



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 20, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. West Innovation District - Kaufman Development 17-023INF** **7026 Shier Rings Road**
Informal Review (Discussion only)
- 2. Midwestern Auto Group – Land Rover and Jaguar 17-014AFDP** **6335 Perimeter Loop Road**
Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 – 0)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Chris Brown, Cathy De Rosa, Deborah Mitchell, Stephen Stidhem, Amy Salay; Bob Miller was absent. City representatives present were: Thaddeus Boggs, Vince Papsidero, Claudia Husak, Logan Stang, Michael Hendershot, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the March 16, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the Midwestern Auto Group case this evening is eligible for the Consent Agenda. She determined the Consent Case would be heard first but the minutes will be recorded in the order the cases were published in the agenda.

- 1. West Innovation District - Kaufman Development 17-023INF** **7026 Shier Rings Road**
Informal Review

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following is an Informal Review of a residential community including 130 single-family units and 202 multi-family units. She said the site is on 64 acres on the north side of Shier Rings Road, east of Cosgray Road. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a future development application. She added that normally, Informal Reviews are restricted to 30 minutes.



Claudia Husak stated the 30-minute time limit is at the discretion of the Chair and the Commission. She recalled the Commission had informally commented on this proposal on September 2016; the applicant has made changes in an attempt to address those comments and to be more in line with the planning efforts going on in the area.

Ms. Husak presented the aerial view of the site and noted the application now includes the parcel that was not previously part of the application, which she highlighted as still being owned by the original Shier family. She explained the parcel is not currently within the City of Dublin corporate limits but as part of an informal application, the application is permitted to proceed and receive feedback. However, she explained that if there was a formal application filed that required a vote, then the parcel would need to be in the annexation process, annexed from Washington Township into the City of Dublin.

Ms. Husak presented the current zoning map within the West Innovation District (WID) that includes ID-4 Research and Mixed-Use and ID-2 Research Flex District as well as that additional parcel that is not under Dublin zoning at this point. Once annexed, she stated that parcel would be assigned to the ID-4 District.

Ms. Husak noted that based on City Council Work Sessions and the help of a consultant they have provided a draft, updated Land Use Map that she presented. She explained the update to the area plan is in response to the needs of the City employers and employees to be more modern and more inclusive of uses. She recalled that Council approved the Framework Plan for Ohio University to the north that has brought a lot of dynamic changes to the WID that were not originally anticipated when the WID was created.

Ms. Husak presented the previous proposal that the Commission commented on September 2016, which included 192 detached townhome units, 231 multi-family units, community spaces, and amenities. She recalled a member from the public commented regarding concerns of access, bike paths, connectivity, and increased traffic. The Commissioners supported the proposed residential use, she stated, but expressed similar concerns particularly regarding density, the overall design details for the project, and how to integrate the project with Ohio University's nearby Dublin campus.

Ms. Husak said the applicant has placed the single-family units more towards the western portion of the site and the multi-family to the north and east. She added the proposed site has increased in size incorporating the Shier family parcel and decreased in density so now proposed are a total of 332 units, 202 multi-family units and 130 detached single-family units. She noted the total density proposed is 6.5 units per the acre. She said the plan includes 5.8 acres of open space with stormwater management accommodated in those areas. She said a lot of amenities continue to be proposed in this plan with a clubhouse, pool, orchards, and others. She noted the single-family units would all be accessed by alleys with the garages oriented to the back of the properties. She reported that staff has discussed this at length with the applicant as there are concerns to the community feel for walking, neighborhood interaction, and a lot of those units front onto open spaces.

Ms. Husak presented the vehicular circulation plan that includes the east/west connector that is in the Thoroughfare Plan that the City would require be a part of the development of this site. She said north/south connections are anticipated as well but not fully integrated into the plan as yet.

Ms. Husak presented the pedestrian circulation plan that include sidewalks and bike paths throughout the development but would be interrupted quite frequently with driveways. While this plan works particularly well in the single-family portion where much of the traffic is to the rear; she said there are concerns with the multi-family areas where the drivers would have to back out onto the major connector streets. She noted this creates a disconnect between the proposed circulation plans for the single-family versus what is lacking in the multi-family side.

Ms. Husak presented a housing plan provided by the applicant to illustrate each of the single-family lots would be somewhat intensely developed in terms of the house footprint and the exterior amenities. She said the plan is to have a lot of the exterior living achieved in common open spaces rather than on the individual lots. She then presented a conceptual plan rendering of the single-family lots illustrating the common open spaces and the variety of housing styles continuing with that modern architecture placed within a rural-feeling development. She said the conceptual rendering for the multi-family units, which has not changed from what was presented in September, illustrates how the garages tend to be a prominent feature.

