MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 16, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the March 16, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present:	Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Lance Schneier, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Kim Way
Commission members absent:	Warren Fishman
Staff members present:	Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Taylor Mullinax, Heidi Rose

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees intending to provide testimony on the cases on the agenda.

NEW CASES

1. **Penzone Base One at 6671 Village Parkway, 22-169AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan**

Exterior modifications and associated site improvements for an existing building on a 3.52-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northwest of the roundabout of Village Parkway and Bridge Park Avenue.

Case Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for the existing Charles Penzone Base One office building. Upon review and approval of the AFDP by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), the applicant may proceed to Building Standards for building permitting. The site is developed with two existing buildings, the Penzone Base One office building, built in 1991 and the Charles Penzone Salon and Spa, built in 2018, along with parking, sidewalks or shared use paths, patios, and vegetation. The site is surrounded by the Greystone Mews neighborhood to the west and the Dublin Village shopping center to the east. There is a retention pond directly to the southwest of the site. In May 2018, the Administrative Review Team (ART) approved a Minor Project Review (MPR) for a 430 SF patio and associated site improvements for the Charles Penzone Salon and with two conditions. Similar improvements are now proposed for the existing office building. Staff has received and answered several public comments regarding this application concerning open space, accessibility and patio design. Those comments and responses were provided in the Commission's meeting packet. To clarify, the two buildings on this site were constructed at different times. The Salon and Spa building was approved in 2018, after the adoption of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code in 2012. The Base One office building was approved and built in 1991, prior to the adoption of the BSD Code; therefore, the proposed patios for the office building are considered an accessory use and site improvement. The BSD Code open space standards are not applicable to the existing development. If it were a new development, the patios would be required to meet those requirements.

The applicant is proposing an AFDP for exterior modifications for the existing site and office building to enhance the overall appearance and to align with the adjacent salon and spa building. The proposed improvements are listed as follows:

<u>Site Modifications</u>

- Construct three paver patios;
- New patio furniture including chairs, benches, tables, fire pit;
- Install fencing surrounding two patios;
- Install a limestone retaining wall; and
- Install new site landscaping to be mixed with existing landscaping.

<u>Building Modifications</u>

- Remove and replace the asphalt shingle roof;
- Paint existing stucco and soffits;
- Paint existing brick with a semi-transparent stain;
- Remove and replace existing stucco with a simulated wood panel cladding;
- Construct two new canopies; and
- Remove and replace the existing light fixtures with new decorative wall sconces.

The applicant is proposing to construct three Wausau paver patios within a landscape area along the northeast/Village Parkway façade of the building. The patios will be open and the two end patios will be enclosed with a black aluminum fence enclosure for private events, which could include the sale or use of alcohol. The third, middle patio space is designated for public use. The patios will contain a variety of patio furniture as mentioned in the summary and will be accented

with planters, side tables, fire pits, and string lighting. New walkways will connect the patios to the existing shared use path along Village Parkway and between the Penzone Base One office building and the Penzone Salon. The neighborhood standards are met with this application, which encourage redevelopment to promote active, walkable destinations through improved access. The application meets lot coverage and setback requirements. A feasibility assessment was provided, which indicates positive drainage for the new, impervious patios and the walkway. New landscaping will be added to bring the landscaping into compliance with the BSD Code. Three trees will be removed and replaced by more than what is required by Code. A limestone retaining wall will be added near the south patio to reduce the impact to the critical root zone of the existing trees. The asphalt shingle roof will be replaced, and all building façades will be renovated by painting the existing stucco grey and black; the existing brick a semi-transparent white stain; and the soffits and trim white. In the Bridge Street District, a precedent for painting brick was established by the PZC approval for First Watch in July 2022. Minimal amounts of existing stucco on each elevation will be replaced with Trespa Meteon simulated wood-panel cladding for accent purposes. In the BSD Code, simulated wood cladding is not a permitted material; therefore, a waiver would be required. Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects, has provided a material review, which was included in the meeting packet. The renovation also will include the addition of canopies, updated light fixtures and replacement of the existing wooden stairs at the main entrance. Staff recommends approval of the waiver with no condition and the AFDP with four conditions, one of which is that the outdoor furniture be the same design, material and color, as required by Code.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Harter inquired if the enclosing fence would have a lock.
Ms. Mullinax responded that it would have a gate, but not a lock.
Ms. Harter inquired if the Fire Department would consider it a safety hazard if a lock were to be added.
Ms. Mullinax responded that what is proposed is similar to the patio improvements that were made for the Salon and Spa, which has no locking mechanism; however, staff can look into it further, if the Commission desires.
Ms. Rauch stated that, typically, such items are handled as part of the Building Permit process.

