



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 2, 2023

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the March 2, 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, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Kim Way

Commission members absent: Lance Schneier

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawzkiewicz

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the February 2 and February 9, 2023 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, 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. **BRC Dublin at PID: 273-008380, 23-005INF, Informal Review**

A request for Informal Review of a new development consisting of 53 residential lots and 4 future outparcels on an 18.54-acre site zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Bright Road.

### **Case Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this request is for an Informal Review of a new development consisting of 53 residential lots and 4 future outparcels on an 18.54-acre site zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Bright Road. The 18.54-acre site is zoned R1 - Restricted Suburban Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. The Mt. Carmel Hospital development southeast of this site was recently approved and will be constructed within the next 1-2 years. The City will be engaging in improvements to both the Bright Road and Emerald Parkway corridors. The Bright Road right-of-way will be widened between Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road to include a 3-lane section for access into the Mt. Carmel site, and Emerald Parkway will receive the installation of a new roundabout approximately 850 feet south of the Emerald Road/Bright Road roundabout. The new roundabout will provide primary access to the Mt. Carmel development, but will also provide access to the subject site for future development. Other than the Rural District, the R1 is the most suburban district. Lots are required to be a minimum size of 40,000 square feet, or approximately 0.9 acres, and the minimum lot width at the building line is 150 feet. This results in a density of 1.0-1.25 units/acre. The R-1 zoning district continues to the north and west of the site, where single-family development currently exists. Single-family lots in the surrounding neighborhoods range between 0.48 acres and 2.96 acres in size. The Grandee Cliff Estates neighborhood to the west of the site was developed at a density of approximately 1.0-1.5 dwellings per acre; the Kiplinger neighborhood to the north of the site was developed at a density of approximately 0.5-1.0 dwellings per acre; and the Glenbriar neighborhood to the northwest of the site was developed at a density of approximately 0.5-1.0 dwellings per acre. The Future Land Use Plan recommends Standard Office-Institutional, or 12,500 SF of office use. The typical uses would be medical or professional offices, large-scale office complexes, skilled nursing/urgent care and hospitals. Residential is not a recommended use for this site. To fulfill the Future Land Use Plan, the Bright Road Special Area Plan was developed. In December 2014, the City of Dublin completed Emerald Parkway Phase 8, a 5.6-mile stretch extending from Riverside Drive to Sawmill Road, completing a premier office corridor from Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to Sawmill Road. Completion of Emerald Parkway Phase 8 positioned the City to advance economic development objectives identified in the Community Plan by opening up approximately 115 acres of land for commercial, income-producing development. In November 2021, the PZC offered non-binding feedback regarding a senior care proposal on this site, which included approximately 205,000 square feet of institutional uses and 62 villa homes for the 18.54-acre site. At that time, the Commission expressed that the proposed senior villas were more residential than institutional in use and did not align with the Community Plan recommendations. Tonight, a different applicant is proposing the development of 53 single-family residential lots and 4 future commercial outparcels on the 18.54-acre site. When the 4 future outparcels are removed, approximately 11.73 acres remain, or 4.5 units/acre. The proposed lots are 35 feet wide by 110 feet deep. The homes would have alley-loaded garages and front a common courtyard space. The applicant's statement identifies the 4 outparcels as commercial. The Community Plan recommends Office, not Commercial, for this site.

There will be two public street connections onto Bright Road to the north, one off Emerald Parkway where the future roundabout will be located. The City currently is working on a potential roundabout further south on Emerald Parkway where the future I-270 crossing is being studied. Should this plan move forward, the applicant would need to incorporate those right-of-way improvements. In regard to the proposed architectural design, the homes will be narrow, as the lots will be 35 feet wide.

Staff has the provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Commission find the proposed land uses meet the Community Plan recommendations?
- 2) If the Commission finds the proposed land use meets the Community Plan recommendations, is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout?
- 3) If the Commission finds the proposed land use meets the Community Plan recommendations, is the Commission supportive of the conceptual architecture?
- 4) If the Commission finds the proposed land use meets the Community Plan recommendations, is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open space and connectivity?

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Chinnock inquired where the proposed I-270 bridge would cross Emerald Parkway in relationship to this site.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the City has identified a preferred alternative from the feasibility study of possible crossings over I-270 and landing on Emerald Parkway. The preferred location is in the southeast quadrant of the target site.

Ms. Call requested clarification of the 2021 non-residential concept that was presented for the adjacent site, where the Planning Commission and City Council preferred different approaches.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the application was a City-sponsored application to create a corporate office area. The Commission recommended disapproval, because they did not believe that Office was a suitable use for that site due to the adjacent parkland to the north. When the application proceeded to City Council, however, it was approved by a super majority.

Ms. Call responded that with that vote, Council was approving a Standard Office use in this corridor, not Residential.

