



## MEETING MINUTES

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 21, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard  
17-072FDP Final Development Plan (Tabled 6 – 0)**
- 2. BSD O - Echo, Neighborhood Hospital PID: 273-009147  
17-081BPR/CU Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)  
Waiver #1 (Approved 6 – 0)  
Waiver #2 (Disapproved 0 – 6)  
Basic Plan Review (Approved 6 – 0)**
- 3. NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Game U 7533 Sawmill Road  
17-090CU Conditional Use (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 4. BSD SRN – Pins Mechanical 6558 Riverside Drive  
17-094WR Waiver Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 5. WID Area Plan Update  
17-091ADM Administrative Request (Recommended for Approval 6 - 0)**

Steve Stidhem called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance as the Chair, Victoria Newell, is expected to be arriving late. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Bob Miller, and Amy Salay. Victoria Newell arrived at 6:45 pm. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, Vince Papsidero, Tammy Noble, Thaddeus Boggs, and Laurie Wright.

### Administrative Business

Claudia Husak suggested the election of the officer should be conducted at the end of the meeting since the Chair is not yet in attendance.

### Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)



### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Miller moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the August 10 and August 24, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Mr. Stidhem explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated cases 3 – Game U and 4 – Pins Mechanical were eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening. He determined the order for the cases to be heard would be: 3, 4, 1, 2, and 5 but the minutes will reflect the order on the Agenda.

### **1. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard 17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

Steve Stidhem said the following application is for a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms for an approximately 2.8-acre parcel in the Tuttle Crossing West Corridor Planned Commerce District. He said the site is north of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. He stated the Commission has final authority on this case and we will have to swear-in.

Steve Stidhem swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang said this was a Final Development Plan for Motel 6. He reported this case was first reviewed at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting on August 24<sup>th</sup>, whereas, the Commission expressed concern regarding the proposed building materials, the architectural character, and the number of conditional approval items. He said the Commission had recommended the applicant address the conditions listed in the previous Planning Report and revise the architecture to correspond to the existing character that has been established by the properties to the east.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed site plan that is substantially similar to the previously reviewed layout with the building located to the west and the parking area in the center of the site.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant has worked to address the conditions regarding the site plan, which included adding landscaping to meet screening requirements along the western and northern property lines, preserving trees near the entry feature in the southeast corner, combining the three properties, and providing sufficient space for fire apparatus maneuverability.

During the review, he recalled, there was also discussion on the proposed setback for Motel 6 from Tuttle Crossing Boulevard in relation to the context of the existing development. He noted the right-of-way line and the approximate setback measurements for each of the developments: Motel 6 has proposed 115 feet, Extended Stay is 155 feet, and Holiday Inn is 82 feet. He said this proposed setback is appropriate as it matches the context of Extended Stay to the east and locates the structure towards the rear of the existing residential home that lies on the west as opposed to being directly adjacent to that home.

Mr. Stang said the other main focus of discussion was around the architectural context and ensuring a consistent character is established along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. He presented three photographs of context photos of the Extended Stay and the Holiday Inn Express to provide a sense of the development pattern. He said the previously proposed architecture, which he presented, comprised of two color schemes and included materials such as brick for the ground story, fiber cement siding for the upper

stories, and cedar siding accents above the main entrances. He recalled the Commission had recommended the applicant use materials that are consistent with the adjacent properties and break up the overall massing of the structure.

Mr. Stang presented the revised architecture to replace the brick with stone on the ground story and has provided additional gable features to separate the massing of the building. The cedar siding has been replaced with a 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding, he said, and the proposal addresses the conditions related to architecture from the previous review.

Mr. Stang reported that staff is conditioning that the mahogany fiber cement siding be replaced with stone to complement the neighboring properties and retain the architectural character intended by the development text.

The applicant has provided a ground sign design, which Mr. Stang presented, to be located in the entry feature; however, not enough information was included to verify that the sign meets the requirements of the development text and Zoning Code. Therefore, staff is conditioning that the applicant file an Amended Final Development Plan application, he said, for the review and approval of the sign package.

Based on the Final Development Plan criteria, staff is recommending approval with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replace the 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding with the proposed stone, prior to filing for building permits;
- 2) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to filing for building permits;
- 3) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan meeting the requirements of the development text with the building permit submittal; and
- 4) That the applicant file an Amended Final Development Plan for the review and approval of the sign package.

Bob Miller asked where staff is specifically recommending stone on the façade. Mr. Stang pointed out that anything that is shown in the brown color, staff is recommending replacement with stone.

Cathy De Rosa asked what happened to old condition #5, which is the protection of those Norway Spruce trees that were along the front. Mr. Stang explained the applicant has revised the plans to preserve those trees so that is why the condition has since been removed.

Steve Stidhem asked what color of stone staff is recommending. Mr. Stang answered they recommend using the stone that the applicant applied to the ground story and to the main gable features on the east and south façade to create a more complementary architectural design and to match the Holiday Inn and Extended Stay.

Amy Salay recalled discussing hotels and the number of hotel rooms so she is still questioning the need for another extended stay hotel in this location in particular. She said her concern is that this will become a defacto apartment building and not necessarily in a good way. She asked if we have spoken to the CVB about the need for more hotel rooms. Mr. Stang reported he had a conversation with Scott Dring with the CVB and he had said the reason we are starting to see more of these hotel proposals is that Dublin has a high demand for hotel rooms right now. He had quoted some numbers to Mr. Stang and depending on a couple months from now when they review that again it may be a little different but there is definitely a high demand in the area.

Deborah Mitchell asked if those numbers have been broken out by extended stay, which can be up to 30 days, compared to regular hotel rooms. Mr. Stang indicated they have but he did not receive that specific information but he could request it.

Claudia Husak said, from a Zoning Code perspective, a hotel, is a hotel, is a hotel and a permitted use on this particular site so whether or not the hotel programming is longer or shorter stay, we have no regulatory authority over that.

Vince Papsidero said the Zoning Code does not allow us to require market study analysis that would determine the demand.

Ms. Salay stated she agreed with staff on the need for more stone.

Mr. Stidhem invited the applicant to speak.

Miguel Gonzalez, 2501 Bristol Road, asked the Commission to further discuss the addition of materials. He said one of the reasons they use the texture of fiber cement is to add some color and differentiation to the building. As it is proposed, he said, it meets the Code requirements and it is a long enough building to actually break it up more with the differentiation of material that would add more character and it would help their client to better differentiate their brand from the neighbors.