Ms. Husak reported that there have been a lot of meetings with the applicant through the fall and winter to discuss how to move this project forward to be in line with the development plans, zoning, and guidelines for the entire WID. She noted the applicant has been ahead of the City in terms of timelines. She said a PUD is now being considered because of all the open space desired. A lot of pieces have to fall in place she said before the Commission will be asked to vote on this application.

Ms. Husak concluded her presentation with the Proposed Discussion Questions:

1. Is the proposed residential development addressing the need for a variety of housing choices not currently available in Dublin?
2. Has the applicant sufficiently addressed the previous comments made by the Commission?
3. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Brian Suiter, 30 Warren Street, Columbus, Ohio, said the four pillars of their company are: sustainability, wellness, innovation, and philanthropy and that is what drives them on a day-to-day basis. He said the plan is unique to push people to the front of their spaces versus just driving in the driveway, and entering the house, without interacting with the neighbors. He added these open spaces will serve as the communities 'back yards' creating collision points between neighbors. He said 'for sale' and 'for rent' units will be available.

Mr. Suiter said they have appreciated the feedback and as a result have created a much better development. He noted they have moved the collector road further north to the parcel line, switched around the uses to be cognizant of what is coming in the future, and density has been reduced to some extent for the single-family area. He pointed out that they are still reviewing this informally and working through logistics, as well as where public and private streets should be. He indicated they are considering condominiums for the single-family units and a condominium or homeowner's association would maintain all of the greenspace and the multi-family would fall under the Kaufman operation for maintenance.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about sustainability aspects. Mr. Suiter explained Kaufman Development likes to provide opportunities for homeowners to have solar panels or wind-powered turbines potentially.

Ms. De Rosa asked about the philanthropy side. Mr. Suiter said Kaufman helped to fund an organization that is basically a one-stop, one click access to volunteer opportunities and resources to quickly connect and engage with the volunteer opportunity. He said this is offered to all of their residences within their existing properties and will be offered here. Beyond that, he indicated they take a lot of pride in their programming for their community centers, which could include: yoga, meditation, fit clubs, etc. but also an opportunity to give back to the community.

Deborah Mitchell asked Mr. Suiter to share again what kind of people will be attracted to this type of development and why they would live here. Mr. Suiter explained Kaufman has developed property in both suburban and urban settings and they found their buildings are being occupied by empty-nesters and young families because they create collision points between generations to build the community. He said there is a variety of the type of people, backgrounds, different occupations, etc. He indicated there probably will not be as many young professionals although there still is an opportunity in the multi-family

section for that. The older segment he explained would be for the Dublin resident that no longer wants the 4,000-square-foot home and the yard to maintain. He emphasized the intent is to create community.

Ms. Mitchell confirmed the demographics will vary. She asked what this community will serve that others would not. Mr. Suiter indicated that ultimately, they will provide different layers that other developers may not and that are the four pillars of the company that they live and breathe, and it is a market segment that is not seen anywhere in Columbus. He said where there is a dense community, there will be a huge amount of focus building community, density, and programming.

Steve Stidhem asked staff what the Zoning Code states on wind power. Ms. Husak answered that in the WID, sustainability is addressed but currently the Code is lacking addressing residential development in the WID. She said if the applicant were to pursue the PUD application, all of those regulations could be folded within that district for this particular neighborhood.

Vince Papsidero added the applicant promoted solar and staff urged them to integrate wind turbine, too. He said it would not be the huge turbines but rather the ones that oscillate in a circle to be much more appropriate at this scale and could be very popular. Ms. Husak also mentioned the rain barrel program existing in Dublin that the applicant could possibly partner on.

Mr. Suiter said the applicant wants to provide a variety of options to help buyers and that will be the typical solar panels but also look at tesla battery packs, tank less water heaters, or possibly tesla solar panel shingles in the future.

Mr. Stidhem asked how much of that is going to be forced versus optional.

Amy Salay asked golf balls will intrude at all since there is a golf range to the north. Mr. Papsidero indicated that is taken care of by the Sports Ohio's property. Mr. Stidhem said for the most part, yes, they have nets, but there is also a short Par Three course that goes right up to the barriers and it is easy to sky over that.

Ms. Salay said she likes that this is a walkable area but asked where one would be walking to aside from a walk within their own neighborhood. Mr. Papsidero explained that just to the north of the multi-family piece, is the innovation Hub; other than campus, it is the most intensive part of the WID and that is intended to have a mix of uses. Over time, he said there will be a great deal of destinations and will become a very active neighborhood. With connectivity, he said one will be able to walk/bike to campus.

Chris Brown said a connection between the residential and campus is imperative.

Mr. Papsidero said the University Boulevard that already exists becomes a major spine throughout this district with a sidewalk and multi-use path on it. He added the creek that crosses the site, northeast to southwest, cuts through Sports Ohio and crosses under US 33; it is another corridor that could lead one under US 33 over to the hospital.