Mr. Hounshell responded that for that site, that is correct.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Amanda Webb, Fischer Homes, 3490 Olympic Blvd., Erlanger, KY stated that she is representing the BRC Dublin Property. The target site is located between the future hospital and the Hopewell Elementary School site. They believe their proposal provides a good transitional use between the intense medical use of a hospital and the school. The four outparcels along Emerald Parkway would be used for Standard Office-Institutional use, consistent with the City's Community Plan. From those parcels, the site would then transition to a Residential use. Their product would be a detached, single-family, with two garages at the rear, accessed via an alley. Walkways are included throughout the concept, which would connect to the school or the hospital. Anticipated residents would be young professionals or empty nesters, which would have a low impact on the school system. The community would be maintained and managed by a homeowners association (HOA).

The 2 – 5-bedroom homes would range from 1,800 – 3,100 square feet in size. The homes would have high-end features, and the development site would contain interesting streetscapes and landscaping. Although the residential component is not consistent with the Community Plan, the proposal provides for a transition of uses, including office, dental or medical facilities. She would appreciate the Commission’s input.

### **Commission Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Way stated that the residential product is attractive. The Commission has been working on PUD residential development guidelines, which would permit a 0 ft. lot line, although the homes proposed in this concept would have some setbacks. Has there been discussion with staff concerning those residential development guidelines?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the discussion has not evolved to that level of detail. The intent was first to determine with this review if the proposed use was acceptable, since it differs from the Community Plan.

Mr. Way inquired the width of the units and the setbacks on each side of the lot.

Ms. Webb responded that the lots are 35 feet wide; the typical units are 20 feet in width. Ideally, there would be 3-foot sideyard setback on each side with a 6-foot building separation. However, to align with other communities within the City, they propose to separate the lots further, providing more building separation. They are open to changing the lot widths.

Mr. Supelak requested more detail about the fronting courtyard.

Ms. Webb stated that the garages are accessed via the alleyway, but the homes will front the courtyard. A porch and steps will be provided on the front façade of the homes, and a sidewalk connection will extend along the front of the home sites. Within the courtyard, there will be curvilinear sidewalks and landscaping to add interest.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the builder has developed a similar community with success.

Ms. Webb responded that this is a new product for the builder. They have built one successful community in the Indianapolis market.

Mr. Supelak inquired if it was a comparable layout.

Ms. Webb responded that the development in Indianapolis is much smaller, but the setbacks are similar and it fronts a courtyard. They are also proposing a similar but also smaller product in Powell.

Mr. Supelak stated that the issue with this type of layout is that the front doors actually become the back doors. Does the builder have confidence that would not occur here?

Ms. Webb responded that they do have that confidence. The intent is that guests could park on the street or the alley and use the sidewalk to access the front door of the home.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there would be opportunity to have larger lots in the community.

Ms. Webb responded that the builder is seeking the Commission’s opinion on that issue.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if their intention is to purchase the adjacent parcel and develop that, as well.

Ms. Webb responded that is not their intention.

### **Public Comment**

Pete Albanese, 4181 MacDuff Way, Dublin, stated that he lives just around the corner, and he has concerns with the proposed density. Bright Road is a two-lane road. Along with the hospital development, adding 53 home units with access onto Bright Road will create a significant traffic issue. Access should be from Emerald Parkway, not Bright Road, which is not zoned for this use.

He is opposed to this proposal, which does not fit the area. A 35-foot lot with a 20-foot wide home is more of an apartment than a house. The number of people and the amount of parking within the community would be much more than the area can accommodate. The I-270 bridge and the traffic issues should be taken care of first; after those are addressed, then the City can identify what else can be developed.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, Dublin stated that he is vice-president of the East Dublin Civic Association. He has met with Matt Stavroff, and their belief is that when the bridge over I-270 and the Snouffer Road interchange connection are completed, that will change what can occur within this area. Their association has supported the Community Plan for many years, since 1995. The vision for their neighborhood has been coming together. They are supportive of Mt. Carmel and the care facility to the east of Emerald Parkway, north of Bright Road. Everything is occurring on the west to preserve their traditional residential neighborhood, and on the east, providing an upscale office use. When Snouffer Road is extended, there will be opportunity for the desired office. He believes the City should adhere to the Community Plan and be patient until the infrastructure changes occur. They do not want this type of development, which would have a very high density. The proposed units would not all be owner-occupied. Their community is very proud of the Hopewell Elementary School, but it overwhelmingly has a transient problem and constant turnover. 75% of their student families are in multifamily housing. They would like to preserve as much as possible their way of life, which he believes is compatible with the already approved developments on the east and west. He believes it is just a matter of being patient and waiting on the right things, and this is not the right thing.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin stated that he also lives in East Dublin, and for 25 years, has been part of the East Dublin Civic Association. Mr. Roth has been very consistent for 25 years concerning the Community Plan. The applicant attended an East Dublin Civic Association meeting in November 2022. This was not the same type of development described at that time, which was 8-12 single-family homes, not 50. As presented, the homes would have 2-5 bedrooms. A 5-bedroom home would likely have 4 automobiles for that family. Other than the 2-car garages, he sees no other parking proposed. The zoning here is R1. He lives in an R-1 neighborhood, which is one house on one acre. As presented, this initial proposal is much too dense and is inconsistent with the Community Plan.