Ms. Salay asked what materials he would consider replacing with stone. Mr. Gonzalez answered his preference would be to leave the textured fiber cement alone but if there is more discussion, perhaps they can meet on a middle ground. He said the standard material, base material, would stay the same, regardless. He explained where they have the accents and the stone on the gables they project out so it is three-dimensional. Ms. Salay indicated it is hard to visualize per the drawings submitted because it is flat and the colors are off. She emphasized she is looking for more stone so they appear more like the Holiday Inn as it has a lot more character with a mix of high quality materials.

Victoria Newell arrived at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. Stidhem asked the public to speak with regard to this case.

Linda Childs, 5382 Crossing Lane, asked to see the graphic that included the setbacks, again. She noted where she lives in relation to this project and stated she is really concerned. She thanked Ms. Salay because she made her points, exactly. She indicated she had heard that there is a 40% vacancy rate. She noted there are 17 hotels in the City that she could count using Google and that does not include the new AC Hotel or any others not yet open for business and most of them are extended stays. She indicated it is easy for someone to live there permanently. She said if occupancy rates have any influence to please check those.

Ms. Childs said ever since she moved in to that neighborhood, she has been using the Commission as reassurance of what they are going to get. She mentioned the difference between the developments in Bridge Park to this; they expected something along that line and quality. If we are going to have the 'great wall of china', she asked why it has to sit on the western edge of the property. She said she would prefer that it back up to the other hotels and have parking and trees facing west so that there will be an extra buffer between the building and the existing residences. She asked that the applicant flip the design.

Diane Kennedy, 5854 Locbury Lane, said she is president of The Village of Tuttle Crossing; they are the dead end of Wilcox Road, next to the park. She indicated that whenever someone says Motel 6, people

snicker. She understands, she said, she even tells her friends they live in lower Dublin – 43016. She said she did not believe the Commission would allow a Motel 6 on Muirfield Drive, so why would it be acceptable here. She stated she hates the sign as it implies a lot of different things and wants something different there.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there was anyone else from the public that wished to speak on this case [Hearing none.]

Deborah Mitchell said she is very sympathetic to the concerns voiced by the citizens. She explained Planning and Zoning cannot really weigh in on the kinds of issues that have been raised. In terms of the appearance of the building, she said, at a minimum we should have the kind of stone placement that staff and Ms. Salay have recommended. She indicated that breaking up the expanse of this building entails more than just color and texture. She noted the Holiday Inn Express has a nice variety of texture that provides an upscale type of experience when one sees it. To be consistent with what is already in the neighborhood, she emphasized that is needed with this proposal and does not see that yet. She said she agreed with staff's recommendation about stone and she would also like to see what else could be done to provide visual cues of quality around this property. As proposed, she noted there is so much sameness about the building. She indicated the use of materials, landscaping, and changing the roofline could potentially relieve some of these concerns.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the placement of the building on the lot. Mr. Stang explained the development text only requires a minimum 15-foot side yard setback. He said the challenge of flipping the building with the parking lot is that on the east side of the property, where the tree area is, is the stormwater detention system that the applicant is using with underground storage that would connect an outlet to the stream that runs on the northern side. He said even if the applicant reworks this to flip the building, they will still need to demonstrate they can meet the requirements. He explained the shape of this lot on the northeast corner is a little tricky because the 15-foot setback would push the building a little bit further to the west from this side. Ms. De Rosa asked if the 15-foot setback would solve the stormwater problem. Mr. Stang answered there is no way to determine that right now without totally reworking the site. He said the other concern would be fire access.

Claudia Husak added, without Fire or Engineering staff present we are in no position to say if this would be okay or not. She said applications are not brought to the Commission without first being reviewed by Engineering and Fire. She emphasized decisions cannot be made here on the spot.

Various Commissioners suggested changes to the building's orientation and shape.

Mr. Stidhem said at a minimum, the entry needs to be revised and could not support this proposal as presented.

Bob Miller said the applicant has made great strides and he is empathetic to the residents. He said this project is not quite there yet and does not meet the criteria so he would have a hard time passing this application. He suggested the applicant bring the proposal up to Dublin standards; the building needs more pizzazz and spiff to it.

Ms. Salay noted the Commission's hands are tied with respect to a hotel on this site as it is a permitted use.

Ms. Mitchell referred to the Holiday Inn Express sign. In terms of cues for quality, she said, the bright red and blue colors used for Motel 6 could be subdued so that it does not shout but rather whispers.

Benjamin Miller, 5120 Pleasant Chapel Road, Newark, Ohio, said he is the Civil Engineer for the applicant. He noted there were questions regarding options for the site layout. He said the issue with flip-flopping the building and parking lot would place a lighted parking lot (that was sitting between the existing building and the proposed building) on a residential side. He said there the light from the parking lot would be much more impactful than some lighting from some rooms.

Ms. Salay said there are lighting guidelines that prevent light from leaving the site. In addition, she said there would be a lot of opportunity to save a lot of trees. Mr. Miller said they did the tree survey for the project and by putting the building on the east side, it would impact the same number of trees. He said they already proposed adding more trees to the west side. He indicated a lot of the trees that are getting cut down are in poor condition. He said the applicant has reached capacity for the site in regards to replacement trees in the landscape plan without promoting healthy trees they are going to plant. In terms of stormwater management, he explained that the stream that is behind and the 50-foot Stream Corridor Protection Zone, that area has to be preserved and new trees cannot be planted in there.

Mr. Miller said the proposal meets the PUD per the Zoning Code requirements, with the exception of the architectural concerns already discussed.

Mr. Bob Miller asked Mr. Benjamin Miller what his opinion was as an engineer to have the building in the middle and parking on both sides. He answered the efficiency of the parking lot would be lost and the parking requirements would not be met. He added that the ditch for the stormwater is very shallow, which is why stormwater management was placed on the east side and switching it to the west side would cause more ponding in the parking lot.

Victoria Newell suggested underground storage.

Mr. Bob Miller asked if there were still options in terms of creating an L-shape with this building, softening the architecture, or rearranging the building somehow on the site. Mr. Benjamin Miller answered anything is possible but whether it fits within the program the owner has established is a concern as far as the number of rooms and parking spaces available.

Ms. Newell noted all the architectural details on the adjacent buildings, which are not being provided with this proposal. She recommended the applicant provide more interest to bring it to the level the development text is asking for.

Mr. Gonzalez said, aside from the massing consideration and the shape of the building, he would like to get a better understanding and clarity on the lack of quality detailing. He said he thought there were a lot of things being missed such as capstone headers, thick window frames on the upper floors on every window, added divided lights to the windows in general, horizontal lap siding and board and batten styles.

