



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 13, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. PUD – Oak Park Subarea D - Townhomes**  
17-028Z/PDP/FDP/PP/FP  
**Oak Meadow Drive**  
**Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**  
**(Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)**  
**Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)**  
**Preliminary Plat/Final Plat (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)**
- 2. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott**  
17-044BPR  
**5155 Upper Metro Place**  
**Basic Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park Block H**  
17-055SPR  
**John Shields Parkway/Dale Drive**  
**Site Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 4. PUD - McKittrick, Subarea 1A - Dublin City Schools**  
17-059Z/PDP/FDP  
**5175 Emerald Parkway**  
**Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**  
**(Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)**  
**Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 5. BSD P – Downtown Dublin Parking Garage Plat**  
17-068PP/FP  
**75 North High Street**  
**Preliminary Plat/Final Plat (Recommended for Approval 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, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Stephen Stidhem, Amy Salay, and Bob Miller. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Phil Hartmann, Claudia Husak, Logan Stang, Lori Burchett, Michael Hendershot, and Flora Rogers.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

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



The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated the following cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening: TownPlace Suites by Marriott; Bridge Park, Block H; McKitrick, Subarea 1A; and Downtown Parking Garage Plat. She said there would be a slight deviation from the normal procedures this evening to hear the cases in the following order: 4, 5, followed by any cases left on the Consent Agenda and lastly would be Oak Park. She stated that she and Amy Salay have a conflict of interest with the McKitrick case so they will recuse themselves for that portion of the meeting. She said Deborah Mitchell has a family emergency and can only attend the McKitrick case. She said the cases will be recorded in the order they were presented on the Agenda.

**1. PUD – Oak Park Subarea D - Townhomes  
17-028Z/PDP/FDP/PP/FP**

**Oak Meadow Drive  
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan  
Final Development Plan  
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a Rezoning of 2.94 acres to permit 20 detached, single-family homes and all associated site improvements where previously three-story townhomes were permitted. She said the site is on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road, approximately 700 feet southwest of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated there is also a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. She noted anyone intending on addressing the Commission for the Final Development Plan portion of this application will need to be sworn in.

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

Logan Stang reported this case was reviewed and tabled at the June 8th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. During that meeting, he said, the Commission expressed concern regarding the main entrance for the community with the loss of the open space reserves along with the fence appearance and landscape details for the private alleys. He reported the applicant has since revised the proposal addressing both the comments as well as meeting a number of conditions from the previous report.

Mr. Stang presented the Planned Unit Development Process Overview and noted this application consists of all formal stages of a PUD review including the rezoning that establishes the development standards through the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and said the proposal is for the conversion of six townhome buildings to 20 single-family lots within the existing Oak Park subdivision. He presented the proposed site plan and indicated the proposal is fairly consistent with what was previously reviewed comprising of 20 single-family lots using rear-loaded garages on the current private alley system. The applicant has addressed previous conditions, he reported, requiring a 9-foot, front yard setback as opposed to 6 feet that was previously proposed as well as additional landscaping for all fences abutting the alleys.

Mr. Stang said the biggest change is at the intersection of Oak Park Boulevard and Oak Meadow Drive and pointed that out on the slide. He explained the applicant has reduced the four lots on the north and south sides of Oak Park Boulevard to 55 feet in width in order to provide two smaller reserves at that intersection. He said the reserves allow for additional open space with a landscape treatment that creates an entry feature and accents the community center. The reserves still result in a loss of private open space but well exceeds the required open space for the community as a whole. He reported the applicant

has also determined that both Lot 118 & 119, located at the intersection, will use the same architectural model to further enhance the entrance to the community and this requirement will be added to the development text prior to City Council's review.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering of the proposed Reserve Landscape Plan that showed a mixture of plant materials to provide openness and symmetry outside the community center. He said the proposal includes four benches and a landscape hedge with masonry columns to define the private realm from the public realm. He indicated that Staff is requesting that the applicant use a more complimentary bench to what exists near the community center and that the landscape details be refined prior to City Council review.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering of the reserve landscaping to show the perspective from the end of the private drives as one enters the neighborhood approaching the community center in the center. This provides a conceptual idea, he said, of the proposed plantings with the mirrored architectural model.

Mr. Stang said the other main concern was the inconsistent fence design and treatment along the private alleys. He presented the applicant's revised proposal of the fence details that allow only the lattice-style fence at a height of six feet in the locations noted. For the properties with additional frontage on public streets, he explained, a four-foot solid fence is permitted that is also noted on the slide, which only pertains to a couple of lots in this development.

Mr. Stang added, this, in addition to the landscaping requirements, will provide a cohesive treatment for the rear of these lots while providing a screening and safety measure for when the commercial properties develop. He indicated that Staff is requiring that Lots 109 & 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas to the west to prevent backyard space from having visibility from Hyland-Croy Road.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering showing the appearance of the homes from the entrance at Hyland-Croy Road. He noted the rendering showed the vacant commercial property and the proposed fence details with landscaping beside the private drives.

In addition, the Plat has also been updated he said that shows the dedication of reserves to the HOA for ownership and maintenance.

Mr. Stang concluded there would be three motions required by the Commission this evening. He said approval is recommended for the Rezoning with the Preliminary Development Plan with one condition to be forwarded to City Council:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require Lots 118 and 119 to use the same architectural model mirrored across Oak Park Boulevard, prior to City Council Review.

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

- 1) That Lots 109 and 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas toward the western property line, subject to verification at building permitting;
- 2) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 3) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the Plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant add a note to the Final Plat outlining ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the two reserves, prior to City Council submittal.

Chris Cline, attorney with Blaugrund, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis Law Firm in Worthington, representing the applicant, said Linda Menerey, EMH&T, was also present to answer questions. He asked that the aerial view be shown again to show the context of the site to the surrounding areas and he noted the measured distances to provide the Commission with a better perspective on what would actually be visible. He remarked on the amount of work involved in changing the six-foot setback to the nine-foot, front yard setback. He said they previously proposed the six-foot setback because it was written in the development text but somewhere along the line, that was changed to zero. He emphasized those townhomes have a zero setback now so they are actually going from zero to nine instead of six to nine feet.