Ms. Harter inquired if protective fencing would be provided for the trees intended to be retained to ensure they are not damaged.
Ms. Mullinax responded that all trees that will be retained would be protected during construction.

Ms. Call inquired about the image of the Trespa material on p. 7 of the consultant's review, which shows two exposed fasteners at the windowsill. Are there some situations in which the installation requires exposed fasteners?
Ms. Mullinax deferred to the applicant to respond to the question.

Applicant Presentation

Mike Burmeister, Meyers+Associates, 1500 West First Avenue, Columbus, OH 43212, representative for the applicant, stated that he is available to answer questions.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the installation of the Trespa material would be of planks or panels.

Mr. Burmeister responded that typically, it involves large, stacked planks. In regard to the earlier question about exposed fasteners, typically, the detailing in their process does not result in any visible screws, as that would be considered a failure point.
Mr. Chinnock inquired if the planks would be butted against each other, with no gaps between the planks.
Mr. Burmeister responded affirmatively. It is a lapped siding approach, essentially, a rainscreen product, which enables water to flow behind the material and drain out.
Ms. Call requested Mr. Burmeister to respond to the image of the exposed fasteners shown.
Mr. Burmeister stated that it appears to be a situational issue. The fasteners should be behind the corner bead or fastened to the trim piece behind or at the top before the next plank laps over it.

Mr. Way stated that in the material provided, there is a reference to materials installed on curved surfaces. How does that relate to this project?
Mr. Burmeister responded that they do not have a curved surface in the plan, but there is an arch.
Mr. Way stated that the south elevation is the only area where the material will be used. Is it on the roof of the arch, as well? Is it used any other place?
Mr. Burmeister responded that is used on the roof of the arch. There are two locations with that type of archway; there is one on the north façade, as well.

Mr. Way stated that the architectural drawing on page 6 of the graphic document shows a different material than is shown in the color drawing. The horizontal section does appear to be wood.
Mr. Burmeister responded that the graphic is not showing it correctly; the section will be wood.

Mr. Way stated that the information provided indicates that the fencing around the patio would be aluminum picket, but the drawing description indicates it is steel.
Mr. Burmeister responded that the intent is that it will be the same aluminum product used on the other Penzone properties.

Mr. Way stated that on the material plans, the landscape lighting and planter were missing material descriptions.
Ms. Mullinax responded that there are some discrepancies in the labeling, and a condition of approval has been added that the applicant work with staff to correct those labels/descriptions to provide clarity.
Ms. Call inquired if that item is reflected in Condition #1.
Ms. Mullinax responded that Condition #1 addresses the patio furniture design and color compatibility.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the wood section to which Mr. Way referred was Trespa simulated wood.
Mr. Burmeister responded that where wood is referenced in the information, it is simulated wood.

Ms. Harter inquired if the existing artwork would be retained.
Mr. Burmeister responded affirmatively, and the intent is to add more to the property. As they develop the plan regarding location of art in the project, they would involve staff in the discussions.

Ms. Harter inquired if a stucco paint would be used and how often the stucco would need to be repainted.

Mr. Burmeister responded that the paint that will be used is compatible with stucco; those paint products typically have a 10-15 year warranty. Stucco repairs would be made before painting occurs.

Public Comments

There were no additional public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak pointed out that in the past, the Commission has not been supportive of the use of simulated wood. He has some experience with the Trespa product, and it weathers well. The past issue with the product has been with its aesthetics, or its questionable appearance as real wood. These products are continually improving, and the image shown in the materials has a real wood appearance. Since the proposal is to use the product in a limited manner as a secondary material, he believes this is an opportunity for a pilot for the City.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the project. The only issue he has is with the interpretation of the Code in regard to furniture selections. The applicable Code Section 153.059 concerns outdoor dining and seating furniture for a restaurant. He does not believe the serving of food or alcohol on private property is the same situation. The type of furniture the applicant places in their office patio does not fall within the purview of the Commission; therefore, he would recommend the reference to furniture selections be eliminated from the condition.