Ms. Newell said there are two things that she looks at in the text, which she is basing her opinion on – the architectural section, "...considered overall, architecture shall reflect a quality in keeping with the surrounding multi-family, office, commercial, and single-family development..." She noted that is where the applicant is falling short. "...All projection and mechanical details such as louvers, exposed flashings, vents, gutters and downspouts should be recognized as architectural features and treated to match or complement the color of the adjacent surfaces..." She noted this was done on the Holiday Inn Express. Again, she said this is where the applicant is falling short. She added the proposal is not rising to the level of detail of what has been constructed in the area.

Ms. Salay quoted a past Planning Director who said "A hotel is never as beautiful as the very first day it opens." She emphasized the materials have to be of very high quality to be timeless; someday this building will be something else and it has to stand the test of time. She concluded the applicant needs to be a good neighbor and fit in to everything that is around them.

Mr. Stidhem asked the applicant how they wished to proceed. Mr. Gonzalez decided to table the application.

Mr. Miller encouraged the applicant that if they choose to bring this back to the Commission, they should bring all the details forward so the Commission can clearly see it more visually and maybe make it idiot proof for those that are not architects or engineers.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to table the Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Tabled 6 – 0)

## **2. BSD O - Echo, Neighborhood Hospital 17-081BPR/CU**

## **PID: 273-009147 Basic Plan Review/Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for an 18,000-square-foot, 24-hour hospital facility for emergency and inpatient care on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road, approximately 500 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236, and a review and approval of two Waivers and a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said the Commission is also required to determine the required reviewing body for future applications for this project. She stated the Commission has final authority on this case and speakers need to be sworn-in.

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

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site, and noted it is unique as a number of constraints are placed on this property. The first being a 100-foot AEP high-tension powerline easement that runs along the western property line that he pointed out. He said the second is a neighborhood street connection shown in the Street Network Map, which connects W. Dublin-Granville Road to Stoneridge Lane and is located along the eastern property line. This requires 50 feet of right-of-way from the existing property line, he explained, and reduces the buildable area further.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan and stated the applicant is proposing two access points from the neighborhood street with a vehicular canopy for emergency drop-off located at the northeast corner. He said a service entrance and ambulance entrance are on the south façade of the building with the mechanicals and trash enclosure proposed in the southwest corner. He said a total of 34 parking spaces are proposed throughout the parking lot and Code requires any parking for a hospital facility be approved through a Parking Plan. He pointed out that the neighborhood street will provide connections to the eastern properties and would allow for a continuation once the property to the south of this site redevelops.

Mr. Stang said the proposed architecture is modern and provides a mixture of materials such as stone, brick, glass, and metal panels. He presented proposed elevations. He said this Civic Building Type is slightly different than other types used in the district thus far to allow for more flexibility in design based

on the interior function of these uses classified as Civic/Public or Institutional only. Although slightly different, he noted many of the architectural requirements related to the form of the building are outlined in the Zoning Code and the applicant will continue to refine the architectural details with the Site Plan Review, based on the Code requirements for the building type. He described the proposed building as a tall, single story; however, the Zoning Code allows a 20-foot or taller ground story to count as two stories total. He indicated this requirement will be verified with the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang stated the first motion before the Commission this evening is for the Conditional Use for a hospital facility. He restated the proposal is an 18,000-square-foot facility, which operates 24 hours a day and has a total of 15 patient beds.

Mr. Stang said the BSD-Office District has hospitals listed as a Conditional and Size Limited Use with no building exceeding 75,000 square feet in gross floor area. He noted this site is mostly surrounded by medical office or similar medical facilities such as Heartland with commercial occupying the other properties making this an appropriate location for this type of use.

Based on the criteria listed for a Conditional Use, he said Staff and the ART are recommending approval of this request with no conditions.

Mr. Stang presented a map of the site with the block size highlighted and the site noted within that block. He said the second motion is for two Waiver reviews. The first Waiver he noted, is for Maximum Block Size. Due to the existing street network and the proposed neighborhood connection, he said, the block would actually encompass everything extending to Shamrock Boulevard. With this being the first site to develop in this area, he stated, a Waiver is required to address the larger block created by the connection; an additional neighborhood street is proposed on the east side of Heartland that will further split this block. The second Waiver, he noted, is for Vehicular Canopies. He explained the Code requires that canopies be located to the rear of the principal structure based on the principal frontage street. The proposed canopy at the northeast corner is located on the side he said but is requested to allow for visibility of the emergency entrance; the other proposed canopies are located to the rear of the building for the service and ambulance entrances.

Based on the Waiver review criteria, he said Staff and the ART are recommending approval of the two Waivers:

1. Lots and Blocks – Maximum Block Size
2. Building Types – Vehicular Canopies

Mr. Stang stated the third motion is for the Basic Plan Review for the development of this site. Based on the Waiver review criteria, he said, Staff and the ART are recommending approval of this request with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an Access Management Study with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review; and
- 3) That the applicant provide final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater management with the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang said the fourth and final motion is to determine if the Planning and Zoning Commission or the Administrative Review Team should be the required reviewing body for all future applications with regard to this case.

Mr. Stang explained the additional item included in the packets was the conceptual sign package for the site. He said the applicant is requesting feedback on the location, size, height, and any other considerations with regard to signage based on the directional need for a hospital facility use. He presented the tentative wall signs on the north elevation along with smaller directional signs that would be located on the canopies. He explained a user for the facility has not been identified at this time and therefore, all signs shown are conceptual placeholders. He presented the conceptual ground signs meant to provide wayfinding for the site. He emphasized these signs are not for approval and are meant only as a tool for discussion for the applicant to submit with a later application. Based on the package, Mr. Stang said a Master Sign Plan will most likely be required, given the number and location of the signs proposed.

Mr. Stang summarized the four motions:

1. Conditional Use recommended for approval with no conditions.
2. Two Basic Plan Review Waivers recommended for approval:
  - a. Lots and Blocks – Maximum Block Size
  - b. Building Types – Vehicular Canopies
3. Basic Plan Review recommended for approval with three conditions:
  - a. That the applicant provide an Access Management Study with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
  - b. That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review; and
  - c. That the applicant provide final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater management with the Site Plan Review.
4. Required Reviewing Body:
  - a. Administrative Review Team *or*
  - b. Planning and Zoning Commission

Mr. Stang offered to answer any questions.

Bob Miller inquired about the intent of the Code around the vehicular canopies and what is the purpose. Mr. Stang answered the main focus of the Zoning Code is to push the building and have it cover as much of the frontage as possible. If vehicular canopies are permitted, he said they need to be oriented away from those main thoroughfares.

Mr. Miller asked for further explanation regarding the civic building type. Mr. Stang said the intent behind the civic building type is to provide more flexibility for those uses. From a site perspective, he said there are a lot of building types that have a required build zone so it forces the building to come up to the frontage in some cases it can be right up to the property line or 15 feet back. He explained the civic building type outlines more standard zoning so it has just a minimum setback (15 or 20 feet) and the building could choose to be even further back from that. In addition, he stated there are some architectural requirements that are more flexible or lenient because the uses going into this building type usually have specific requirements for how the interiors function and so it is to not limit them from doing

that but to provide the same context in form and massing that the Commission is looking for in the BSD. He said the library application came forward as a civic building type, for example.

