065(E)(2)(j): site constraints

Ms. Husak said approval is recommended for the Basic Site Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan application with the Development Plan/Site Plan application;
- 2) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat application; and
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to determine the location of the neighborhood street right-of-way.

Ms. Husak said a required reviewing body needs to be determined for the Parking Plan and Final Development Plan, Final Site Plan, and a potential Master Sign Plan. She said the Planning and Zoning Commission has the option of appointing the Administrative Review Team or the PZC to review all future applications.

Amy Salay inquired about the right-of-way. She asked he owned the land between Hobbs Landing and the Penzone parcel. Ms. Husak explained there are a couple of different ownerships in place. She explained the parcel with the parking on it is shared by Penzone's with the owners of the Dublin Village Center. She said the parcel that includes the retention pond and frontage along Shamrock Boulevard are owned by the owners of the Dublin Village Center. She said the piece of land, part of Greystone Mews, east of Hobbs Landing, is owned by the City and maintained by the HOA.

Ms. Salay asked what would trigger the construction of the proposed neighborhood street. Ms. Husak explained it would be the development of the parcel that contained the retention pond.

Ms. Salay asked for the location of the power line easement to which Ms. Husak pointed out.

Steve Stidhem asked if the Penzone development was triggering the construction of the proposed street. Ms. Husak clarified the Penzone application is triggering the dedication of the right-of-way.

Chris Brown asked if this was a preservation of opportunity.

Ms. Husak explained that in the BSD, based on the street network map, any kind of parcel that is coming to the City for development or redevelopment that has a proposed street through it, Staff would have that conversation with the applicant, first.

Mr. Brown said when he looks at it as preservation of a right-of-way, it is not as much a potential for developing where the retention pond is, it is what might happen at Dublin Village Center in the future and how the grid connects with the rest of the district. He clarified that is why the City views it as vital. He said he understands the people are concerned not by what Mr. Penzone is trying to do but rather this street going through. He asked everyone to understand there are two separate issues: 1) business man trying to expand and do something that is part of the community; and 2) Master community plan. Phil Hartmann added the preservation of a right-of-way was City Council's vision so it is not in the PZC purview to deviate from that.

Bob Miller said parking was discussed a lot at the Informal Review. He asked about the number of spaces that were requested then and where we are now and if Staff had any concerns with the amount of spaces.

Ms. Husak said Staff continually has concerns regarding the underutilization of the site in terms of there being more parking than building on the site. She said the data that the applicant provided for their parking use is solid. She said the applicant also provided possible additional uses on the site. She said Staff interpreted the Commission's comments as not being as concerned about the amount of parking requested as the ART may have been. She indicated Staff feels pretty comfortable with the parking as it is and appropriate.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Charles Penzone, 6671 Village Parkway, said he has appreciated having an operation in Dublin. He said he is the Chairman and Founder of the company started in 1969, and for 32 years there has been a presence in Dublin. He emphasized this has been very important for their company. He indicated they have plans to develop this property even further and he is concerned with bisecting their "campus". He said they want to extend this property long-term.

Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates Architecture, echoed Mr. Penzone's comments about working with Dublin. He said staff has been fantastic. He said they started with something much different and have since gained an understanding of the Code and how we can make this a true example as best as we can to meet the BSD Code. He said Ms. Husak did a great job of presenting this application.

Mr. Meyers said they started with 93 parking spaces and brought it down to 80. He said the area designated as loading is for the VIP drop off area like for brides, moms for Mother's Day spa treatment, prom goers, etc. He said the canopy covered entry space is intended to be a continuation of that pick-up space. He said they envision that space to embrace the landscape and the plaza. He stated internally, there are 40 salon stations, a full spa with seven treatment rooms, a nail and skin care space, and also an event space for small groups. He said with the constrictions of the site, they have really tried to meet the intent of the Code but 10 Waivers were still identified.

Mr. Meyers said they were asked to come up with a Master Plan that is not part of this application. He said they are considering supplemental buildings on the site for different components of health and wellness and clinical or medical related spa functions or treatment facilities. He said they have expanded the landscaping and seating areas that will tie into the bike path. He said the character and appearance of this parking lot is not a big black sea of asphalt but there is detail and refinement to it and it incorporates pervious pavers. He said they are being mindful with how the walkways can continue to the roundabout and beyond.