Janette Gearing, 4355 Bright Road, Dublin stated that she has lived here only 4 years, but she thought she was moving into a suburban area with space. No one anticipated that they would be proposing construction of a cityscape area in the suburban neighborhood. How can they change and R1 to an R5 zoning so suddenly? Do the neighbors have any say in whether or not a portion of their neighborhood is rezoned? What is proposed is not suitable for their area.

The following public comments were received via the City's website:

John Wreathall, MacDuff Way, Dublin:

"This site was described at earlier P&Z meetings as worthy of superb and creative designs, as it is in many ways a gateway to Dublin. The proposed plan is just about as far from such a goal as one can get. It drab, boring and completely lacking in any imagination, whether in terms of layout or designs of units. I think it would be a blight on the neighborhood. I find nothing in favor of it. It is my intention, as someone who would have to pass it on a daily basis - we live in the Kiplinger Estates - to oppose this plan and urge my neighbors to do likewise. To repeat, this

is an appalling concept and urge P&Z to encourage Grand Communities (an ironic name, given their plan) to look elsewhere to place their site.”

David Vargo, 3362 Kendelmarie Way, Dublin, OH:

“As the President of the Village of Scioto Condominium Association, I am writing on behalf of myself and the twelve residential units in our Dublin compound to formally go on record expressing our deep concern with what appears to be the unlimited expansion of concrete commercial properties on the remaining natural, green and potentially green fields of the City of Dublin - which is in direct conflict with the Dublin Ohio Code for Tree Preservation Requirements §153.140. We ask that you keep in mind that your BRC Dublin Concept Plan, a very dense project of 53 houses on only 8 acres, will only add to greater traffic congestion in the Bridge Park area, including at the roundabout. If indeed you insist on taking away more of our green Dublin space and packing more human bodies in to feed the greed of commerce, we ask that the Planning & Zoning Commission holds the Developer to strict compliance with building codes related to density allowances, setbacks and green space. Current and longtime residents of the City of Dublin are organizing and are watching. Do not think we are sitting idly by and will allow this unchecked despoilment of the natural land to continue without objection.”

Kyle Rush, 4143 MacDuff Way, Dublin, OH:

“Having this many single-family homes on only 18 acres would substantially increase traffic in the area, especially with the hospital going in across the street. This development would not look aesthetically pleasing when taking into account the surrounding neighborhood’s appearance.”

Aaron King, 3154 Lily Mar Ct. Dublin, OH:

“Please make sure ample due diligence is done to study the impact these additional (53) proposed residential homes will have on already congested traffic patterns and our Dublin school system. The adjacent Hopewell Elementary School has already had to redistrict once because of overcrowding, and it is less than 4 years old. While the plan is schematic at this point, I didn't see any pedestrian walking paths connecting to the adjacent site and ultimately Hopewell Elem. school. We should be encouraging walking to & from school as much as possible based on this sites proximity to the school. If this plan moves forward, we need to encourage more walkers and connections from this development to the adjacent sites. Maybe instead of the detached garages make them attached to each residence and give that space back to the community for more open green spaces, playgrounds, or proposed "pocket parks" they mention but don't show in their plans.”

Sharon Huber, 4345 Bright Road, Dublin, OH:

“The proposed development containing 53 home sites with a proposed 4.52 units per acre is totally out of character with the rest of the neighborhood which is zone predominately R-1. Having that many units added to that parcel will adversely affect the flow of traffic in and out of Bright Road since the only access from Bright Road properties west of that is around the roundabout. We do not support this proposal!”