Steve Stidhem inquired about the easement and the road and if it would go through the Sports Medicine building to get to Stoneridge Lane. Mr. Stang answered affirmatively; eventually it will connect all the way through. He said it is incorporated into the street network map that is in the BSD Zoning Code. He indicated the street actually lines up with that AEP easement and that would never be allowed to occur because AEP would never allow a road to be constructed in that easement. He reported Engineering had reviewed that and found the existing entry drive there to provide that connection through. Mr. Stidhem indicated the road would never go through until the Sports Medicine building was eliminated to which Mr. Stang agreed. He added there is a service drive that runs to the east on the backside of those properties so it provides that connection through there as well.

Deborah Mitchell asked if anyone on city staff was going to study the impact of emergency vehicles on traffic as well as the noise they would create. Mr. Stang answered staff had not reviewed that but the applicant may have additional information. He indicated that is something that could be incorporated with that access management study. Mr. Stidhem noted there are already facilities near this site that receive frequent ambulance visits.

Ms. Mitchell asked if Council has indicated that hospitals would be more in the area of Hospital Drive, from a planning perspective. Mr. Stang said, in terms of this use, this is being classified as a hospital use because it is the only type of use that this fits into in our Zoning Code. He indicated it is not a typical hospital use. He added he has not heard of any planning for future hospital locations and not sure there is an intent to do so knowing that these smaller ER facilities are starting to pop up more through Central Ohio. He indicated there was one other application that came forward as an informal review and that was a similar ER facility but that did not end up moving forward.

Victoria Newell asked if the Assisted Living Facility right down the street (Heartland) was located at the 15-foot setback off of SR 161 to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively. He said that was designed before the BSD came into play. Ms. Newell indicated it was a really nice project and Heartland worked really hard to meet the intent of the impending BSD Code.

Linda Menerey, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, introduced Denise Valenta, division manager from Embree Healthcare.

Denise Valenta, Embree Asset Group, 4747 Williams Drive, Georgetown, TX, said this facility is truly an eight-bed inpatient hospital, typically for short-term stays of two to five days. She stated it is accredited by the joint commission, registered by CNR, and it is a general medicine hospital. She indicated the short-term stays would be for end of life, dehydration, and detoxification type of care. She said seven beds are for true emergencies. She added it is not a full hospital so there is no surgical suite but there is a full radiology department. The facility itself she noted is open 24-hours, seven days a week as a small format hospital and ER and not a typical community hospital. She said the intent is for a faster turnaround time in the ER setting with an anticipated wait time of 15 minutes for this type of facility.

Ms. Menerey said this facility would see certain kinds of patients. She indicated if a heart attack patient were to come in, they would stabilize that patient and then transport them to a hospital set up to treat the heart attack.

Ms. Menerey referred to the building footprint and the 100-foot power line easement and the neighborhood street, specifically, and said the applicant wonders about the long-term viability of this site as they are left with two acres of developable ground and it is just a little bit more than 200 feet wide.

She said the site works very well for the applicant's prototypical building, which is rather long and narrow. She reported there was a lot of discussion at the ART in terms of the parking lot and access points so the applicant reworked three access points down to two; all of the functions for the ambulance drop off – they will come in off of the southern drive to the back and the canopy is on that side but the building is really split into two long pieces. She added the eight inpatient beds run on one side and the seven emergency beds on the other.

Ms. Valenta added there is a set program because there are two functions of the building. She explained there is an existing division inside the building but they share some of the common areas like storage, etc. She emphasized there is a distinct separation between the in-patient hospital and the emergency side.

Cathy De Rosa asked what sort of patient would come to this facility and how they would know to come to this facility or to a hospital. She asked if Washington Township picks up the patient and they decide based on which facility is closest. She said since they do not treat a lot of things like heart attacks and the patient would be transported out, if the patient is now making two emergency visits when they could make one.

Ms. Valenta answered, in an emergency, one would go to the closest facility. She said their registered doctors can treat the emergency but will not continue to care for the severe cases as they would be transported out; cases they would handle are more like broken arms, cuts, and general ER issues.

Ms. Menerey noted one's instincts would be to call 911 and that operator will know to call the squad not to take the heart attack patient here. She gave the scenario if you are sitting there with your husband and he cuts his finger, if this is closest, you would come here.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the care would cost less if treated here rather than a full-scale ER. Ms. Valenta explained it is all about timing and service of care. The level of care, she said, is going to be quick where you may have to wait much longer at a community hospital. She added the cost is not any different.

Ms. Mitchell asked if this is a level three trauma hospital. Ms. Valenta clarified it would be a level four hospital.

Amy Salay asked if this is an emergency room light and not for real emergencies. Ms. De Rosa said it seems more like an urgent care facility, almost. She asked if it is categorized as a hospital because that is what it would be considered per the Zoning Code. Claudia Husak said, from a use perspective, where staff has to fit it, it is a conditional use in the district but in terms of a definition, of the service that is provided here, it is a hospital.

Ms. Valenta clarified they are licensed as a hospital; they have to meet every licensing code that the community hospitals have to meet. She said if someone is having a stroke, they come to this facility, they are stabilized, and then transported out. She emphasized it is about convenience.

Ms. Mitchell suggested this applicant is trying to be somewhere between an urgent care and Dublin Methodist Hospital.

Ms. De Rosa questioned again, how someone would know which facility to go to. Ms. Salay suggested when serious things happen, she may want to go to Riverside or OSU and not Dublin Methodist, first. Ms. Newell asked how often patients arrive by ambulance as opposed to someone driving someone in by car and would be looking for the closest place.

Ms. Valenta said she could not provide any specific information but has been told by their client that typically, any time a patient is brought in by ambulance, it is because there is an overload perhaps, maybe a disaster. She said she cannot say there will not be any patients brought in by ambulance but it seems to be more of their transports are out-going. She said when the community comes to them, they are right there, they know where we are, because it is part of the retail environment where they buy things every day.

Ms. Newell suggested it is probably like when a doctor sees a patient because they are 'not feeling well' but they are having a heart attack and transport them to a hospital. She provided an example like when her kids were little and her daughter had her face completely slit open, hurt her lip, blood was gushing everywhere, so they just drove to the nearest hospital but if this was closer, they would have stopped here.