Mr. Cline clarified that fences are now required; this is not an option for the buyers.

Linda Menerey added that the four-foot fence is really the bottom half of the six-foot fence as it does not include the lattice portion on top.

Mr. Brown asked if the four-foot fence is being required, to which Mr. Cline answered affirmatively. He said the four-foot and six-foot fences will all be consistent and the color white was originally considered but finally decided on light beige.

Mr. Cline said he thought they resolved the issue of the condition in the Final Development Plan, to which Mr. Stang agreed.

With regard to outdoor living spaces, Mr. Cline noted the chamfered corner, which moves the house towards that eastern building line where there is no setback because there is a significant reserve.

Ms. Menerey explained how they revised the landscape plans and the green space.

Mr. Cline indicated they plan to have one or two spec homes built for potential buyers to see at the initial entry and they would incorporate landscaping as well.

Mr. Brown asked for Staff's perspective on Lots 109 and 128. He indicated that if the open side of those homes is not put towards the street then one is looking at a bigger, blanker wall upon entering the community. Mr. Stang said that was true and indicated Staff thought the six-foot fence would be required but part of Staff's concern was the clarity of whether the four-foot fence was optional or if it was a requirement. He said the concern was outdoor items that might be stored in the area that directly faces Hyland-Croy Road, which has high visibility for a heavily traveled thoroughfare and Staff thought that would be a detriment from the aesthetic perspective. With the additional landscaping, he concluded that Staff would be comfortable with what is proposed as the landscape will soften that viewpoint.

Steve Stidhem indicated he thought swing sets might be what staff is referring to when talking about outdoor items. He said he did not share this concern with staff but figured that was the intent of the condition.

The Chair called for public comment.

Prasad Vempati, 7031 Greenland Place, thanked the applicant for their effort based on the number of conditions the Commission raised last time. Walking on those same streets every day, he said, the unevenness that the proposal creates, concerns his family. He explained that on one side of the street, there is a seven-foot tree lawn space from the curb to the walkway and on the other side the tree lawn space is four feet from the curb to the walkway. He said this prompts an uneven visual aspect on the same street. He added on one side of the street there is a 14-18-foot setback and on the other side there is a 9-foot setback. As he imagines himself every day, living in that place, walking through the streets, he said those conditions create a very uneven view. He concluded he is concerned about resale value. He said this is a unique situation but does not want to see a situation where the City is trying to put a square peg into a round hole.

Since there was no one else from the public that wanted to speak about this case, the Chair closed the public portion.

Cathy De Rosa requested clarification on the comments just heard from the resident about the sidewalk and tree lawns. Mr. Cline responded he had a hard time understanding what that issue is. He stated none of the public streets in the subdivision are being changed; the only things they are changing are the setbacks from those public streets. Right now, he restated, the setbacks are zero feet and they are proposing to change the setbacks to nine feet. Ms. De Rosa asked if the setbacks are consistent. Mr. Cline emphasized that everything they are doing in Subarea D is the same at nine feet. He explained the setback in the rest of Oak Park is a minimum of 13 feet or maximum of ±21 feet. He added there is a four-foot difference between their development standard of nine feet and a minimum setback of 13 feet for the Village and Park homes in Oak Park. He said some of the homes had to be set back further based on conflicts with the current infrastructure, which could impact the perspective.

Mr. Stang explained the reason for different tree lawn spaces is they are associated with on-street parking and this is one of those existing conditions the applicant has to work with.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the deterioration of fences over time and then fixed, replaced, or repainted as part of maintenance. He asked if there is an active HOA in this area and if they would enforce any reconstruction and repainting. Mr. Cline said there will be a very strong and active HOA, it just has not been turned over yet. He indicated the HOA would be the appropriate body responsible for maintaining the fence.

Mr. Stidhem clarified he was more concerned with the enforcement of paint color and style. Mr. Cline said that would be part of the Final Development Plan. Mr. Stang added the fence appearance would be a Code Enforcement issue as well.

Victoria Newell thanked the applicant for addressing the Commission's comments from the last meeting as well as the public's. She said that what the applicant presented for open space this evening is very nice. She said she is very comfortable with the position of units for Lots 109 and 128, especially with the additional amenities such as the fence and landscaping. She recommended removing that condition from the final development plan.

Ms. De Rosa wanted the fencing requirement to be clearer. Mr. Stang indicated there is a provision in the text that addresses that issue but staff will review it with the applicant.

Ms. De Rosa said it makes sense to not use a bright white color for the fencing; a creamy white will make a real difference. She emphasized the exact color name and number should be included in the text. Mr. Cline said a better place to put that information is in the Final Development Plan and will ensure that information is included. The Chair asked Staff if that was acceptable. Mr. Stang said Staff can work with the applicant to ensure those details are provided.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the development text to require Lots 118 and 119 to use the same architectural model mirrored across Oak Park Boulevard, prior to City Council Review.

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

The Chair requested to see again the four conditions of approval for the Final Development Plan:

- 1) That Lots 109 and 128 orient their outdoor amenity areas toward the western property line, subject to verification at building permitting;
- 2) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 3) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting; and
- 4) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review.

Based on the discussion, Mr. Stang suggested that condition #1 be removed and a new condition be added as follows:

- 1) That the non-operational street light at the southwest corner of the Mitchell-Dewitt Road/Oak Meadow Drive intersection is made operational at no cost to the City, prior to the submittal of building permits;
- 2) That the applicant choose a bench that coordinates with the existing benches near the community center, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plan (sheet 6/11) defining the location of proposed plantings, bed edges, and diversified landscape materials, subject to Staff approval, prior to City Council review; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to outline installation requirements for the fence details, prior to building permitting.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with the amended four conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant add a note to the Final Plat outlining ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the two reserves, prior to City Council submittal.