Barbara Hart, 4409 Zachary Ct., Dublin, OH:

“Once again, a developer is proposing another high-density project near Bridge Park and long existing Dublin residential neighborhoods. The plans show primary access to the new project from Riverside Drive to Emerald Parkway and to Bright Road from Sawmill Rd. Bridge Park has become one of the most popular destinations in Northwest Columbus. I don't understand how and why

your predecessors on the Planning & Zoning didn't foresee the popularity of this new urban development and give some thought to how residents, customers and employees were going to arrive at and access various Bridge Park destinations. Primary arrival arteries currently used include 2-lane Riverside Drive, 4-lane SR 161 and the overly congested Sawmill Rd. corridor. My particular concern is 2-lane Riverside Dr. Regarding this new development - consider current traffic backups and congestion at prime drive time trying to get through the roundabout - after the roundabout traffic continues north on Riverside and /or to Emerald Pkwy - Bright Rd then to the proposed new development. At any time of day this development could be adding an additional 53-106 vehicles driving north on Riverside to this new destination. The easy alternative after you've been waiting to approach the roundabout from Riverside Dr, is to turn east on Martin Rd and try to avoid the congestion. This has resulted in a significant increase in traffic, cars speeding, noise and loss of privacy on what was once a quiet unnoticed neighborhood in Dublin. Martin Rd used to be referred to as a connector street. Since Bridge Park it's a major thoroughfare." It appears that the City of Dublin and Bridge Park developers proceeded with the Bridge Park concept and gave little thought to vehicular access to these new and popular destinations and the long-term effect, of significantly increased traffic, on the adjoining Dublin neighborhoods of Martin Rd and Bright Rd. Why do you, again, want to add more traffic to the already overcrowded approaching roadways. Maybe the developers should also be offering plans for improving existing overcrowded traffic conditions, to make their new communities accessible and traffic friendly without imposing their development plans on existing neighborhoods."

Michael Gonser, 4480 Huber Road, Lewis Center, OH:

"A friend of mine who lives on Martin Rd brought this issue to my attention recently, I worked in Dublin for many years until the pandemic forced me to work from home, which became permanent. I enjoyed being an employee in Dublin, and have always loved spending time in the community. I feel that the additional development being considered for Bridge Park is detrimental to the overall good of the area. When I commuted to Dublin, I always avoided the 33/161 roundabout. Adding more commercialism will add to the traffic problems already being experienced there, and will take away from the natural beauty and serenity of the river area that residents enjoy. Undisturbed green space is a benefit that we all treasure and need. That enjoyment is curtailed when it is accompanied with noise from road traffic and the smell of car exhaust. Sometimes less is more. Sometimes more is too much. In this case, the location of the proposed new development is not well suited to handle the added influx of patrons that would result."

Carl Gleditsch, 7001 Grandee Cliffs Drive, Dublin, OH:

"Looking at the current plan, the density of the homes is way too high. No greenspace, and frankly, the development looks ugly. I hope the Planning and Zoning Commission will reject this proposal."

Diane Cartolona, 3390 Martin Road, Dublin, OH:

"Not specific to tonight's project but related, I wanted to share some comments, questions and concerns from recent conversations with fellow citizens both in and out of my immediate neighborhood. I realize that you probably can't answer these questions tonight, but maybe someone could provide a written response at a later date. Developers seem to be driving the direction of the City. Citizens believe that City Council and PZC are charged with being the guardians of the City's well-being and should be the ones to run interference for residents when it comes to the threats of overdevelopment. While we understand that public engagement is part of the process, we also want to feel confident that the law/codes will be upheld even if we are not here. Many have asked why developers are able to present plans that do not comply with Code in the

first place. They assume that if PZC is reviewing them, they have already been vetted for compliance; they are surprised when they learn that is not the case and are uncomfortable with being put in a position to point this out. I know that they have the legal right to present whatever they want, but wouldn't it save everyone a lot of time and trouble if projects were brought forth that complied with Code to begin with? We were all encouraged that you upheld the law with The Indus Group, requiring them to comply with the 6-story limit for their buildings, and we trust that you will apply the same standard to all developers, no matter who they are, with future projects and that waivers/variances will be rare and not considered at the last minute. Much of what we see in Bridge Park was in motion a long time ago and with a few exceptions, the decisions were made by people who no longer serve on City Council and Planning and Zoning. That is the point. Decisions were made that still have repercussions today – some good, some not-so-good – so we hope you will be mindful of how your decisions now will affect the residents still living here 10 years down the road, when you may no longer be serving. I was recently reading "The Lorax" to my grandson, and it struck me that it feels like that is what is going on in Dublin with regard to green space. Like the Lorax imploring the Onceler to stop cutting down the Truffula Trees, we too are "asking you sir at the top of our lungs" to be attentive to preserving the natural beauty of Dublin. There are pictures in your packets from the most recent *Dublin Life* magazine that highlighted several area parks, and I found it interesting that all of the parks are green, except Bridge Park. Thank you."

### **Commission Discussion**

Question 1: Does the Commission find the proposed land use meets the Community Plan recommendations?

Mr. Fishman, Mr. Supelak and Ms. Harter stated that the land use does not meet the Community Plan, and they do not support the proposal.

Mr. Way stated that he likes the proposed residential product, but this is not the right place for it. There may be other sites appropriate for a transitional residential use. The size of the site is part of the challenge. The mixture of residential and office is a valid idea, but you cannot do both on this site. With the hospital moving forward, the market for medical offices will be substantial. The designation of this site for Suburban Office is absolutely correct, and that is the appropriate direction. He does not support the proposal.