Ms. Newell said she wanted to completely understand since this is an application for a Conditional Use, she wants to know how this facility would function. She referred to patients that are detoxing. She asked how they would get to this facility in that instance. Ms. Valenta answered that is typically a referral from a hospital and maybe the patient needed a more private, quiet environment. She said detoxing patients are not going to just show up. She restated they would transport most patients out to the community hospital. She emphasized this facility is for some private pay patients that want to be here for a more serene environment.

Ms. Menerey summarized that this is right around the corner and they may receive the patient that is dehydrated or close to end of life.

Ms. Newell said they have had this discussion that came as a surprise to the Commission. She explained there are care facilities in Dublin that required a tall fence (10 feet) because of the patients that were brought there. While they were supposed to be voluntary, she said, they were not necessarily completely voluntary and as a Conditional Use she does not want to see the Commission in the same situation where an application comes back after the fact because there are patients that need to be detained because they are suicidal or there for drug abuse.

Ms. Valenta reiterated this facility is for short-term stay; it is not an addiction center or a detoxification clinic of any sort. She restated this is high-end and private pay scenario on the inpatient side. Her understanding from her client is that they would see residents from the assisted living facility that maybe fell and needed a few days of care or it was an end of life situation. She said if a psych patient is brought in, they have to have a room available that is protected but they would not plan on keeping them. She indicated they are in the process of trying to get rid of that psych type requirement because they do not want to keep patients as they would be better suited for a community hospital in a true psych ward.

Ms. Salay asked if this was part of a larger health system or a new system to our market. Ms. Valenta said there is a confidentiality agreement with her client so she cannot comment at this time. Ms. De Rosa asked if Echo is the real name to which Ms. Valenta answered it was not.

Ms. Husak asked the Commission to focus more on the application at hand because some of the questions being asked do not relate to the review before them tonight.

Thaddeus Boggs said how the property will be used and how it relates to the criteria...will it be harmonious, will it meet the existing character of the community...those sorts of questions driven to the criteria are appropriate and the ins and outs of the business model may not be applicable.

Ms. De Rosa said she is trying to find out what the traffic flow will be, what it means on the ambulatory services in town, and those types of things so they are trying to learn a little bit about the operations. Ms. Newell said they are all struggling because it is a Conditional Use and difficult to understand how this is fitting in if information cannot be disclosed.

Ms. Valenta said she would like more feedback on the site plan component, architecture, and signage.

Ms. De Rosa she asked why the drop off canopy is in the front of the facility and asked if it could be relocated. Ms. Valenta said it is all about the function inside; they cannot just move things around in there. There is a licensing component and certain functions have to happen to make a hospital and an ER efficient. Ms. Menerey pointed out what the different drop-off locations were for whether it was for a vehicle/general public or an emergency apparatus and the general public access needs to be readily visible.

Ms. Newell said the BSD Code dictates this needs to be a walkable, urban environment where buildings are pushed up to a road and this proposal appears to be really hard to fit that format. She said if the Commission accepts this without addressing the urbanism, they could not enforce it upon anyone else. She said it is a difficult to fit in a medical facility in an area that is designed to be an active, urban, walkable environment. She said she knows there are surrounding properties that are set back before we had changes in our Zoning Code, which has taken a different direction.

Ms. Menerey said the face of that building is set back 30 feet versus the 15-foot setback line because it is the function of the canopy on there. She said if they slide it up, the drop off is going to move forward with it so they could only move it up a bit but not to the 15-foot line. She explained there is a grade change from east to west; they have to have steps coming from the sidewalk up the front on the main entrance, which all changes where the accessible route is going to end up.

Ms. Newell said she can understand the grading issue and that can be proven to this body but engagement of the street with the activity of the building is walkable urbanism. She suggested they give the appearance of addressing the street frontage in the design of the building so people feel they could walk up to the entrance from the street.

Ms. De Rosa asked what staff's opinion is on this. Mr. Stang reported they have had discussions with the applicant similar to this with the Commission. He reported staff asked the applicant if it was possible to rotate the building to the right 90 degrees so it runs long ways with the canopy being towards the rear. The big request from the applicants is that they need that visibility for that emergency access. Anyway the building is rotated, that drop-off has to be near that prominent corner and visible from SR 161 because currently, that is the only access point. If the canopy is moved anywhere else, they lose the function within the building.

Ms. Menerey indicated there is some room to move the building forward and deal with interfacing the street; the canopy and the big glass component on the corner is inviting. She said they can add some lower landscape and if a low wall is needed they could incorporate that. She noted when they went in front of the ART, there was a one day turnaround for revisions and is confident they can achieve that again.

Ms. Valenta said they have spent a lot of time trying to fit this on the site and still work with the plan of the interior's function. She said they have reviewed all sorts of options for a few months.

Ms. Newell encouraged the applicant to look at the Charles Penzone property and Heartland to see how they engaged the street frontage.

Ms. Menerey asked about the materials list in the grayish tone that includes brick, stone, glass, and metal panels. Ms. Valenta added the intent for the facility is for it to be very contemporary and modern to give the depiction that serious medicine goes on in there. She said they have already upgraded their materials to better fit the Bridge Street District. Ms. Newell said it would be helpful to have examples of those materials.

Ms. De Rosa said the glass will be a nice addition to the streetscape. She said this design is fresh, different, and interesting and that will create a positive impression.

Ms. Salay said she knows that the applicant needs signage but questioned two signs on the same façade. Regarding the materials, she said the rendering makes it appear a little whiter. She said she would like to see more of an off-white or cream for a warmer tone rather than the gray. She noted that State Bank did a nice job fitting within the BSD Code as that street frontage is engaging. She said we have to look long-term at the big picture; the goal of the district is not to have so much auto orientation as street orientation. She said she likes the glass and the architecture on the north side that will face SR 161; the rest of it could be improved with more detailing perhaps. Her impression is not a serious medicine building but an interesting looking building.

Ms. Mitchell said the glass is really nice but she agrees with Ms. Salay's suggestion of a warmer tone. In terms of signage, and the really nice feature with the glass, hopefully the signs will not shout. She understands emergency is a shouting kind of word, especially in all capitals. People will learn pretty fast this is a 24/7 facility as an emergency room does not have banker's hours or mall hours. She said people need wayfinding but asked the applicant to consider communicating without shouting even though this is a serious use.

Mr. Stidhem said this building does not look like anything over in that same area, and does not really fit with what exists but he still loves it. He said it will be a great addition to the area. He said it would be nice to have this use because of the services offered in the area already, which is a lot of healthcare. He said he hoped this might inspire more activity in the building to the west that is mostly vacant from an economic development standpoint. He said he understands the architecture. He reiterated the intent for this area is walkable urban space but that is not what we have there now and yet we cannot let someone new go in that does not get us to where we want to be, which is why the applicant is having to struggle with the requirements. He said he could see how the applicant would question walkable urbanism because right now cars fly down SR 161 at 45 mph but again, that is where we are headed.