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

**2. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said this is a request for a Basic Plan Review in the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She added the Commission is the final authority on this case.

The Chair swore in anyone interested in addressing the Commission with regard to this case.

Logan Stang reiterated this is a proposal for the construction of TownePlace Suites, which is a five-story, ±64,000-square-foot hotel. He presented an aerial view of the site and noted its unique position as it lies on the border of the Bridge Street District. He pointed out the BSD boundary with everything north being located within the district and as such means that this and the neighboring sites to the east will act as transitional pieces to existing development and Bridge Street development. He presented the existing site conditions and said the site contains a single access point to the north across from the Embassy Suites hotel and is mostly vacant with a pocket in the center and a fairly dense tree row that runs along the southern property line.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan and explained the hotel will be located near the northern property line with a proposed open space along Upper Metro Place, private amenities on the south side of the building, and a 112-space parking lot. He stated the applicant is proposing to shift the existing access drive to the west to allow for the building footprint and install a new access point in the southwest corner.

Mr. Stang said the proposal includes the creation of a smaller lot, which will require a future plat application. The existing lot, he said, has a 20-foot utility easement running along the south side of Upper Metro Place, which forces the building and pavement to be further from the road. Due to this and the unique curve of Upper Metro Place, he said, a number of Waivers will be required for the building and site since there is substantially more frontage than a typical corner lot and the easement prevents construction near the roadway.

As this is the Basic Plan Review, Mr. Stang said, more details will be provided with the Site Plan Review such as the open space design, final architectural details, stormwater management, and other items. He stated the parking will require a Parking Plan as it exceeds the 125% maximum allowed by Code. He stated there are a number of landmark trees located in the southern tree row, which the applicant has been notified of and is working with staff to preserve.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed architecture that consists of two different shades of brick for the lower levels with fiber cement panels for the entire fifth floor and panels used as accents. He said the roof has varying parapet heights with a few angled parapets to provide better definition of the roof mass. The main entrance along Upper Metro Place, he said, has a canopy and curtain wall that extends to the fifth floor to define the public entrance. He stated the actual main entrance will be located on the south side of the building facing the parking lot and would have a similar canopy to what is shown for Upper Metro Place. He restated that additional materials regarding building type requirements will be provided with the final Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang said the other component to this application is a Development Plan, which he then presented that includes the creation of a block using the existing infrastructure of Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. He said the applicant has provided options for future phases of development including this proposal and two additional lots to the east. He stated those applications will all require separate approval processes but the existing block will not change as no street connections are proposed through

this site. As such, he noted this block will not meet certain requirements such as block width, perimeter length, mid-block pedestrianways, and a number of other items due in part to the existing layout as well as being on the edge of the BSD and not necessarily being able to provide the connections to the existing development to the south.

Mr. Stang stated there will be three motions required by the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening.

Mr. Stang presented the Waiver Review Criteria and said six proposed Basic Plan Waivers are being requested:

1. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum of 95% coverage (required); 33% provided along Upper Metro Place (requested).
2. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone – 0 to 10-foot minimum with 25% of front façade permitted between 10-20 feet (required); 20 feet for the entire front façade (requested).
3. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) – Parking Location – Parking in rear or within the building (required). Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place (requested).
4. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(b) – Ground Story Height – 16-foot minimum to 24-foot maximum (required). 14 feet (requested).
5. Building Type – Section 153.062(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) – On-Site Parking – Surface parking only permitted in areas not required to be occupied by a structure (required). Parking located within principal structure area (requested).
6. Building Type – Section 153.062(I)(2)(a) – Mid-Block Pedestrianways – On all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length (required); None (requested).

Mr. Stang reported the Administrative Review Team has recommended approval of all six Waivers.

Mr. Stang presented the Basic Plan Review Criteria as well as the seven conditions recommended with approval from the Administrative Review Team:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That the applicant continues to refine the architectural details and Building type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review; and,
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.



Mr. Stang presented the possible Required Reviewing Bodies and stated the Commission must designate a required reviewing body for all future applications, as applicable, which could be the Administrative Review Team or the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Steve Stidhem asked if the applicant had proposed any other façade options to Staff. Mr. Stang answered what was presented this evening to the Commission is the same that was submitted with the original so no alternatives have been proposed. He added that since this is the Basic Plan Review, the conditions allow Staff to work with the applicant through to the Final Site Plan to work on the materials, design of the architecture, etc. so there is latitude moving forward.

Mr. Stidhem reported that what he found online for TownePlace Suites by Marriott was not consist at all around the country so that is why he inquired about the architecture presented. Mr. Stang restated this was the only design presented to Staff. He recalled that the applicant brought forward a pre-application in the fall of 2016 and conceptual ideas from other hotels had been presented that clued Staff in as to the direction the applicant was headed in terms of design but the design this evening is the one submitted.

Chris Brown inquired about the Architectural Master Site Plan that contains Options A and B and wanted to know if the Commission was reviewing that or if it was just showing potential development. Mr. Stang answered this property owner owns both of those properties so the intent is they could design this as a Master Plan including all three properties. He emphasized the only one getting approved this evening is this western site.

Victoria Newell inquired about landmark trees since the Commission was not provided with a tree survey. She asked where the trees are located on the site, just in general. Mr. Stang pointed out the locations of the three landmark trees. He said there was an issue with the tree survey in a portion of the site that did not appear to have been included in the survey so Staff did not have all of the details regarding the trees which is why a condition was added.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there are stormwater issues. Mr. Stang said stormwater management and open space is reviewed and required for each development. He added the Master Plan options are only conceptual at this point and could change significantly moving forward. He said stormwater details for this site will be provided with the final Site Plan but the intent is that the applicant would be using underground storage.