Mr. Chinnock stated that a proposed rezoning for a significant change such as this would have to be a very special, unique plan, which fits within the neighborhood and has the support of the community. This clearly is not that plan. He does not support the proposed plan.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is an advisory board to City Council for zonings under consideration, and this is a rezoning application. The Commission is challenged to uphold the documents approved by City Council. Those documents include the Community Plan, the Special Area Plans and the Future Land Use Plan. Currently, this parcel is zoned R1, so we can consider R1 applications. The Future Land Use Plan contemplates larger scale commercial buildings in this employment corridor, and this is not consistent with that plan, either. Because the Commission upholds the existing plans adopted by City Council, she is not supportive of the proposed plan. She would challenge the applicant to consider what could work here that is complementary and would be very special in the City. She would comment that the proposed architecture is fantastic; this is a very nice product. The Commission also appreciates that the applicant engaged with the



neighborhood. She invited Commissioners to comment on the other discussion questions, if they wished.

Mr. Supelak stated that Ms. Webb's presentation was one of the better ones that the Commission has seen, regardless of the feedback provided on the proposal. He applauds the sensitivity that the applicant was trying to deploy. They are clearly good designers and thoughtful in tempering the intense use down towards the residential use. However, the intensity and density is a problem. The architecture is a lovely product. He applauds the attempt at the courtyard element. Although it is a good product, this is not the right location for it.

Mr. Fishman agreed that it is an attractive product; however, the Commission will be very particular in regard to what goes in here, even if it is consistent with the zoning and Land Use Plan.

Ms. Webb thanked the public for their comments and the Commission for their input.

This case was an Informal Review; no action was taken.

## **2. CWP Dublin at 435 Metro Place South, 23-010INF, Informal Review**

A request for Informal Review of a proposed conversion of an extended stay hotel to multifamily apartments on a 4.077-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District - Waterford Village. The site is located ±170 feet southwest of the intersection with Frantz Road.

### **Case Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this a request for an application for the conversion of an extended stay hotel to multifamily apartments. The 4.077-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Waterford Village, and is located approximately 170 feet southwest of the intersection of Metro Place S. and Frantz Road. The site currently contains an extended stay hotel constructed in 1991 with customer amenities centrally located between five separate buildings. The site is currently zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District – Waterford Village; however, it does not currently permit any Residential Use, but defaults to the uses of the Suburban Office District. Smiley Park is located adjacent to the site and a multiuse path runs south of the property, connecting Frantz Road to Smiley Park. Other residential uses are located on the east side of Frantz Road; however, this site is fully developed as an extended-stay hotel.

The site is located wholly within the boundaries of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which is a Special Area Plan approved by City Council in 2018 and updated in 2022. The DCAP builds upon a previous study of Dublin's legacy office parks, which identifies ways to improve the area for businesses, employees and residents to ensure Dublin remains a competitive place to live, work, and play into the future. This plan primarily focuses on providing a mixed-use, walkable environment to an area that has been almost exclusively focused on singular land uses including office uses. The plan recognizes that mixed-use development provides the amenities that employers/employees demand, which are vital to the future success of the area. The Plan also strongly encourages integrated housing options as part of this mixed-use environment. The site is located within the Metro/Blazer Subdistrict. Uses for this subdistrict include office, research and development, personal services, retail, restaurant/bar, entertainment, hotel, and multifamily residential, although it is discouraged along the I-270 frontage. The applicant is proposing the

conversion of a 106-unit extended stay hotel to a 106-unit multifamily apartment complex. The proposal would require a rezoning from PUD: Waterford Village to a new PUD, allowing multifamily residential. The parking and circulation is located on the outside of the property, around all of the buildings, except the one on the south side. The greenspace along Frantz Road is not a part of this property. It is a stormwater detention area. Functionally, significant changes to the units are not necessary. The units currently contain kitchens, bedrooms, bathrooms, living rooms and all facilities typical with apartment complexes. Renovations and updates to the existing units would be made in the future. Currently, no site modifications are proposed with this application. The site currently has 128 parking spaces. There is currently only one access point into the site off Metro Place South to the north. The applicant has expressed interested in pursuing a cross access with the property to the west of the site.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan?
- 2) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, what site modifications would be recommended?
- 3) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, what improvements would be recommended to incorporate open space on the site?
- 4) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, would the Commission be supportive of reduced parking for the multifamily use?
- 5) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, would the Commission be supportive of cross access to the west of the site?