Mr. Brown indicated that Holiday Lane is a natural north/south walking corridor and it is linear for the shortest walking distance.

Ms. Salay said she liked the idea of an alley so the front of the house faces green space. She indicated the multi-family piece does not impress her due to the garage doors. She asked if the applicant would consider flipping them so there is an alley in the back that would serve the garages and treat the multi-family like they are treating the detached units.

Mr. Suiter said they have been working with staff and understands the garages are a concern.

Mr. Brown said patios facing patios is not realistic and are not comfortable; he prefers zero lot lines. Mr. Suiter said this is a challenge to create a new kind of housing mix to figure out how to have a community but sometimes you just want a beer with a spouse and not see anybody. He said they are considering the public versus private spaces and how they should be integrated.

Ms. Salay said this is going to be a great addition to the community.

Victoria Newell said she really liked the contemporary design proposed in September but she wants to ensure that the same sense of care to detail is used when this is built like what was shown in the renderings. She stated she likes the layout presented this time much better, however.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Russ Meyer, 6073 Shier Lane, said his address is across the street at the southeast corner. He said traffic is already an issue and now you want to add 300 plus more units so density and traffic all come into play. He noted that Shier Rings Road at Avery Road is not safe and when the traffic is funneled across the ditch or by Holiday Lane and Shier Lane it is all going to be focused east on Shier Rings Road. He inquired about the plan to improve all of that over to Avery Road.

David Neel, 6076 Shier Lane, across from Mr. Meyer. He said the intersection of Eiterman and Shier Rings is quite dangerous, especially at rush hour but with this new development, overall traffic would be a mess. He asked if there are plans for Shier Rings Road to be widened because it is extremely narrow and there are ditches on each side.

Mr. Neil inquired about the cost of the condominiums. Ms. Newell said the price range is between \$300,000 and \$500,000.

Ms. Husak said the Shier Rings Road plan was adopted by Council. In terms of this particular project moving forward, the applicant is working with the City's traffic engineers on a traffic impact study for this area. She said there are improvements planned for Shier Rings Road that include widening it and creating pedestrian and bike facilities throughout the WID as the district develops.

The Chair closed the public comment as there was no more interest to speak.

The Proposed Discussion Questions were posted again for the Commission:

1. Is the proposed residential development addressing the need for a variety of housing choices not currently available in Dublin?
2. Has the applicant sufficiently addressed the previous comments made by the Commission?
3. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Mr. Brown addressed #1 above and said this is starting to get there. He said it relates to the University and innovation and people that support that would be attracted to the area. He indicated he can see a demand for multi-family housing too for those studying to go into the medical field. He restated there needs to be a walkable north/south axis that runs up to the campus. He said he prefers this layout to the one presented prior. He restated his concerns for parking when there is more than one car per household or parking for guests. As for materials, he said he agrees with Ms. Newell and if the materials are to be considered sustainable; let us build something that lasts and looks good over a long period.

Ms. Mitchell emphasized the residential area has to be thought of in the context of everything around it and the university is such an important draw. She indicated there are a lot of \$300,000 - \$500,000 homes people can live in, in Dublin, and a lot of places where you can walk to entertainment or restaurants so for this area, the university is critical and the innovation is important too. She said she likes the idea of creating a community and basing it on the four values the applicant calls out but restated the applicant

must think about the people that would live here, what they would be doing, and how this would all be connected. She encouraged the applicant to maximize the quality of the lifestyle and to brand this residential development by determining what is distinctive about this compared to other areas where one could reside in Dublin. She said that would help the Commission to work out planning issues and this area is exciting so this needs to be different than other areas in Dublin so we should be intentional about it.

Ms. Mitchell noted that rent was not discussed, just purchase prices of residences in this development. She said it is important to have a range of affordability because innovators and those interested in life-long learning come in every price point and particularly at the lower end.

Mr. Stidhem indicated this is not an island, and it is not going to live by itself; therefore, the area screams for connectivity. He said he grew up in San Francisco, CA and the houses were practically just inches from each other; everything is very narrow and long. He noted this proposal is not typical of a suburban neighborhood in Columbus, Ohio, and that is okay; it should be different.

Mr. Stidhem emphasized the sustainability aspect and encouraged the applicant to make sustainability financially encouraging for units for sale. He said there should be more sustainability options in the rentals, too. He said his kids are in college and they talk about sustainability all the time; that is how young people are viewing the future.

Mr. Stidhem said overall he really likes the design and the layout but is concerned about traffic issues.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the Kaufman Community Plan/Programming and how it would be funded. Mr. Suiter answered the community center will be available to owners and renters, single-family and multi-family units in this development so Kaufman as the owners of the multi-family would contribute to that programming just as much as the Homeowner's Association would contribute. He indicated there will need to be some sort of connection between two distinct groups towards a common facility and programming.