Cathy De Rosa asked if there was sidewalk access. Mr. Stang said there is an existing sidewalk on Upper Metro Place and the applicant would be providing connections from the main entry through their pocket park or plaza as well as a connection along the parking lot to get secondary access to the building.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Steven M. Roberts, 5803 Destiny Court, Cincinnati, Ohio, said he does not have anything to add but is here to answer any questions.

Ms. De Rosa asked why extra parking is needed. Mr. Roberts answered that the brand (Marriott) has a 100% money-back guarantee for their customers to have a parking space provided on site. He said they anticipate additional vehicles that might be towed that would take up a few extra spaces as well as a few staff members parking on site. He explained the calculations include 110% of the room count and in this case there are 105 guest rooms.

Ms. De Rosa asked how that compares to other surrounding hotels. Mr. Stang said those hotels were developed under older standards and he would have to look into it. He indicated the standard Code requires one parking space per room and the intent in the BSD is to reduce parking. For this site, he

explained, 70 spaces are required as a minimum and they are allowed to do 125% more, which would be 87 spaces. He restated the Parking Plan is needed to obtain more than that, which is 112 parking spaces. He said Staff has determined they do not desire this and do not want to set a precedent for moving forward but what helps is the property to the east, which could be developed out with complimentary uses and shared parking arrangements could be considered for the overflow and provide a cohesive project. He emphasized the property is difficult because it is on the boundary of the BSD, surrounded by existing development, so Staff is allowing accommodations for transitioning.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the extra parking would take out the existing tree row, to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively. He said that is a concern, especially the landmark trees, and Staff is hoping to preserve as much of that as possible. He said the applicant has worked to pull the parking and the building back slightly to give more space but more than likely a lot of those trees would get removed with this application.

Ms. De Rosa asked how many parking spaces would impact those trees. Mr. Stang answered every tree along the southern line extending from the southwest corner to the southeast and beyond. He said there are a lot of trees there on this property as well as the property to the south and because the parking is so close to the property line, some of the trees off-site could be impacted as well. Ms. De Rosa said that seems congruent to what the Commission discusses often.

Ms. Newell added that is why she made the comment about the tree survey. She said she is uncomfortable taking out those trees for the sake of parking.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was a way to replace the trees and Amy Salay said there was not. Ms. Newell said the landmark trees and ages of trees are a consideration.

Gayle Frazer, 7377 Bridge Point Pass, Cincinnati, Ohio, said she is a tree hugger too. She said some of the trees are worth saving and others are not. She indicated that when they remove the understory and the Honeysuckle and all the invasive species, the tree line is not going to look as good as 80% of those trees are Hackberry and a lot of those are leaning. She said she anticipates a lot of the trees will break as they remove the understory because they are weak and lean to the northwest. She stated she would like to keep two landmark trees but the third landmark tree was in poor condition.

Mr. Brown said it would help the Commission to have a good tree survey to be able to walk the site and actually see what is being proposed. He said he understands the understory material and the Hackberry but landmark trees should be preserved whenever possible.

Ms. Newell suggested that a presentation including photographs would provide a clearer picture and platform to discuss with the Commission rather than just trying to describe the conditions only verbally. She emphasized that when a tree row like that is proposed to be removed, and there is potential for cutting down healthy trees, typically, an applicant needs to prove to the Commission the trees really need to be removed.

Ms. Frazer said it is hard to see as it is extremely overgrown. She asked if they can clear out the Honeysuckle to provide a clearer picture of the trees.

Ms. Newell affirmed that other applicants have struggled with the same challenges.

Ms. Salay said the Commission is used to walking sites. Mr. Brown said if there is a landmark tree noted on a tree survey, he will make a point to check it out to judge the health of the tree. He said if a tree is not healthy and will not last, there is no need to save it and work against ourselves.

Mr. Stidhem clarified there is nothing to the east except for grass. Mr. Stang responded that the tree row continues along both properties. Mr. Stidhem said his point is that if there is room to expand the parking to the east, as opposed to the south, if that was an option. Mr. Stang said the applicant could push the property line further to the east in order to move the parking in the south elsewhere on the site.

Mr. Stidhem asked again about the architecture and if there were other options to which the applicant answered there were not; they are using the current prototype and would not go backwards to older designs.

Mr. Brown said a lot of effort has been put into planning Metro Place including future office massing and parking. He asked how this interrelates to that.

Vince Papsidero said the difference with this location is that it falls within the BSD Code instead of separate from that process. He said the Code updates they are pursuing would be for south of this area. He said with the BSD Code, from a development standpoint, he anticipates the whole site maximized to a greater extent. He said the idea of shared parking between multiple buildings should play out over time and Staff would hold the applicant to that expectation as we see future development. At this point, he said there is not commitment regarding future development, just an opportunity depending on the market.

Mr. Roberts indicated that one of their goals was to take advantage and capture the offset peak hours that will happen between office and hotel operations.

Ms. Salay said she was concerned with the amount of fiber cement siding proposed; she would rather see brick, stone, and glass. She indicated that as we evolve and do more and more hotels in Metro Place, the quality of materials is decreasing. She stressed she does not mind the massing of the building but has issues with the materials; therefore, she cannot support the concept with the amount of fiber cement proposed or the colors. She realizes this is just a rendering, she said, but the colors are cold and remind her of February in Ohio when everything is gray and awful. She said she would prefer warmer tones and less fiber cement.

Ms. Salay suggested the parking be shifted to the east side so the trees do not have to be touched. She added that as many trees as possible should be preserved. She said the north elevation should be dressed up, given its location, to provide a 'sense of place'. She stated she does not see a good reason to have 16 feet for the first floor.

Ms. De Rosa said she visited the site again recently and noticed it has a tough curve around and asked how this can be made into this walkable space that we want it to be. She indicated we are going to have one shot at connecting this up to Frantz Road and making it walkable so making more than one part of the property interesting as we are trying to make it feel like a community rather than individual properties would be much appreciated by the Commission.