### **Applicant Presentation**

Asaf Fligelman, Churchwick Partners, 198 Ocean Avenue, Woodmere NY stated that they purchased the property in 2022. These are the typical garden-style apartments prevalent on the east coast. When they purchased the property, their primary goal was to stabilize the asset from both an operational and safety/security perspective. Currently, they utilize 29-day contracts; they do not conduct background or credit checks on their guests. They have become aware of Dublin's revitalization plans for the Metro Place business park, and although this area lies outside that area, they believe it would be a natural extension of that area. Hotels like this are not built anymore; typically, there is one tall tower of residential units, which has ability to be monitored. There is not that ability here. There are 5 buildings containing individual units on 4 acres. There is no ability to monitor the hotel guests. As a multifamily complex, they would be able to do background and credit checks on the tenants. Their vision is to help solve a need for apartments within the area with an adaptive reuse of this asset. There are 82 studio units and 24 2-bedroom units. Studio units would not contain families. There is an access point at the back of their property to Smiley Park, but currently, there are trees on their site that block the entrance path into that park. The anticipate creating an access point on their property so that their residents can access the walkway into Smiley Park.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Fishman inquired if this property is converted, what would be the duration of the resident lease. Mr. Fligelman responded that it would be a 12-month lease, and require the typical background check.

Ms. Harter inquired about the lighting package they were contemplating. Mr. Fligelman responded that they anticipate enhancing the current lighting infrastructure to ensure that the archway entrances to the units and the dark areas between the buildings are well lit.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the potential additional parking, concerning which they are in negotiations with the adjacent property owners. There is a grade change between the properties. Mr. Fligelman responded that, currently, there is a mulch path and trees between the properties. They would have to remove some mulch and install stairs to provide access to potential visitor parking in the adjacent parking area, if deemed necessary. However, their hope is that the Commission will determine that their current parking is sufficient.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the proposed interior improvements are significant. Would they be leasing apartments prior to making those improvements, or are the improvements contemplated over a period of time?

Mr. Fligelman responded that it would be a staged transition. Some units would be taken off-line, improvements made to the units, and then leased. Many of the improvements would be aesthetic.

Mr. Way stated that, as he understands it, they do not plan to make any improvements to the site, which means they would be returning to the Commission with plans that do not propose changes to the existing layout and landscaping.

Mr. Fligelman responded that the plans would include changes to the landscaping, and he would like to have the Commission's feedback tonight on that item. Specifically, to create an accessway to Smiley Park, what would the Commission prefer to see? Could he erect a fence along the rear of his property that includes an open access for his guests to Smiley Park? The units are fully outfitted, and no improvements for the units are intended at this time.

Mr. Way stated that he was referring to the site. The information that was submitted states that over time, he would be investing in the property.

Mr. Fligelman stated that any investment that would occur would be subject to financing. Banks encourage hotel property owners to invest in their properties, so that their collateral will continue to improve.

Ms. Call requested clarification of the number of units.

Mr. Fligelman responded that there are 106 units -- 82 studio units and 24 2-bedroom units; there are 128 parking spaces.

### **Public Comment**

The following public comment was received prior to the meeting:

Tallia McCormick, Regional Property Manager, Birge & Held, 9002 N. Meridian Street, Suite 209, Indianapolis, IN:

"Greetings, Zach. I obtained your contact information from the group working with Jonathan Schwalb, relevant to the potential rezoning and redevelopment of the Sonesta ES off of Frantz Road in Dublin. Our group at Birge & Held currently owns/operates 17 multifamily communities in the Greater Columbus area, and given that, we are always interested in new projects coming into

our markets. Churchwick Partners reached out to our group in the beginning stages of their planning for this potential rezone and multifamily project, looking to build local connections, obtain some demographic data, and increase their level of local integration overall. One of our assets happens to be across the street from this project, Turkey Run Apartments, and we would be happy to have a competitor join us in this area for several reasons. Our group believes there is a significant need for the type of product that this project would accommodate, specific to units with smaller square footages than ours and correlating to that, likely a slightly lesser price point. As our asset on this street, our units are quite large by standard apartment metrics, at 800-1600 sq. ft., so having competition to work with on the street, specifically with product that we are unable to offer, but that there is a need for, could be very beneficial for the demographics in that area, which are currently unable to find this type of unit in this area (specific to Frantz Rd-Bridge Rd/.5 mi proximity to downtown Old Dublin). Given our positive stance on this project, we felt compelled to connect and at least provide our opinion of the project while it is still in the planning and approval phase. I hope this feedback will be considered during the review process.”