Mr. Meyers explained the Penzone's are in the process of rebranding and the direction they are headed has been reflected in the signs for the building. Even though the signs are not part of this application, he said they plan to return to address that and welcomes any feedback the Commission would like to provide at this preliminary stage.

Mr. Meyers stated the applicant is agreeable to the first two conditions of the Site Plan approval. He said for a neighborhood street to go through their property, a 50-foot right-of-way will need to be dedicated. He said they have proposed a right-of-way that would be 37 feet wide that would lessen the elimination of so many parking spaces since they are already at a premium. He said traffic also became a concern as it related to the adjacent neighborhood. He said they are proposing to create an identity of a neighborhood street but restrict it as a campus entry and the west end connection limited to pedestrians and cyclists rather than automobiles. He emphasized that the applicant wants to meet the intent of the BSD Code by having a connection but not have it be a fully auto-oriented street. He concluded by saying he is requesting the Commission's vote so they know if they can go forward and they are in a bit of a hurry.

Mr. Miller asked what material would be used for the street wall. Mr. Meyers said he likes the stone farm walls and the nod to being in Dublin.

Victoria Newell referred to landscaping photographs as examples. Mr. Meyer said the one illustration is for the paver band design. He said the building design has a number of horizontal slat conditions and part of that banding and regulated pattern would be translated into some of the landscape components. He said they intend on landscape up lighting to light canopies of the trees. He said they would like to mesh the landscaping with the hardscape, especially for that loading area. He said the Penzone's host a lot of events so they planned on potted plants at the perimeter of the building. He pointed out the path intended for the staff to use providing access across the campus from the current building, which may be repurposed for more office space. He said it is the intent that staff parking be further from the building to allow the customers closer access. He said low lighting bollards would be needed for the path at night. He pointed out where the bicycle racks and spaces would be located.

Ms. De Rosa noted the parking behind the current salon that is staff parking. Mr. Meyers confirmed that was included in their parking analysis.

Matt Dunlap, 6671 Village Parkway, clarified the west parking is shared parking with the other property owner but if that site ever gets developed the development supersedes the ability to park so it is a temporary situation.

The Chair invited public comment.

Roger Ansel, 4232 Hobbs Landing Drive, W., said he and his wife have resided in Greystone Mews for seven and a half years and absolutely love it. He indicated a "mews" is supposed to be a retreat or a hideaway. He said their community contains 132 condominiums surrounded by a walking path and a mature tree line and hedgerow. He said there are already three entry points into Greystone Mews. He said they are not opposed to development in the neighborhood. He said a new neighborhood street will not help the traffic concerns in the area. He said if it is not going to benefit Mr. Penzone's development, he does not see a reason to add a street; the neighborhood asked the Commission to vote no on the right-of-way as they oppose the street but would welcome a bike path.

Lee Bruinich, 4254 Troutbrook, said he agreed with everything Mr. Ansel just said. He said he cannot see how the added street would ever be used in a productive residential manner.

Terry Burnside, 6689 Hobbs Landing Drive, E., said there is a lot of contention about this proposed street. He indicated Greystone Mews is an island onto itself. He said they live there to avoid the traffic of

Sawmill Road. He said the walking path is used by people pushing strollers, walking dogs, our children and grandchildren. He said he opposes anything that provides a danger to their community. He said he is in favor of the Penzone project and the development in the Bridge Street District. He said they feel like they are being invaded. He asked the Commission to consider the current plan and come up with a better solution for the community.

Jill Kilanowski, 6756 Cooperstone Drive, said she and her husband are from New York City and they came to Ohio ±19 years ago. She said they were attracted to the Mews because of the development in the area and it was a protected environment. She said data changes over the years and the Commission cannot go on something that was determined several years ago and new assessments need to be made to see if it is still valid. She asked the Commission to consider headlights that would come into their windows if they had to live at a T-intersection. She questioned the stormwater pond and how it would affect future businesses. She urged the Commission to vote against this.