Ms. De Rosa reported she has been traveling in Illinois and there are some really interesting communities built on these similar type of principles. Upon entering these communities, she said one will see natural yards that are not mowed, fruit stands, shared gardens, ponds with little fishing decks, and little farms with animals such as chickens and horses, etc., which is all quite deliberate and beautiful. She said from a branding perspective, once one is on that piece of property, one gets that sustainability and gets the natural aspect, which does attract as it is the essence of the space and not as an add-on thing. She indicated she could see herself living there but some of this cannot be optional or the strategy is not really going to work and it cannot be price prohibitive or the group will not be attracted. When the applicant returns for the next review, she said she would like to see more specific things that would help the Commission understand how this is going to create that environment.

Ms. Salay said she echoes everything already said by her fellow Commissioners.

Mr. Brown suggested there should be connectivity through to the east and not just to the north. He said there are a lot of people out running, jogging, and biking in Dublin and he wants to see that encouraged at every opportunity.

Ms. Newell said overall this is unique and it would be really interesting for the City of Dublin. She said she agrees with Mr. Brown about exploring the private space. She indicated that if this comes to the Commission as a PUD, that they will have the ability to do a zero lot line. Having a little bit of shared privacy and having places for guest parking, she said in the long run will be really important. She noted that her daughter has a condominium in Arizona and there are no parking spaces for guests in their

complex but they also have back loaded garages so if guests come, they end up parking in front of the garage door.

Mr. Suiter pointed out there are two-car garages with each of the single-family units and there is 'grandmother' parking behind them. He said there is some 'buddy' parking but the majority of the streets are not the alleys of the area but rather yield access so folks can park on one side of street still allowing for two-lane traffic. He said while Columbus is still a driving community, people will have to walk a little farther, similar to German Village.

Ms. Mitchell restated the people that will be drawn to this type of community will not have any trouble with that type of parking arrangement.

Ms. De Rosa again referred back to similar communities she has seen and noted parking is not right across the street but it is closer to some of the amenities she brought up earlier. She said you want people to be able to park to participate in some of the amenities so the parking does not need to be in front of each house to be effective; we will want people to come to the little farmer's market, etc.

Ms. Newell said she loves the fact that one will be able to drive down Shier Rings Road and see the front of the residences; she said she hates to drive around Dublin and see people's backyards and sideyards.

Ms. Newell concluded the architecture for the single-family residences are wonderful, but she does not quite see the same character for the multi-family units. She again encouraged the applicant to combine garages for better walkability.

**2. Midwestern Auto Group – Land Rover and Jaguar 6335 Perimeter Loop Road
 17-014AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is an amendment to the previously approved Land Rover and Jaguar building to reduce the building footprint. She said the site is on the south side of Venture Drive, approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission in regard to this case. She determined a formal case presentation was not needed. She said approval is recommended for the Amended Final Development Plan with the following seven conditions:

- 1) That the approval of this application includes only the Jaguar and Land Rover wall signs and that they be included for review in the future cohesive sign package and that no permits may be issued for these signs until the cohesive sign package is reviewed and approved by the Commission and City Council;
- 2) That the plans be revised to provide seven-foot landscape islands from the inside of the curb to ensure interior landscape requirements are met, prior to building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to continue the 2:1 grove design along SR 161/US 33, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the landscape plans be revised to ensure all existing and proposed plant materials are identified, prior to building permitting;
- 5) That the landscape plans be revised to include an additional deciduous tree behind the pond along SR 161/US 33 to satisfy the one tree per 40 feet requirement, prior to building permitting;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer; and

- 7) That the applicant comply with the maximum allowable slopes along the retention basins as defined in the Stormwater Design Manual to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

The applicant agreed to the above conditions.

Motion and Vote

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

Communications

Claudia Husak said there should be invitations for the Commissioners to attend the Central Ohio Planning Zoning Workshop that is normally held in May that the Ohio APA puts on. She explained it is a whole day of really good learning opportunities.

Ms. Husak said there is a Work Session that Council is having June 19; not a joint work session but the Commission is invited.

Cathy De Rosa requested more education or overview at some point about how annexation works with regard to timing. Amy Salay said the annexation laws have changed significantly and there are two different tracks people can take to get their property annexed.

Thaddeus Boggs said it would be easy to confuse someone about all the laws of annexation. He suggested that projects that have been worked on recently could be reviewed.

Ms. Husak noted this application applies to just two acres that are not in the City yet. She said it is new for staff to be permitted to take informal applications to the Commission without sites being annexed as it that was not the case a few years back. Apparently, she said it is common in other municipalities so city management determined that would be appropriate since no formal action is taken.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:36 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 18, 2017.