Keith Barnes, Waterford Village resident, 279 Clover Court, Dublin, OH stated that at a recent neighborhood association meeting, which approximately 50 residents attended, one of the issues discussed was the Sonesta property. The property owners have indicated to the association that their intent is to convert the extended stay hotel to apartments. No objections were voiced at their meeting, but the association requested him to represent the neighborhood at the PZC meeting. Before attending the meeting, he conducted some additional information, and he spoke with Mr. Fligelman yesterday. In the 12-page document Churchwick Partners provided, he noticed a couple of items that would be good for the community. One is “creating housing that would attract a less transient population, improve vetting of potential new residents and create a greater sense of community with permanent residents.” However, their report indicates that the property has been downgraded from a Tier 1 brand management. Therefore, their community would have concerns about the property upkeep. He noticed, as well, that the number of police and EMS calls to some of the local hotels and apartments were alarmingly high, including the hotels at 450 Metro Place and the one on Post Road. Their community would support opportunities that would result in a safer community. Another concern of the Waterford Village community is that, due to the high traffic volumes, the residents are unable to safely exit their neighborhood onto US33, and during peak hours, to turn left onto Frantz Road. Additionally, their neighborhood is being used as a cut-through route to avoid the downtown traffic congestion. The residents are concerned that the current infrastructure is unable to accommodate the many changes occurring within the City. In regard to the proposal under consideration tonight, however, the Waterford Village residents are supportive of the project.

Scot Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, OH, stated that the proposal seems consistent with the City’s goals concerning Metro Place. Additionally, there is an excellent opportunity for shared parking with the large office building on the adjacent property. He is supportive of the proposed plan, as well.

### **Commission Discussion**

Ms. Call directed the Commission’s comments to discussion questions.

Mr. Supelak stated that he first has an additional question for Mr. Hounshell. This site is currently zoned PUD, which has its own set of rules. How would this site in its current layout compare with a typical multifamily development in density, lot coverage and open space?

Mr. Hounshell responded that this site lies within the Waterford Village PUD, which is one of the older PUDs within the City. Therefore, the development text reverts to requirements of the standard Code. However, according to the Future Land Use Plan, any future rezoning, even if it were PUD to PUD, would need to align with the MUR1 subdistrict requirements. The MUR4 Rezoning and Code were adopted in accordance with the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. The intent is that any development that occurs within the areas of an anticipated area rezoning to the MUR 1, 2 or 3 subdistricts must align with the principles of that anticipated rezoning. Mr. Supelak has inquired if this type of development were to come forward as a new development today, would it be approved. Mr. Supelak noted that it is a proposal for a new development with a change of use.

Mr. Hounshell stated that he could not say whether or not it would be approved today; however, the PUD process provides the ability for give/take.

Mr. Supelak inquired what the development standards are for this area; PUD rules allow more flexibility than the standard Code requirements.

Ms. Rauch stated that the Dublin Corporate Area Plan lists a number of uses that would be considered as part of the MUR1 subdistrict, ranging from office, residential multifamily, and other support uses. It does not define specific locations for those uses.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are development rules associated with that residential multifamily concerning density, lot coverage and open space; that is the information he is requesting.

Ms. Rauch responded that the standard Code is the default for guidance, because a Code amendment has not occurred to establish the MUR1 subdistrict standards. Until that occurs, the current multifamily Code requirements are followed. She assumes the site met the existing Code standards for its earlier approval and met the parking requirements for a hotel.

Ms. Call stated that across the street, Turkey Run Village was approved earlier as a multifamily product, so its layout is different from the Sonesta site's current commercial hotel use. However, as a comparison, the Turkey Run Village development met the standard multifamily Code requirements.

Mr. Supelak responded that would be the type of baseline he was seeking. The question is, if the Commission were to grant the change to the PUD, which of those rules would we be agreeing to relax?

Ms. Call returned the Commissioners' discussion to the discussion questions.

- 1) Does the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP)?
- 2) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, what site modifications would be recommended?
- 3) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, what improvements would be recommended to incorporate open space on the site?
- 4) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, would the Commission be supportive of reduced parking for the multifamily use?
- 5) Should the Commission find the proposed conversion meets the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, would the Commission be supportive of a cross access to the west of the site?

Mr. Fishman stated that what is proposed is not consistent with the site's existing PUD, so it would be necessary to replace it.

Mr. Boggs responded that the proposal is to replace the current PUD with a new PUD, which would have new development text.

Mr. Fishman stated that any new PUD would be proposing something different from any other apartment complex built in Dublin, because it was not constructed as multifamily. Additionally, the existing units are very small, under 450 square feet. The buildings are multi-level, and since stairs to the upper units are necessary, no retirees would be interested in those units. The existing use looks and acts like a hotel; it does not meet the intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) as an apartment complex. Very few people live alone; there will probably be 2 people/unit with 2 cars. The potential shared parking area requires a lengthy walk. People will not want to do that and will crowd their vehicles into the primary parking lot. He understands and is sympathetic with their intent. However, this site was zoned as a hotel use to meet that need and was built accordingly. He would anticipate couples or a single parent with a child in these units.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is struggling with the proposal, as well. The question is if it meets the intent of the DCAP, which indicates a multifamily residential use within the area would be good. Even though residential in the area is desirable, he believes this conversion is problematic. The intent of the DCAP and MUR1 is to inject mixed-use into the legacy office park as primarily one use. That mixed-use would concede some of the office for residential and some of it for commercial. In this situation, we would be conceding commercial for residential; therefore, not abiding by the intent.