Ms. Menerey said she can understand everything developing north and west that it will become more walkable and this is on a major bus route; the applicant could have employees that use the COTA bus system to come to work. The neighborhood street is a big nut in terms of dollars but it will have sidewalks on both sides and on-street parking. It is promoting more vehicular activity but it ties to the path behind Gordon Foods and then Ohio Health's credit union.

Ms. Newell said for our applicant this evening since she is not familiar with what we are talking about, she suggested she visit the area on and around Riverside Drive.

The Chair asked the applicant what they wanted to do with the case this evening.

Ms. Husak suggested the Commission take a step back and think about this is a Basic Plan, which is a conceptual sort of step in the process and to keep in mind it will come back to the Commission as a final.

Ms. Newell said the Commission would be approving the Conditional Use, the two Waivers, and then it will be hard to go backwards if they cannot address the issues.

Ms. Husak asked what issues are outstanding for the Conditional Use. Ms. Newell said she was still struggling with that and how this facility fits in this site. Ms. Menerey said from their perspective, she is not sure what else they would be able to bring back to convince the Commission about the use of it besides what has been shared this evening so the applicant is struggling with that.

Mr. Miller said, from a Conditional Use perspective, he does not have a problem.

Ms. Mitchell indicated there were some details that the Commission did not have this evening that could possibly be provided. She wants to know what they can expect from a typical level four, trauma hospital. She would like to know what types of people will be served and whether they will be coming from the community or more like outside the community. She said there is an issue about potential detox; what percentage of patients currently in the Echo model are detox patients and how often they are there for how many days. A typical detox is more than two days and it is not just mental health or behavior issues that can cause the need for security. More details on typical users, treatments, and what is going to be happening there in general is needed. She wants to know how it would interface with the community around it as well as the broader Dublin community.

Ms. Newell read through the criteria.

1. *The proposed use will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or purpose of the Zoning Code and/or Community Plan.*
2. *The proposed use will comply with all applicable development standards, except as altered in the approved conditional use.*
3. *The proposed use will be harmonious with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity.*

Ms. Newell said for criteria 2 and 3, how it is working for the BSD and walkable urbanism as she does not believe this application meets the criteria as it has been proposed.

4. *The use will not be hazardous to or have a negative impact on existing or future surrounding uses.*
5. *The area and proposed use(s) will be adequately served by essential public facilities and services.*

Ms. Newell stated that would not be a problem.

6. *The proposed use will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*
7. *The proposed use will not involve operations that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare.*
8. *Vehicular approaches to the property shall be designed as not to create interference with traffic on public or private streets or roads.*

For criteria 8, Ms. Newell suggested they look at how the applicant would redesign the entry and shift the traffic pattern.

9. *The proposed use will not be detrimental to property values in the immediate vicinity.*
10. *The proposed use will not impede the normal and orderly development of the surrounding properties.*

Ms. Newell said criteria 9 and 10 were something the Commission was trying to understand in terms of ambulance access and how often the ambulances would be coming to the facility. She said due to the criteria she noted above that she is struggling with, she cannot approve a Conditional Use as not enough information has been provided.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification on the criteria for a Conditional Use analysis that Ms. Newell is struggling with. He noted criteria 2 and 3. She answered affirmatively because they could potentially move the position of the building and how the entry feature would act. Mr. Stang said for criteria 2, there is still another development application that has to come forward. This part of the Conditional Use does not necessarily speak to the BSD as much as it was in place prior to the BSD Code. In terms of a PUD, the Conditional Use allowed the Commission to make slight alterations, if needed, based off of that Conditional Use approval; whereas, this would still have to abide by the Basic Plan Review Criteria as well as any future development applications. The Site Plan Review will need to be consistent with the Basic Plan Review, he said.

Ms. Newell asked Mr. Stang to explain how criteria 3 is met. She said what is proposed is not conforming to the BSD Code. Mr. Stang said, from staff's perspective, they look at this as a medical related use and there are a lot of similar facilities in the adjacent areas including: Heartland, Sunrise of Dublin, and various medical offices. He stated staff viewed this as another medical oriented use to be able to blend in with that existing character established by the other facilities. He explained Heartland would have a lot of similarities as far as emergency travel to/from as well as the general impact on the surrounding area. He emphasized this is an acceptable and appropriate use for this site; whereas, if it were to be closer to residential or closer to a different type of use; more concern and scrutiny would have to be taken for the review of this and how it would impact those sites.

Ms. Newell said Heartland is a residential facility under the building code. Mr. Stang said staff speaks from the zoning side and those two do not always line up the same way. Mr. Papsidero said it is an institutional use in some respects from a zoning standpoint. He said we would expect the applicant to return with a Final Development Plan that explores moving the building forward as this Commission has suggested and adjusting that canopy as can be to make that stronger presence.

Ms. Newell said she expects the canopy area to engage the street.

Ms. Menerey indicated there is room to make some adjustment to get the building slid forward and see if they can get the architect to address some of the issues with the interface with the street and the canopy. She noted this site has sat undeveloped for a long time and they saw this as a turning point for the BSD moving farther towards Sawmill Road. She added staff was pretty excited that the building is contemporary, different, and new and how the site fit pretty well with the prototype of this building.

Ms. Salay said she was concerned about interfacing with the street and does not see anyone spending any time outside here. Ms. Menerey said she thought differently about it and suggested a scenario where a visitor is waiting for someone, if it is warmer out, they might be in that drop-off area sitting on a bench. Ms. Salay emphasized that challenge is on the applicant to make it more engaging with the street.

Ms. De Rosa said visually, this is a very interesting building, which creates some engagement. She said she could support the Conditional Use now but encouraged the applicant to address some of these issues with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell requested to see the two Waivers again:

1. §153.060—Lots and Blocks (C)(2)(a)—Maximum Block Size: Maximum block length permitted is 500 feet, and the maximum block perimeter permitted is 1,750 feet; Requested: Block length of ±1,890 feet and block perimeter of ±3,360 feet.

Mr. Stang explained Waiver #1 is due to the existing street network and this proposed connection; the block would be substantially larger than what Code would allow. He added this is the first site to come through and redevelop; it is an issue currently but it can be addressed as future sites redevelop.

2. §153.062—Building Types (L)(1)—Vehicular Canopies: For buildings facing a principal frontage street, vehicular canopies shall be located on the rear façade of the principal structure; Requested: One vehicular canopy located on the side façade at the main entrance.

Mr. Stang explained Waiver #2 pertains more specifically to this site as the vehicular canopy needs to be on the northeast corner as opposed to being on the rear of the building.