Ms. Call requested legal clarification of the Code requirement in regard to exterior dining furniture in an open space of a commercial property.
Mr. Boggs responded that in General Definitions, Section 153.002, outdoor dining and seating is defined as an area accessory to an eating and drinking facility or a retail business in which food and beverages are served, offered for sale, or are available for consumption outside of the principal structure. What is proposed is an area exterior to the principal structure, a retail business, where beverages are contemplated to be served or offered for sale or consumption. In Section 153.059 (G)(1), the reference is to outdoor dining and seating areas and furniture. Subsection (G)(4) indicates that dining furniture shall be of the same design, material and color for all furniture associated with the use. It addresses dining furniture, rather than dining and seating furniture. Therefore, this would be a matter of interpretation. Is it the Commission's preference to be strictly textual or to take an interpretative view?
Ms. Call stated that the Commission's decision on this question would have a greater impact than with this application only. She inquired if the applicant was willing to work with staff to meet the furniture selection criteria.
Mr. Burmeister responded affirmatively.
Ms. Call stated that although this applicant has no concerns with working with staff on the selection, the Commission has identified a section of Code that is ambiguous. It is important to know if Council agrees with the Commission's interpretation, which is that the Code refers to outdoor dining areas and outdoor seating areas as two different elements. If Council is in agreement, a Code amendment could be recommended for adoption.
Ms. Rauch responded that staff would consider the best manner to address this issue going forward.
Ms. Call stated that in this case, the applicant has no objection to the condition as worded.

[Discussion of the wording of the condition continued.] Commission consensus was that the language of Condition 1 be revised to use the word "all materials" instead of furniture and to insert the page numbers (19 and 20) on which the items are depicted.

Mr. Way, Ms. Harter and Mr. Chinnock indicated support of the application.
Mr. Chinnock stated that he agrees that the use of Trespa should be considered on a case-by-case scenario. With this project, Trespa may be better than wood, as the modern element brings an updated look to the building. He likes the use of Trespa as a secondary or tertiary material and supports its use for this project.

Ms. Call stated that she is also supportive of its use for this project. The Commission has reviewed several previous applications for use of the material, and they were not approved. The City prides itself on having buildings with longevity, which reflects the quality of building materials used. City Code does not permit wood-clad materials, primarily as there are no cases of its proven experience. Because the previous applications proposed use of the material in prominent locations and on buildings that had not been modified in 30 years, the Commission was not supportive. At this point, the Commission is still not supportive of adopting the use of this material as a primary or secondary material, due to its lack of experience. The City will be looking closely at the limited use and quality of installation in this case. The Commission must do its due diligence, however, in calling out to the applicant that this is an unproven material for Dublin, in the event the applicant needs to replace it in a few years.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of a Waiver to City Code Section 153.062 (E)(1)(c, d) - Permitted Secondary Materials to permit Trespa Meteon simulated wood cladding panels as a Secondary Building Material.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following four (4) conditions as modified:

1) The applicant work with staff to provide updated plans including all materials depicted on pages 19 and 20, subject to staff review and approval prior to building permitting;
2) The applicant continue to work with staff to provide additional details for the removal of the existing wooden stairs outside of the exit door on the northeast elevation, subject to staff review and approval, prior to building permitting;
3) That all existing landscaping that is in poor condition, or has been missing and not replaced, be brought into compliance with the proposed landscape plan, subject to staff review and approval, at building permitting; and
4) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to provide positive drainage across all impervious surfaces away from the building, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- **Envision Dublin – Community Plan Update**

Ms. Rauch presented an overview of the City's Community Plan Update process, which was initiated in late 2022. She has provided a detailed presentation of the process to City Council and would like to provide the same to the Commission.

The Community Plan is a vital policy document that influences development growth and infrastructure expansion. The existing Community Plan was last updated in 2013. It was a minor update and was provided in an interactive, electronic format to allow for more engagement and for incorporation of Area Plan amendments. The last comprehensive review of the Community Plan was in 2007. The update now being undertaken also will be a comprehensive review, including traffic modeling, utilities and fiscal analysis. The intent is that the new update will be user friendly.

The City has completed or is engaged in significant projects and studies, throughout various divisions of the City, including curbside management, railway/passenger rail, SR161 Corridor visioning, Parks and Recreation Master Plan and economic development strategies. Those studies will help in setting the framework for the Community Plan update. In 2022, Planning issued an RFP and selected Houseal Lavigne to be the consultant lead on the project.

Task 1, Project Initiation, will involve data collection; meeting with department leaders and elected officials; community education; review of relevant studies; project branding; fiscal modeling; innovative technology including 3D modeling and urban GIS.

Task 2, Public Engagement, is a key component for everything the City does, particularly the Community Plan, because it impacts everyone in the City. The project management plan includes public engagement throughout. The process will involve a steering committee, various tasks and the use of many strategies. At the recent State of the Community, there was opportunity for the community to have a first look at the anticipated Community Plan process. Map.Social, an interactive mapping system, will allow the community to identify, map and comment on geographic areas of the community.