Mr. Chinnock stated that we cannot compare what would be ideal to what is proposed here. Ms. Call stated that the DCAP “supports integrated, infill residential development at key locations in support of office....use a variety of land uses....focus on needed amenities.” Specific to the MUR1 subdistrict, it says, “The Metro Blazer Subdistrict exemplifies the challenges of legacy office development passing. Once a premier office district in all central Ohio, this district now has a competitive disadvantage compared to more newly-developed office areas, due to lack of amenities, low walkability and an outdated appearance.” This application does not change the outdated appearance and does not change the walkability. It does capitalize on a residential component. “The introduction of a mix of uses, additional roadway connections and strategically phased redevelopment will reposition this subdistrict to succeed for generations.” That is the challenge of the DCAP – a revitalization. This Informal Review application does not do anything to further that intent. It does not add in walkability, redevelopment or revitalization, which are the challenges we are given in the DCAP.

Mr. Way stated that to him, this is an adaptive reuse. It is an existing use not likely to be removed, and to change the use from a long-stay hotel to residential makes sense to him. This is a garden apartment complex. To him, it is a 1980s residential development that is fitting into an area that needs housing. It is located in an area of the City that has all of the support services needed. He is supportive of the proposal. As the proposed PUD moves through the process, it will be reverting to standard Code requirements, and staff will be pointing out the items that must be addressed to be compliant with Code.

Ms. Harter stated that she is generally in favor of the proposal, but she would like to see the site better address the need for connection and walkability. The adaptive reuse would meet a need in the area.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is generally supportive of the proposal, as well. He does not believe it meets the intent of the DCAP, but there are other factors to consider. It is a great adaptive reuse

and an improvement to this area. The alternative would be having this facility continue as its current use because we cannot identify how to change it. More conversations will be needed on how we can maximize the property to the extent possible.

Ms. Call stated that she supports converting a hotel use to a residential use in this area, but the plan will require some changes. We owe it to the residents who will occupy these units to require some elements be addressed, such as open space, parking, amenities, integration into the area, revitalization and walkability. It would be necessary to see those addressed in a future application.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is customary in the Dublin development process that items be addressed before approval and before the site can be occupied. Although the applicant indicates his preference is to phase in the internal improvements, he believes the external improvements need to be addressed before approval. He is concerned about the parking and open space.

Mr. Way stated that he anticipates that if a PUD process moves forward, there would be opportunity for a dialogue about what items would be essential.

Mr. Chinnock stated that it is clear that the applicant, who is not from Dublin, has extended significant effort with this plan. He appreciates his due diligence.

Ms. Call stated that Mr. Chinnock speaks for the Commission with that comment, who appreciates the opportunity to work with the applicant now and in the future. She inquired if the applicant desired additional clarity on any items.

Mr. Fligelman noted the following points:

- It would be beneficial to have a residential use here for the workers in the nearby offices.
- In regard to the open space, the access point to Smiley Park is City-owned property. He would be able to construct only the portion of the accessway on his property.
- The studio units are only 450 square feet; however, they were designed in a manner to maximize the space and feel much larger. Studio apartments in great demand nationally and in Dublin. The first floor contains the 2-bedroom units; the second floor has studio units.

Mr. Fishman inquired the tenant number limitations for the units.

Mr. Fligelman responded that the limit for the studio units is 1-2 people. They are non-discriminatory and abide by all Fair Housing laws. He thanked the Commission for their review and consideration.

Ms. Call thanked Mr. Fligelman for his ownership in the property and his interest in investing in it and becoming part of the City of Dublin.

This case was an Informal Review; no action was taken.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Rauch reported that:

- The Commission feedback provided following the Legal refresher training at the February 9, 2023 meeting was very positive. The joint board and commission training session will be held later in the spring, and staff is willing to provide education on any other topics desired by the Commission.

Ms. Call invited the Commission's feedback on a potential semi-annual Commission training similar to the one Mr. Boggs provided at the last meeting.

Ms. Rauch pointed out some significant dates:

- 2023 State of the Community will be held from 6-8:30 pm, Thursday, March 9 at The Exchange.
- 2023 APA National Conference will be held April 1-4 in Philadelphia, PA. Commissioners interested in attending should contact Ms. Beal.
- Community Plan 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.
- Community Plan Public Engagement Meeting is scheduled for 6-8 pm, Tuesday, April 18 in Council Chamber.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 pm, Thursday, March 16, 2023.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Clerk of Council