Ms. Newell said she did not have an issue with Waiver #1 but with Waiver #2, they are still struggling with the design of that front entry. She said if she agrees to waive this and the applicant cannot resolve this, the Commission is giving them a Waiver on something that is not yet resolved with the Basic Plan Review.

Ms. Newell read the Site Plan Review analysis.

- (a) The Site Plan Review shall be substantially similar to the approved Basic Site Plan.*
- (b) The proposal is consistent with the approved Development Plan, if applicable.*
- (c) Meets all Zoning requirements except as authorized by Administrative Departures and Waivers.*

Ms. Newell said staff has stated (a) and (b) are not applicable but (c) meets criteria. She said it is not meeting walkable urbanism.

Ms. Newell said she could support the Conditional Use but is getting stuck as she reviews the Basic Plan Review criteria. Mr. Miller said he does not have a problem with the Conditional Use or the block size Waiver but still gets hung up on the Waiver for vehicular canopies. He finds vehicular canopies need to be in the back for aesthetic reasons and obviously the Commission can waive that. The question is whether this causes problems the next time a project comes through because the Commission perceived this one as prettier than the one that comes to them next, for example. He asked if the Commission is putting themselves in a box.

Mr. Stang said the decision today is based off the unique nature of the current application. He said part of the Waiver review is that every application to have this request has to come before the Commission and state their case for why that Waiver is requested and why the Commission should be supportive of the request. He indicated this allows the Commission to state whether a case is not meeting the intent or not integrated like it should be; this does not hold the Commission in a bind for setting a precedent.

Mr. Miller said it still comes back to Ms. Newell's point that the canopy is not engaging the street the way it is proposed today so it is hard to agree to this Waiver because now we will be boxed in on this particular project.

Mr. Papsidero clarified the Waiver allows for the canopy to be on the side façade, not at that specific location so the applicant can adjust the canopy based on how we deal with the street frontage.

Mr. Boggs said the Waiver would not require that the canopy be there so if the applicant came up with a configuration that had the building turned 90 degrees it does not say the applicant has to put the canopy on the side there.

Ms. Menerey asked that clarification be added to the Waiver language since this is the BSD. She said when they work in the normal PUD mode, they add conditions. She asked if there was a way to make the Commission feel comfortable if they allow the applicant to move forward at the Development Plan, the more detailed Site Plan, and the signage plan to meet these concerns. Mr. Stang said a condition can be tied to the Basic Plan Review because these are Waivers associated with that. He explained Waiver #2 would merely allow the vehicular canopy to be on the side as opposed to the rear. He suggested staff can add a condition on the Basic Plan Review that states that the applicant and staff will continue to work on the location of that canopy or shift the building to the north to address the canopy.

Ms. Menerey indicated if the Commission approves all these and the applicant returns and the Commission is not happy with the canopy, the application is not going to get approved.

Mr. Boggs said to Mr. Stang's point, it seems that the core issue is the engagement with the right-of-way and how it promotes that urban walkability as well as how that canopy plays into that.

Ms. Newell said the BSD Code is priority and that is what makes this challenging with this particular site.

Ms. Menerey said the civic building type allows for flexibility.

Mr. Boggs said the Conditional Use by itself can be approved. Mr. Stang said if the Commission is not comfortable with the vehicular canopy Waiver, the applicant could move forward with a disapproval on that and the applicant would still have the option to file for that with the Final Site Plan Review. He added they could come back with a revised design that takes into consideration all the comments that have been discussed this evening. Ms. Newell said she was comfortable with that.

Ms. Menerey asked if the applicant pulled that second Waiver/canopy, the applicant is not going to end up sliding it further south into the site around the back and wanted that known up front. Ms. Newell said she could understand that but the applicant is going to have to be creative about that.

Mr. Stidhem clarified, all the Waiver is stating is that the canopy can be on the side and in the Final Development Plan it would state how the whole side of the building is presented.

Mr. Miller suggested the Commission could argue both sides of this until the cows come home but it does not make a difference if they leave it in or leave it out. The message that this is a real issue as it pertains to the BSD Code should go back to the client.

Ms. Menerey asked for clarification on how to move the process along.

Mr. Stang suggested a fourth condition:

- 4) That the applicant work with staff on revising the architecture and site layout to address the W. Dublin-Granville Road frontage with the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang said the fourth condition would give staff the leniency to work with the applicant on upholding a lot of the comments that have been presented this evening about trying to shift that building forward and working on the architectural aspect of how the canopy integrates into the main structure.

The Chair asked the applicant if they were acceptable of those conditions. Ms. Valenta said she agrees with all four conditions. Ms. Menerey said their concern is that when they return, the canopy will not have been moved to the back, it will be on the side.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. De Rosa moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the Conditional Use for a hospital use as classified under Civic/Public/Institutional uses with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. De Rosa, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the first of two Waivers:

1. §153.060—Lots and Blocks (C)(2)(a)—Maximum Block Size: Maximum block length permitted is 500 feet, and the maximum block perimeter permitted is 1,750 feet; Requested: Block length of ±1,890 feet and block perimeter of ±3,360 feet.

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

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the second of two Waivers:

2. §153.062—Building Types (L)(1)—Vehicular Canopies: For buildings facing a principal frontage street, vehicular canopies shall be located on the rear façade of the principal structure; Requested: One vehicular canopy located on the side façade at the main entrance.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, no; Ms. De Rosa, no; Ms. Salay, no; Ms. Newell, no; Mr. Miller, no; and Ms. Mitchell, no. (Disapproved 0 – 6)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Basic Site Plan Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an Access Management Study with the Site Plan Review to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 2) That the applicant continue to refine architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant provide final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater management with the Site Plan Review; and
- 4) That the applicant work with staff on revising the architecture and site layout to address the W. Dublin-Granville Road frontage with the Site Plan Review.

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

**Motion and Vote**

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

**3. NE Quad, Subarea 5A – Game U  
17-090CU**

**7533 Sawmill Road  
Conditional Use**

Steve Stidhem said the following application is for a 2,000-square-foot tutoring and educational service use for a tenant space within an existing shopping center zoned Planned Unit Development District – NE Quad, Subarea 5A. He said the site is west of Sawmill Road, approximately 850 feet northwest of the intersection with Hard Road. He stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. He said the Commission has final authority on this case and they will have to swear-in speakers.

Mr. Stidhem swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Salay moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Conditional Use to provide a tutoring service that is not currently being provided in this shopping plaza. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**4. BSD SRN – Pins Mechanical  
17-094WR**

**6558 Riverside Drive  
Waiver Review**

Steve Stidhem said the following application is for an entrance separation distance greater than 75 feet on the south façade of building B1 in the Bridge Park Development zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. He said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive, northeast of the intersection with Banker Drive. He stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. The Commission has final authority on this case he said and they will have to swear-in speakers.