Ms. Salay asked if the Dublin Convention and Visitor's Bureau has been contacted about hotels that are coming online. She asked what their needs are in terms of a community because we do not want to overbuild hotel space only to find some not succeeding. She asked if someone can reach out to our Economic Development team and have that conversation. Mr. Stang said that could happen as Planning gets a lot of development inquiries about hotels and in the past couple of years they have seen a resurgence of hotels.

Mr. Stidhem asked where this same architectural design exists for this hotel for him to view. Mr. Roberts said there is one in Richmond, KY, which is 10 – 15 miles south of Lexington, KY.

Bob Miller inquired about mechanicals to which Mr. Roberts responded would be placed on the roof with the exception of the pool condenser that would be ground mounted. He explained the condenser would be screened on two sides by the inside corner of the building and by landscaping on the other two sides as well as the electrical transformer on the northwest side. Mr. Miller confirmed the applicant cannot do anything about the transformer.

Mr. Brown remarked there is a ton of fiber cement proposed. He said he just drove by two mid-tier hotels in New Albany, Ohio that were entirely brick so it has to be financially feasible. He emphasized the Commission does not want to see lower standards because Bridge Park is a little more special.

Ms. Newell agreed.

The Chair asked for clarification on Waivers and seven conditions before motions are made. With a Basic Plan Review, she asked if this is locking the Commission into all of those parking spaces. Mr. Stang answered not at all. He explained that with the Final Site Plan Review, the applicant has to file a Parking Plan with that to approve the adjustment over the 125% permit so it is still negotiable at this point.

Mr. Stang presented the information needed for the three motions.

Ms. De Rosa asked how the trees and parking are being handled, which Mr. Stang explained.

#### **Motion and Vote**

The Chair requested that Waiver #4 for ground story height be removed from their motion based on the discussion this evening. She said the applicant has the opportunity to further refine these details and meet the minimum story height with the site plan review. The Commission agreed unanimously to remove the ground story height waiver. [The motion reflects the reordered waivers with Waiver 4 removed]

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the requested Basic Plan Waivers:

1. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum of 95% coverage (required); 33% provided along Upper Metro Place (requested).
2. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone – 0 to 10-foot minimum with 25% of front façade permitted between 10-20 feet (required); 20 feet for the entire front façade (requested).
3. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) – Parking Location – Parking in rear or within the building (required). Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place (requested).
4. Building Type – Section 153.062(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) – On-Site Parking – Surface parking only permitted in areas not required to be occupied by a structure (required). Parking located within principal structure area (requested).
5. Building Type – Section 153.062(I)(2)(a) – Mid-Block Pedestrianways – On all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length (required); None (requested).

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

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review with 7 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat, either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;

- 2) That the applicant continues to refine the architectural details and Building type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for a Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review, and;
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the seven conditions. Steven Roberts agreed.

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

### **Motion and Vote**

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

### **3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park Block H 17-055SPR**

### **John Shields Parkway/Dale Drive Site Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a residential development with 64 condominiums in six buildings located within the Bridge Park Development. She said the five-acre site is on the west side of Dale Drive, south of the intersection with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

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

Lori Burchett reported the applicant received approval for a Site Plan Review for this project in December 2016. Since then, she said, the applicants have made some changes to the individual units and to the façade. She said the changes did not meet the requirements for a Minor Project Review and therefore requires a new Site Plan Review.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the project is located in Bridge Park, south of John Shields Parkway and north of Tuller Ridge Drive between Dale and Mooney Streets.

Ms. Burchett presented the previously approved site plan that showed 73 townhome units with a pool in the open space area for residents. She then presented the proposed site plan that showed a reduction in units to 64 to enlarge some of the units but the footprint of the buildings is relatively similar to the previously approved plan. She indicated this is change is in response to market demand. She said the applicant has also removed the private pool from the open space.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is proposing changes to the exterior facades of the buildings. She explained that some of the porch areas have been redesigned or have shifted location, responding to changes to the interior. She said the materials and overall contemporary aesthetic is similar to the approved plan. She presented site plan elevations for H2 West and H1 West on Mooney Street for comparison. She then presented another example of the proposed changes versus the previously

approved for H1 West and H1 East on Tuller Ridge Drive. She presented previously approved and currently proposed elevations of the auto-court for comparison and noted the significant change here, which is the use of fiber cement panels in the auto-court in place of brick. She said the applicant had found the brick to be quite heavy looking so they felt the fiber cement panels used on the other facades would be an appropriate material replacement.

Ms. Burchett presented the six Administrative Departures approved by the Administrative Review Team that allow for minor deviations from Code requirements within a fixed amount, within 10 percent as required:

- 1) Street Façade Transparency §153.062 (O)(2).
- 2) Non-Street Façade Transparency §153.062 (O)(2).
- 3) Vertical Increments §153.062 (O)(2).
- 4) Minimum Primary Façade Materials §153.062 (O)(2).
- 5) Street Façade Transparency §153.062 (O)(2).
- 6) Off-street Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions §153.065 (4).

Ms. Burchett presented the requested Waivers in detail which included transparency requirements, vertical increments, primary façade materials, blank wall limitations, building variety and building type compatibility, parapet heights, tower quantities, balcony size, lot coverage, first floor information, and aisle dimensions.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is requesting approval of 18 Waivers that she presented and reviewed:

- 1) Incompatible Building Types §153.062—Building Types (C)(1). Required: Incompatible building types not permitted. Requested: Incompatible building type on Block G.
- 2) Building Variety §153.062—(K). Required: Building designs must vary from adjacent buildings. Requested: Repeated elevations between buildings.
- 3) Parapet Height §153.062—Roof Type Requirements D(1). Required: Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet in height. Requested: Parapet between 0-4 feet in height.
- 4) Parapets continuous §153.062—Roof Type Requirements—(D)(1)(b). Required: Parapets shall wrap around all sides of the building. Requested: Not continuous parapets at locations shown on site plan.
- 5) Tower Quantity §153.062— (D)(4)(a). Required: Only one tower is allowed per building. Requested: Towers at H1 East: 5 Towers, West: 3 Towers; H2 East: 3 Towers, West: 3 Towers; H3 East: 5 Towers, West: 4 Towers (and repeated elevations).
- 6) Projecting sills §153.062— (H)(1)(a). Required: Projecting sills are required within siding clad walls. Requested: No projecting sills on Fiber Cement Panel clad elevations.
- 7) Balcony Size §153.062— (I)(1)(a). Required: Balconies shall be a minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide. Requested: Balconies to be 5.33 feet deep and 12.25 feet wide.
- 8) Maximum impervious lot coverage §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Maximum 70% is required. Requested: Impervious coverage to be 76% (entire block) (H1, H2); and 80% (H3).
- 9) Permitted Primary Material Types §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Permitted types include stone, brick. Requested: Thin brick (All buildings).
- 10) Front Property Line Coverage §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Minimum front property line coverage to be at least 75%. Requested: Property line coverage to be 64% along Dale Drive (H1 East); and 48% Dale Drive (H3 East).
- 11) Occupation of Corner §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Occupation is required. Requested: No occupation of the building in the corner at Dale/Tuller Ridge (H1 East); building in the corner at Mooney/Tuller Ridge (H1 West); and building in the corner at Dale Drive and Larimer Street or Dale Drive and John Shields Parkway (H3 East).

- 12) Street Façade Transparency §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Minimum 20% transparency. Requested: To allow street façade transparency to be 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Tuller Ridge South: 15%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Tuller Ridge South: 16%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Mooney West: 17% (Building H1 West and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Larimer North: 17% ; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Larimer North: 18% (H2 East and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Mooney West: 18%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Larimer South: 18%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Larimer South: 18%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Larimer South: 18%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor John Shields North: 16%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor John Shields North: 16% (H3 West and repeated elevations).
- 13) Non-Street Façade Transparency §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Minimum 15% transparency. Requested: To allow non-street façade transparency to be 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage West: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 10%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 14%; All Floors Motor Court East: 0% (H1 East and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage West: 9%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 10%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 14%; All Floors Motor Court East: 0% (H2 East and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage East: 10%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Passage East: 13%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 11%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 11%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 11%; 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 12% (H1 West and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage East: 9%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 10%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 13%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 13%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 13%; All Floors Motor Court West: 0% (H2 West and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage West: 9%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 10%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court West: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 12%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 14%; All Floors Motor Court East: 0% (H3 East and repeated elevations); 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Passage East: 9%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 10%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court East: 13%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 8%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court North: 13%; All Floors Motor Court West: 0%; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 7%; 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Motor Court South: 14%; All Floors Motor Court East: 0% (H3 West and repeated elevations).
- 14) Blank Wall Limitations §153.062 (O)(2). Required: No blank walls on elevations. Requested: To allow blank walls at H1-03 and H1-12—All Stories East Elevation; H1-01 and H1-14—All Stories West Elevation (Building H1 East and repeated elevations); H1-17—1<sup>st</sup> Story North Elevation; H1-23—1<sup>st</sup> Story South Elevation; H1-24 and H1-16--All Stories West Elevation. H1-25 and H1-15--All Stories East Elevation (Building H1 West and repeated elevations); H2-01 and H2-10—All Stories West Elevation; and H2-02 and H2-09—All Stories East Elevation (Building H2 East and repeated elevations); H2-13 and H2-22—All Stories West Elevation; H2-12 and H2-22—All Stories East Elevation (Building H2 West and repeated elevations); H3-01 and H3-11—All Stories West Elevation; H3-02—All Stories East Elevation; and H3-11—3<sup>rd</sup> Story East Elevation (Building H3 East and repeated elevations).
- 15) Parking Lot Façade; Entrances §153.062 (O)(2). Required: For parking lot or detached garage, 1 per unit. Requested: To allow no entrances for 12 Units face interior Motor Court (Building H1 East and repeated elevations); 10 Units face interior Motor Court (Building H1 West and repeated elevations); 10 Units face interior Motor Court (Building H2 East and repeated elevations); 10 Units face interior Motor Court (Building H2 West and repeated elevations).
- 16) Permitted Primary Materials §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Minimum primary materials must be at least 80%. Requested: To allow primary material percentage to be East Dale: 70%; North Motor Court: 17%; West Motor Court: 11%; East Motor Court: 19%; South Motor Court: 16% (H1 East and repeated elevations); East Dale: 61%; West Passage: 76%; West Motor Court: 11%; North Motor Court: 17%; West Motor Court: 11%; East Motor Court: 16%; South Motor Court: 17% (H2 East and repeated elevations); West Mooney Street: 66%; North Motor Court: 16%; West Motor Court: 11%; East Motor Court: 16%; South Motor Court: 17% (H1 West and repeated elevations); North Motor Court Elev.16%; West Motor Court Elev.—11%; East Motor Court

Elev.—16%; South Motor Court Elev.—17% (H2 West and repeated elevations); East Dale: 70%; South Motor Court: 16%; East Motor Court: 19%; West Motor Court: 11%; North Motor Court: 17% (Building H3 East and repeated elevations); North John Shields: 74%; West Passage: 71%; South Motor Court: 25%; East Motor Court: 25%; West Motor Court: 25%; North Motor Court: 25% (H3 West and Repeated elevations).