John Hayden, 6697 Hobbs Landing Drive, E., said he moved into Greystone Mews a year ago and it is a very unique and beautiful community. He said he is excited about the development in the Bridge Street District and the designs for this new building are beautiful. He questioned how much walking would happen in this area. He said people going to Lowe's would need a vehicle for their purchases. He said he loves that Mr. Penzone is expanding as it is great for the community. He said he understands the Code needed for the BSD but in this instance to consider common sense. He said people coming to the salon will want to come in and off of Village Parkway, not Hobbs Landing. He asked the Commission to vote against this part.

Bill Fullerton, 4223 Tuller Ridge Drive, said he has lived in Greystone Mews since 2009. He said the road is not necessary, it will adversely affect the planning at Penzone's, and it is a waste of money. He said he is supportive of the Penzone's plan, he thinks it is great, but he asked the Commission to vote against the road.

Jenny Dipaolo, 6713 Hobbs Landing Drive, E., said the road would meet at her front door. She said she loves her community and loves where she lives. She said she grew up in Columbus, Ohio. She said she found Greystone Mews six years ago and was told it would remain green space. She stated her front door is 13 feet from the street and those headlights would go directly into her windows. She said she does not want to move. She was quite upset. She said she would speak for a number of people on her street who will be detrimentally affected by a new street. She said it would not benefit Penzone and it would hurt the neighbors. She restated she does not want to move but cannot live on the end of a dead end street. She said she cannot risk a car missing that stop sign or cutting the corner too much because again, her door is only 13 feet away. She said her office is in that front room. She indicated today she had a conference call from 10 am to 5:30 pm, 7.5 hours on the phone, she counted 11 cars that drove past during that time and that is what she signed up for. She said Bridge Street is going to be wonderful and provide a lot of opportunities. She said earlier, Mr. Stanford referenced walking paths and bike paths five times. She said if a connector is needed, to please put in a walking path.

Phil Beckwith, 6739 Cooperstone Drive, asked if the use of a right-of-way demand a use of motor vehicles or can it by policy be interpreted as bicycle traffic only. Ms. Newell said it would always refer to vehicle traffic.

Ms. Husak said a right-of-way is for transportation.

Mr. Beckwith said he heard earlier that City Council already approved this and the PZC cannot do anything about that. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Brown said the Commission is appointed by Council to make recommendations, however, Council members are elected and there is a large group that does not want this and the developer does not want

this. He said Staff prefers to keep it for latitude. He said the Commission can always make a recommendation to Council that they revisit it.

Mr. Beckwith said he agrees with much of what everyone else said. He said it seems to be a notion that solves no particular problem and it improves no particular condition and therefore it is a capricious defacement of an established community and a waste of money.

Colleen Connor, 4239 Troutbrook Drive, said she understands wanting to preserve a grid pattern for the future but agrees with her neighbors that we do not gain any efficiencies by adding the right-of-way.

Mr. Hartman said what would happen is a preservation and the possibility of that going forward but Council at some time in the future could always change that; right-of-ways are vacated all the time. He said the condition states that the right-of-way be dedicated and that does not occur until the roadway is platted and then we would not use that until we would have some reason to think traffic wise, that that needs to go through, which would generally be the development of the adjacent parcel and who knows when that would be. He said it does not mean a road will be there, it just means it is a preservation at some point in the future if in fact they want to keep the grid system the way it is set up now in the codified ordinances.

Ms. Salay said she is on the Commission as well as City Council. She said the Council approved the grid style street network and when looking at this site, it would make sense to ask for a right-of-way. She said she sees that a lot of people would be detrimentally affected and there is an established business that also does not want the roadway. She indicated there would need to be a really compelling reason to build the road and tonight she does not see that scenario but we do not know what the future will hold. She said when the residents are asking the Commission to vote no, she explained they would not be voting on the construction of the roadway per se, the Commission is voting on an approval of a site plan with a right-of-way called out in the middle of it.

Rowene Bessey, 6737 Hobbs Landing, E., asked if there was anyone on City Council that is a realtor. She questioned whether anyone would be able to sell their house if it was known that a right-of-way was going through there and it would affect the price.