Some important dates in the Community Plan Update process are:

- March 9, 2023 - State of the Community [completed]
- April 17, 2023, 6-8:00 p.m., Council Chamber – City Council, Boards and Commission Work Session
- April 18, 2023 – First Steering Committee meeting
- April 18, 2023, 6-8:00 p.m., Council Chamber - Public Meeting

The proposed composition of the Steering Committee is as follows:

(2) Members of City Council
(2) Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission
(1) Member of the Architectural Review Board
(1) Member of City Administration
(1) Member representing Washington Township
(1) Member representing the Dublin and Hilliard School Districts (Administration)
(1) Member representing the Historic District
(2) Members representing the development community
(2) Members representing the corporate resident community

(1) Member of the Community Inclusion Advisory Committee
(1) Member representing the Dublin and Hilliard School Districts (youth)
(1) Member representing sustainability efforts
(2) Members at large

Task 3, 4 and 5 – These tasks take an in-depth look at the existing conditions analysis and needs assessment, the Community Vision and goals, and the development of three land use scenarios based on fiscal, transportation and utility impacts.

Tasks 6, 7 and 8 – These tasks involve refinements of Subarea Plans; development of a draft Preliminary Land Use Plan; final recommendations and policy direction; and a final draft of the updated Community Plan for approval.
Ms. Rauch stated that the goal is to complete the Community Plan Update process by the end of First Quarter 2024.

Ms. Call inquired about the representation in the planning process, and suggested involving representation from past Citizen Academies.
Ms. Rauch responded that they work closely with Ms. Nardecchia and her team. Individuals can be trained to have related discussions with their neighborhoods. The intent is to involve previously engaged residents. There are many ways in which to involve the greater City population.

Mr. Way inquired if the joint meeting on April 17 would be facilitated, have an agenda, and if there would be homework involved.
Ms. Rauch responded that the meeting will be facilitated by the consultant. There will be an agenda and the Commission will know beforehand what the meeting expectations will be.
Mr. Way stated that the Commission has grappled with several land use-related issues in the time he has been a member. Would it be appropriate to bring those up at this first meeting with the consultant, or will it primarily be an introduction to the process?
Ms. Rauch responded that the format of the meeting has not yet been finalized, but she believes it would be appropriate to point out any key issues the Commission believe should be addressed.
Ms. Call suggested that, as homework, Commissioners should email staff any topics on which they would like the Community Plan Update to provide more direction.

Ms. Call stated that the list of proposed steering committee members includes Washington Township, but not Franklin, Union or Delaware counties or the Police Department.
Ms. Rauch responded that the goal is to look at the local level impact, and Washington Township provides emergency and fire services. The City has agreements with them, so we want to ensure we understand their needs. The Police Department is part of the City structure, so they are already engaged in the process. However, there will be stakeholder groups involved, so there will be opportunity to meet with County parties to ensure we understand their perspective and concerns.

Mr. Supelak stated that Dublin is developing to the northwest into a neighboring jurisdiction. Is that entity privy to or a participant in this conversation?
Ms. Rauch stated that there are many municipalities and entities on the City of Dublin's border, which will be impacted. Historically, we have reached out to them to understand their future land use plans. The City is engaged in regional participation, including, for example, with LUC (Logan-Union-Champaign) Regional Planning Commission, the NW 33 Innovation Corridor Council of Governments, and the Delaware Regional Planning Commission. We will solicit their input and

perspective in our Community Plan Update process. The Land Use scenarios would be impacted by the City's negotiated service areas. Future Land Use is shown outside City boundaries, and the goal is to work cooperatively.

Mr. Way stated that he believes Plain City will be initiating a Community Planning process, as well. Ms. Rauch stated that the City of Dublin has a good working relationship with neighboring entities.

- **Upcoming Meeting Dates**

Ms. Rauch reminded Commissioners of the following:

1. 2023 APA National Conference will be held April 1-4 in Philadelphia, PA. Commissioners interested in attending should contact Ms. Beal.
2. Community Plan Update Work Session is scheduled for 6-8 pm, Monday, April 17 in Council Chamber. City Council, Planning & Zoning Commissioners and Architectural Review Board members will participate.
3. Community Plan Update Public Meeting is scheduled for 6-8 pm, Tuesday, April 18 in Council Chamber.
4. The next regular meeting of PZC meetings are scheduled for 6:30 pm, Thursday, April 6 and April 20, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council