- 17) Vertical Increments §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Every two units or no greater than every 40-feet. Requested: maximum vertical increments to be at 43.85 ft. at East Elevation of Motor Court (Building H3 East and repeated elevations); at 43.5 ft. at East Elevation of Motor Court (Building H3 West and repeated elevations).
- 18) Minimum Finished Floor Elevation §153.062 (O)(2). Required: Minimum Finished Floor Elevation required 2.5 ft. above the adjacent sidewalk elevation. Requested: To allow finished floor elevations to be at <2.5 ft. above adjacent sidewalk: H1-01: 2.35 ft.; H1-02: 2.33 ft.; H1-03: 1.69 ft.; H1-08: 2.20 ft.; H1-09: 2.25 ft.; H1-12: 2.17 ft.; H1-22: 1.75 ft. (Building H1); H2-08: 2.35'; H2-09: 2.33 ft.; H2-10: 1.97'; H2-11: 1.88'; H2-12: 1.63'; H2-13: 2.00'; H2-14: 1.95'; H2-15: 2.04'; H2-16: 2.30' H2-17: 2.46' (Building H2); H3-01: 1.91'; H3-02: 2.30'; H3-06: 2.47'; H3-07: 2.37'; H3-08: 1.92'; H3-09: 1.93'; H3-10: 2.09'; H3-11: 1.25'; H3-12: 2.02'; H3-13: 1.87'; H3-14: 1.86'; H3-18: 1.94'; H3-19: 1.72'; H3-20: 1.80'; H3-21: 1.66'; H3-22: 1.93' (Building H3).

Ms. Burchett reported that the Administrative Review Team recommends approval of all 18 Site Plan Waivers as listed above, finding that the review criteria has been met or is met with conditions.

Ms. Burchett said the ART also recommends approval of the Site Plan Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant define a portion of the courtyard as Public Open Space in order to comply with the Open Space Node shown on Figure 153.063—Neighborhood Standards (6)(d)(2)—Open Space Network;
- 2) That the applicant be required to submit construction details for the surface parking lot to the satisfaction of staff, prior to building permit approval; and
- 3) That the applicant remove the off-street parking spaces from the parking count on the site plan.

Victoria Newell asked if any of the Waivers are new from the previously approved plan to which Ms. Burchett affirmed the Waivers were not new but the percentages are slightly different. Ms. Newell asked if that included the lot coverage percentage. Ms. Burchett said she would defer to the engineer.

Steve Stidhem inquired about the blank wall. Ms. Burchett said if anything, the transparency actually increased slightly and would have reduced the size of the blank wall.

Chris Brown said the biggest change to the units appears to be the amount of fiber cement panels but it is all in the internal courtyard. He indicated he would not like to look at it from his unit but it is not visible to the public.

Ms. Newell said she is disappointed the applicant is changing the brick out for fiber cement panels and perceives it as a negative, to which Mr. Brown agreed.

Ms. De Rosa suggested that the interior courtyard is part of the aesthetics of the overall project so this does change that for her.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Russell Hunter, 6640 Riverside Drive, Suite 500, said he did not have a formal presentation this evening and is in attendance to answer questions as he does not have anything new to add. He indicated that they have been out there quietly marketing for some time and have seen good success with it. He reported that the change is due to the prospective buyers that are interested in larger units. He said the



applicant is in the process of developing D Block, which is directly to the west of this site and there is a pool going in there. He said it just made more sense to remove the pool from Block H to provide more open space. In terms of the auto-courts, he said they had the opportunity to view them via a virtual tour and it just felt like a fortress with all the brick and it felt like a different material should be introduced. He cited that Bridge Park West has done the same thing and it appears light and feels good over there. He said the fiber cement panels would also provide options for more color that they would not have otherwise.

Mr. Brown asked if this is a condominium association or common maintenance on the outside. Mr. Hunter answered it would be common maintenance.

Mr. Brown asked if all the steel that is being shown is galvanized.

David Keyser, DKB Architects, 52 E. Lynn Street, Columbus, Ohio, said to address Mr. Brown's question, there are two different styles of railings. He said the railings that are shown with the X pattern have an aluminum finish and the horizontal railings working with the cement fiber would also be in an aluminum finish.

Mr. Brown inquired about the structure of the balcony itself. Mr. Keyser answered, in the case of the buff color units, they are creating a post and beam system out of galvanized steel. Mr. Brown indicated he hates rusty steel and is supportive of the use of galvanized steel.

The Chair invited the public to speak [Hearing none.] She moved on to the Commissioner's discussion.

Ms. Newell said she was glad to see the pool eliminated from this block and prefers the open space.

Mr. Brown said he can see the demand for larger units.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the 18 Site Plan Waivers as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the three conditions to which Mr. Hunter answered affirmatively.

#### **Motion and Vote**

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

#### **4. PUD - McKittrick, Subarea 1A - Dublin City Schools** **17-059Z/PDP/FDP**

#### **5175 Emerald Parkway** **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan** **Final Development Plan**

The Vice Chair, Chris Brown, said the following application is a rezoning of 10.71 acres from PUD (McKittrick, Subarea 1) to PUD (McKittrick, Subarea 1A) to permit educational uses. He said the site is on the south side of Emerald Parkway, approximately 600 feet east of the intersection with Coffman Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050 and a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. He stated

anyone intending on addressing the Commission for the Final Development Plan portion of this application will need to be sworn in.

The Vice Chair said this case was on the Consent Agenda and asked for objections. Both Bob Miller and Cathy De Rosa asked to pull this case from the Consent Agenda so they could hear the entire case.

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

Claudia Husak noted the procedural issues of this case stem from the fact that in the 90s, the McKittrick PUD was zoned and the subareas allowed office use.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and noted it consists of two parcels totaling 10.7 acres. She said Dublin City Schools has purchased this property for the use of an Alternative High School, primarily. She said the proposal is to open this up to allow uses within the Zoning Code that includes: premium office and institutional uses; schools, libraries, vocational training, and a lot of different uses that are currently within the Code but were not contemplated at the time when this area was originally zoned.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed zoning and noted the existing McKittrick PUD in Subarea 1 - known as Verizon and Subarea 2 as Cardinal Health. She said the name McKittrick stems from the landowner at the time of the zoning. She explained the City wants to amend the site as Subarea 1A and include the uses mentioned above – educational uses primarily for the Alternative High School but also allow for the potential of the library to locate there temporarily while the library site is under construction.