John Suba, 6740 Cooperstone, said he does not understand preserving land for a possible good opportunity or development. He said we have a good development now. He said when a different development is brought to this Commission, a dialogue should be brought to the residents to determine if it would be something that would benefit the neighborhood and does not deter from the value of the neighborhood. He said that would make sense but to say today we are going to rubber stamp an easement just in case something happens down the road, and take away from something great that is there now, does not make sense. He said if something is in the works, let us know, otherwise there is no need for this. He said if nobody else plans on developing the property and Mr. Penzone does not want it, then if there is a way to stop it then he thinks it should be stopped.

Jessica Pepper, 4250 Troutbrook Drive, said she agreed with her neighbors, and added when there are cars parked in the street, it is a challenge for two cars to pass each other so if a road were built, this would not be a good neighborhood to allow for cut-through traffic, besides there being a lot of kids and pets.

Loren Miller, 4247 Troutbrook Drive, said he would love to see the Penzone's site developed without the right-of-way so they could use the land as they see fit and to make it as prosperous as possible not only for jobs and community but for tax base and for the beauty of it. He said per the drawings, the building is beautiful.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else in the public that wanted to speak on behalf of this case. [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification from staff. He indicated his understanding of the Commission's role in this particular case is dealing with the right-of-way is determining if this particular plan responds to the right-of-way. Ms. Husak confirmed that was correct per the requirements of the BSD Code.

Mr. Brown said the Commission does not write the Code, they respond to the Code and sometimes grant Waivers to the Code. He clarified the question is whether Chris Meyers and the Penzones responded to that Code with their plans. As a Commission member and a citizen, he said looking at that grid, he cannot understand why that stub is there. He said Greystone Mews is stunning and it is an enclave that is going to be surrounded by wonderful area with a lot of vitality. He said we do not know what is going to happen at Dublin Village Center. He said surprisingly it has made a little bit of a rebound, which he did not expect. He said the way this development is laid out, he does not see ever cutting through there and he is a cut-through guy. He said it makes no sense. He said I cannot go through there to get to another street that gets me anywhere that I want to be. He said John Shields Parkway would be my path. He said when he votes on this tonight, it is not in regard to the right-of-way. He said he believes this should be brought back to City Council to revisit to see if this is preserving a right-of-way and can it be defined what it is for.

Mr. Hartmann clarified this is a recommendation that goes to Council so Council will be the final decision-maker. Ms. Husak added that when the plat is brought before the Commission, it is a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Brown proposed a future condition for when this is platted that the street be used for pedestrian and bicycle traffic and not used for automobiles. He indicated Council is very responsive but they are also strong and they see a bigger picture. He said he liked their vision but at the same time, he said he has never seen them totally squash a neighborhood.

Victoria Newell said she was around to see the original presentation of this street grid and they discussed how existing neighborhoods were going to intermesh with the new grid work and the other areas. She said her perception of the roadway there was this was a point where we might be able to create that grid section. She said she understands Council has voted on this network, but the Commission has granted Waivers for other development in the BSD for eliminating the right-of-way.

Ms. De Rosa said one of the wonderful things about living in the City of Dublin is that the community and the people you elect to lead the community and the people they hire to do our work, try very hard to put forward thinking ideas out for creating the grand visions that have led to this development and others. She said the value of having grid systems like this in these proposals allows us to think bigger. She indicated plans are approved but then they are revisited and resident input is obtained. She said it makes a lot of sense when this comes back for the plat, that whatever we can recommend to put conditions around that to make it useful in its current and potential future development makes a lot of sense. She said maybe there is an opportunity to have some walking and bicycling at some point so maybe it makes sense to preserve that option. She said she agrees with what she has heard tonight by not seeing where it adds value and where it detracts.

Ms. Salay said she would take this conversation back to her colleagues on Council and it is one of our first tests to our 50-year vision for a road system. She said this is one of the times the existing neighborhood and its residents run up against this vision. She said they all live in Dublin and do not want to see a neighborhood harmed. She said there are a lot of different ways to communicate with Council. She said she agrees with what she has heard tonight in that this does not make sense immediately; there will be a lot of evolution and change and cited Riverside Drive and Bridge Street as an example.