Mr. Stidhem swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Bob Miller stated it is obvious they need to make this change. He asked if there is a patio right there or if it is just a sidewalk. Lori Burchett answered there is an approved patio that went through a Minor Project Review as part of a previous project. Mr. Miller recalled discussing that door, specifically, and it was obvious that the door could not be there. He said he does not have a problem with that. He asked how the applicant is going to serve the patio. Ms. Burchett noted there is a door on the south façade that they can utilize but she cannot speak to the circulation. Mr. Miller said it was not an issue.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.062—BuildingTypes(O)(6)—Building Entrance: For Mixed-Use buildings, one entrance is required for every 75 feet of frontage on a street facing façade; Requested: A distance between entrances of 84 feet on the southern façade facing Banker Drive.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**5. WID Area Plan Update  
17-091ADM**

**Administrative Request**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for updates to the West Innovation District (WID) Area Plan including future land use recommendations, development and design policies, transportation and utility considerations, and implementation. She indicated the WID is a key business district that includes office, research, laboratory and clean manufacturing uses. She said the site is approximately 1,000 acres between Avery Road, Houchard Road, Shier Rings Road, and SR 161/Post Road. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for proposed amendments to the Community Plan, for the WID Area Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.234.

Tammy Noble said the WID Area Plan, in association with the Community Plan, has not been updated since 2008. She said this work has been in conjunction with the City's consultants, O'Brien Atkins, Durham, NC and several divisions of the City of Dublin including Economic Development.

Ms. Noble presented an aerial view of the site and noted there is quite a bit of land undeveloped, mostly to the east of Cosgray Road. She said there are pockets of development primarily to the northwest corner where there are some manufacturing type of uses, commercial uses at the southern tip, the center is primarily vacant with the exception of a recreational facility, and Ohio University (OU) is located in the northern section.

Ms. Noble indicated this district is on the forefront of regional cooperation for the City; this is the first district where there are opportunities to work with communities to the north - Union County, Marysville, as well as areas to the south and east including the City of Columbus and be a regional partner in the area. She stated that this district's name was changed in 2008 from 'Central Ohio Innovation Center' and the 'EAZ' the Economic Advancement Zone to the West Innovation District. She explained this area was designated for research and development and densities, heights, and architectural standards can be gradually increased as properties reach closer to US 33. She stated this district is earmarked for fairly progressive and innovative architecture to create a different atmosphere for the City. She stated that this district also provides for an expedited review process that is intentionally created to foster "business friendly" processes with the business community. She stated this was expressly supported by our Economic Development team.

Ms. Noble said Obrien Atkins shared trends in this type of work industry as part of their early research for updating the plan. She said the workforce that the City is trying to engage in these areas are people who do not want to differentiate between work and life; they want those two areas of their lives to mesh together and be able to walk outside during a business day and have gathering spaces and activities that provide social interaction. She said that requires amenities to be in close proximity to businesses and provide a range of activities within a walkable distance. She said another important part of this update is the partnership with Ohio University, which has created an almost immediate energy and vitality to the area.

Ms. Noble explained the three-step process for the updates:

She reported City Staff engaged the public by facilitating public open houses and using surveys of which they received 214 responses. She said staff worked with O'Brien Atkins to discuss trends and goals and organized a two-day tour of the Research Triangle Park in Raleigh, NC that included staff, members of Council, representatives from Dublin City Schools, and OU staff members. She indicated staff worked with OU to glean the primary objectives for their campus, increase vitality to the area, create connectivity, and develop design guidelines that would work off of the Dublin Methodist Hospital.

Ms. Noble said the plan has been presented to City Council at a work session in October 2016, whereas Council provided guidance for staff and the consultants who have moved forward with a draft plan. In addition, she reported staff has drafted a Framework Plan with OU that was reviewed and adopted by City Council and the OU Trustees.

For land use recommendations, Ms. Noble said, there are nine subareas of concentration, all of which are still focused on research and development but have a mixture of uses that are being presented as primary and secondary uses. She said Innovation Center and Research/Development are the districts that primarily support these technology-oriented uses. She said there are two residential districts to the south that are adjacent to the Ballantrae Subdivision, and academic uses to the north associated with Ohio University. She stated there is an Advanced Manufacturing District in the northwest corner, which includes some existing industrial uses and Darree Fields in the southwest corner. She stated there is a Mixed-use Commercial District in the eastern portion of the district and a Recreational District is in the center of the district.

Ms. Noble explained with any of these land use plans there are design standards, transportation recommendations, open space, and connectivity requirements among other elements that are typical of an area plan. She stated the draft plan is posted on the City's website throughout the month of October and that the plan is tentatively scheduled to be presented to City Council in the later portion of October. She encouraged the Commission to review the plan for further detail.

Cathy De Rosa asked how this relates to the US 33 Smart Mobility Plan.

Mr. Papsidero said the connection between the US 33 Smart Corridor and the Academic Innovation District (principally OU) is looking at moving the AV Research Group at the Engineering School to Dublin so that is the economic correlation. Ms. De Rosa asked why the City is not being more overt about that. He answered the mobility is a larger discussion for this area of the City and will be a topic for other studies. Ms. De Rosa suggested the City be way more explicit about that in the plan as that is something the City is trying hard to promote. Ms. Salay added that the update to the West Innovation District is a planning document and the topic that Ms. De Rosa is referring to is a larger discussion.

Mr. Papsidero clarified these are zoning districts and staff will eventually update the Zoning Code.

Ms. Mitchell asked if Planning coordinates with other divisions of the City to market the area plan. She stated that the word "innovation" can be simplistic and words like "leadership" are becoming overused and meaningless.

Ms. Noble said that the primary land use categories were provided by the consultant and meant to relay the overarching goal of the area, which is to promote research and development, as well as complimentary uses to the university. She stated they are also meant to be easily understood for the general public.

Ms. Newell indicated it would be awkward for the Commission to make a recommendation while staff is still taking public comment. Mr. Papsidero said the recommendation is to City Council and the last of public comment is meant for Council since they are the reviewing body and legislative authority.

Ms. Noble stated that the update to the West Innovation District Special Area Plan meets the criteria of the Zoning Code and Planning is requesting approval to City Council.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Miller moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for an Administrative Request to amend the Community Plan to update the West Innovation District Special Area Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0)

Rather than adjourn to Executive Session, the Chair just asked the Commission who would like to be the next Vice Chair. Mr. Stidhem said he would like the position.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to elect Mr. Stidhem as the 2017-2018 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments. [Hearing none.] She adjourned the meeting at 9:57 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on November 2, 2017.