Ms. Husak presented the Future Land Use Map included in the Community Plan. She said the site is within the Premium Office/Institutional District, which includes sites along the highway that have a lot of visibility that serve as employment centers and are intended for large-scale facilities such as hospitals and universities. Within the school's vision for this Alternative High School, she indicated, there is a collaboration and vision with universities with large businesses within the City that would provide education that is not currently available within the school system, as it exists today.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan. Within the development text, she said nothing is intended to change with this site. One of the things staff asked the school to address, she stated, as part of this rezoning, is the ODOT Acquisition of the Right-of-Way piece that had to deal with interchange US 33 and I-270. She said the application today includes reduced setbacks for pavement, which is impacted by the shrinkage of the site on the south side due to ODOT's acquisition.

Ms. Husak said the schools have provided staff with operational details, which essentially help in terms of traffic flow and busing required for the two schools that are farther away from this area. She indicated the intent is to have students attend half a day and be home-schooled the other half the day for students that qualify for this service. She reported there was a lot of discussion about how the students would be transported and how traffic would be impacted. She indicated the schools feel they can make it work with the current infrastructure.

Ms. Husak noted other changes for zoning allowances that have occurred: a sign on the highway would be permitted for a school; and a sign for the library would be permitted so there is way-finding within the site. She said there is an existing sign on Emerald Parkway and it could be used however the applicants see fit, based on what is in the Zoning Code and Development Text.

Ms. Husak reported the City asked the schools to include a Final Development Plan that would not be in effect until City Council approves the Rezoning but the FDP is basically to accept what is on the site today.

Ms. Husak reported there were 16 criteria this were weighed against from a staff recommendation perspective. She stated all the criteria have been met, therefore, approval is recommended to City Council. She said the intent is for this to be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on July 31 and then their first meeting in August.

Ms. Husak reiterated that since nothing is changing on the site, approval is recommended for the Final Development Plan.

The Vice Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Steve Stidhem asked how the busses plan to maneuver around that little circle. Ms. Husak answered the City asked the schools to do an Auto-turn to ensure the busses could maneuver within the site.

Mr. Miller inquired about pedestrian safety. He said he does not see this as a problem but asked if the City considered the fact that Coffman High School has a substantial parking issue and this could be seen as a natural overflow for students and that would allow for students to be crossing Emerald Parkway. Ms. Husak said this was discussed and the safest pedestrian crossing is at Emerald Parkway and Coffman where students are intended to cross. She said there is no traffic lights anywhere in front of the site to provide egress/ingress and engineering determined it is not a safe place to add a crossing.

Mr. Miller asked if the building in its current state, can handle educational uses – vocational on all floors. Ms. Husak answered it is not permitted on all floors. From a Building Code standpoint, she said the fourth floor is exempt from educational uses and from a zoning standpoint, staff does not want to limit uses to floors because it would be difficult to enforce. She said the school is fully aware of those issues and intend to use the fourth floor for offices, conference rooms, and meeting rooms.

Jeffrey L. Brown said he is an attorney with the firm of Smith and Hale, representing the Dublin School System. He said this location, in terms of being across the street from Coffman High School is a good place to have a new Alternative High School. He said they have worked diligently with staff to address traffic issues and engineers have run a computer simulation on both driveways that showed buses can come in either driveway, make the turn around the circle, and come back out. He said they also did a traffic study in terms of their use, which the City reviewed and accepted the findings that require no improvements. He said they anticipate the traffic generated by this school will be less than if the building was occupied with all office uses. In terms of the Building Code and limiting student uses to the first three floors, he reiterated the top floor will be used for Administrative Offices and the library will be on the first floor during the construction period of the library.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the building has been named yet.

Jeff Stark, Dublin City Schools, said there is a whole naming process including public participation, anticipated to begin next month.

Ms. De Rosa if there will be any outdoor activity planned. Mr. Stark said no outdoor activity is being planned. He added the school will not allow for this parking lot to be used for overflow parking from Coffman High School until there is a thorough plan in place.

Ms. De Rosa asked if there will be a book drop available or traffic flow for the library when it occupies the space. Mr. Stark indicated it is going to be a bare-bones site for the library's use.

Ms. De Rosa inquired further about permitted uses, specifically about research, development, and testing laboratories. Ms. Husak explained the City encouraged the applicant to add those uses because in terms of an Alternative High School, and in terms of the types of education that might happen there, the City

thought this particular language within the Code might actually catch something that the SO District would not.

Mr. Miller asked if the use of this building is intended primarily for gifted or advanced students. Mr. Stark said the demographics of the types of students that will use this facility has not been fully decided yet. He explained that for an Alternative High School, there are two factors for it: 1) something cutting edge and different; and 2) save taxpayers' money by not building a fourth high school.

Mr. Miller asked if this site's PUD is only being opened up to a zoning change, asking if any other site along that corridor will have to come to the Commission. Ms. Husak answered affirmatively. She restated the 10 acres that this application pertains to is for creating the Subarea 1A.

The Vice Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to address the Commission with regard to this application. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Husak said there are no conditions requested for either motion.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for Rezoning. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Recommended for Approval 5 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**5. BSD P – Downtown Dublin Parking Garage Plat  
17-068PP/FP**

**75 North High Street  
Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the subdivision of two lots and the dedication of right-of-way for the Downtown Dublin Parking Garage Plat. She said the site is on the west side of North High Street, north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary and Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

The Chair asked if anyone needed a presentation or if this case could be left on the Consent Agenda [Hearing none.] She called for a motion.

Chris Brown said there was one condition of approval and asked if the applicant was in agreement with that condition as follows:

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

Paula Miller agreed to the above condition.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat/Final Plat with one condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)

**PLANNING ITEMS and COMMUNICATIONS**

Vince Papsidero indicated there will be a new format used for the Planning Reports by the time they meet again, which will be much more streamlined and concise.

Victoria Newell reported she would not be in attendance at the first PZC meeting in August.

A discussion ensued about the progress of the Bridge Park Development overall.

Chris Brown told Lori Burchett and Logan Stang they did an excellent job presenting this evening.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:06 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 7, 2017.