Mr. Brown commended staff as they work on the behalf of the residents.

Ms. Newell clarified that whenever water engineering occurs in the City of Dublin, by law, it is always analyzed and never permitted to be designed so it impacts the surrounding property owners.

Mr. Brown said the architecture is outstanding and he loves it. He said he knows Mr. Penzone and is familiar with a lot of Mr. Meyer's work and they both have high design standards. He said this plan has the quality and pizzazz we are looking for at this intersection. He said he understands the high tension tower is tough to deal with on this site. He referred to the sketch that showed potential future buildings and he is a big advocate of that. He recommended tying in the campus to the streetscape and developing a rhythm between the buildings to unite in an urban fashion making the area dynamic. He said he wanted to see the landscape become part of the framework.

Mr. Meyers said the essence of an urban street is the proximity and dimension between the facades. He said the existing building is fairly large. He said they plan to integrate the signage into the architecture of the buildings.

Ms. Newell said she really liked the architecture and it will look nice on the site. She said she liked the streetscape amenities and the pocket park. She said she is happy to see Charles Penzone stay in the City of Dublin and redevelop. She inquired about the grill work on the entry canopy.

Mr. Meyers said Mr. Penzone is a fantastic art collector of which there is an enormous amount of metal work. He said the entry canopy has the grill work incorporated into acrylic to provide cover from the weather and casts an interesting shadow which is also a reflection of the interior designs.

Ms. Newell said the ground sign will not fit well on this site as it looks like it is for an office park.

Mr. Meyers said the sign is existing on the current building site. He said the visibility of the new building to the roundabout and vehicular traffic, the intent of the branding and identity of the campus is pulled to that corner.

Ms. Newell said she drives by the sign on a regular basis and did not realize it was there; it is hidden by vegetation. She said she liked the stone wall feature in front of the parking and it conflicts with the sign. She suggested incorporating the sign into the wall.

Ms. De Rosa said she likes the CP sign and can see it being used as an interesting piece of art in the plaza. She said the architecture brings the urban feel of energy, which is fantastic.

Steve Stidhem said he appreciated the covered entrance.

Bob Miller said he liked how the mechanicals were screened on the roof. He asked if they would be visible as one was coming down from Lowe's to the roundabout. Mr. Meyer said some of the shielding will be visible from a long view.

Mr. Brown said there is opportunity outside for art and this Commission likes seeing fun, cool, and neat stuff. Mr. Meyers jokingly said metal sculptures in electrical easements are challenging.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, to approve 10 Site Plan Waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

The Chair asked Mr. Hartmann if the Commission has the ability to make a recommendation that the location of the right-of-way be considered further. Ms. Husak said the best strategy might be for the applicant to do the preliminary and final plat as their very next step before doing a lot of work on the Final Development and Site Plan. The Chair said that if Mr. Penzone moves forward with the development of the adjoining property, the design may meet the intent of the Code without necessarily having the roadway there; there are creative ways of preserving that same thing.

Vince Papsidero said he thought this was a process issue because the only way to resolve it is for the plat to move forward. He said staff has no way to interpret Council policy and the Commission's ability is somewhat limited on this issue.

The Chair said she trusts Ms. Salay to express the Commission's conversation to Council as it moves forward.

Mr. Brown said the right-of-way becoming a bike and walking path that continues that grid is important, given the size of the block.

Mr. Meyers restated that they would like to create the character of a neighborhood street, get it into the campus, and then create a pedestrian/bicycle, dog walk connection to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Dunlap said he agrees with everything but they are concerned with what could happen. If what might happens in two years, then they lose 40 parking spots and there will not be enough parking to support the business.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan application with the Development Plan/Site Plan application;
- 2) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat application; and
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to determine the location of the neighborhood street right-of-way.

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Brown seconded, that the future required reviewing body is the Planning and Zoning Commission. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

Communications

The Chair asked if there were any communications from staff. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 10:31 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 11, 2016.