



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 10, 2023

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the August 10, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She noted 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, Kathy Harter, Kim Way, Warren Fishman, Mark Supelak, Lance Schneier, Jamey Chinnock

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar, Zachary Hounshell

### ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded to adjourn to executive session for the discussion of a personnel matter related to the appointment of a public official.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

### MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting was reconvened at 6:38 p.m.

### ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded election of Mark Supelak as Vice Chair for the term of April 2023 through May 2024.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, abstain.

[Motion carried 6-0 with one abstention.]

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Supelak seconded election of Rebecca Call as Chair for the term of April 2023 through May 2024.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion carried 7-0.]

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. There are no administrative cases this evening.

### **ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 07-20-2023 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.  
[Motion approved 7-0.]

### **CASE REVIEW**

- **Case 23-069 - Ashland Multi-family Development, PIDs: 273-012284 and 273-002453, Concept Plan**

Construction of a multi-family development consisting of 330 residential units and a stand-alone residential clubhouse. The 18.9-acre site is zoned Office Laboratory and Research District and is located north of the intersection of Blazer Parkway with Ashland Service Road.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that before the Commission is a Concept Plan, which is the first step in a Planned Unit Development (PUD) review process. It operates similar to an Informal Review, as no determination is required; nonbinding feedback only is requested. The Commission is asked to evaluate if the proposal for this site aligns with the Community Plan and the Special Area Plan, whether the use(s) are appropriate, and whether the general site layout allows for conducive development in the future adjacent to this site. The 18.9-acre site is zoned Office Laboratory and Research District and is located north of the intersection of Blazer Parkway and Ashland Service Road. The site has ±510 feet of frontage on Blazer Parkway. The site is located ±810 feet from I-270 and is currently empty and flat. The Cosgray Ditch and FEMA-regulated Special Flood Hazard Area run through the northern portion of both parcels at the site, which limit the developable area, and there is a tree corridor along the eastern edge of the site. City Council recently adopted Interim Land Use principles to guide development while the Community Plan update is in process. The goal is to provide a policy document to supplement adopted plans and accepted planning practices in the interim. These principles are to be utilized similar to the recommendations of the Community Plan, as both are guiding policies and principles for the City. They were not established to supersede zoning requirements. Only one of the principles would be applicable to this case. This site is located in the Dublin Corporate Area Plan – MUR 1 District, which focuses on the Metro Place and Blazer Parkway area. The general goals of this area plan are to encourage a variety of uses with amenities

for workers, hotel visitors and residents; to utilize open space as focal points and usable amenities; and to support infill residential development at key locations to support the office use. Some of the uses considered in the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, MUR 1 District are office, infill residential and neighborhood commercial, more specifically along Frantz Road. The area plan provides specific recommendations for vacant sites. This is Site #6, which calls for support of office and technology uses, but also calls for residential use subordinate to office as an appropriate use of the site. The area plan also calls for a north-south street connection, which would connect Metro Place and Blazer Parkway in the future, and a minimum of 4-story and maximum of 5-story buildings.

This case was before the Planning Commission for Informal Review of an earlier plan in April 2023. At that time, the applicant was proposing seven (7) residential structures, 300 dwelling units, 450 parking spaces, and approximately 7.75 acres of open spaces, which calculate to a density of 16 dwelling units (du) per acre and a parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit. The Commission provided the following feedback:

- Challenged the applicant to think about how the site integrates with the surrounding properties through site layout and open space.
- Recommended the addition of complementary uses to the proposed residential development consistent with the mixed-use intent of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan.
- Recommended additional density and height to accomplish the recommendations for the MUR-1 District.

The applicant has revised their plan based on that feedback and made the following updates to the Concept Plan submitted for comment tonight:

- Reduced the number of residential buildings from 7 to 6;
- Increased building height from 3 stories to 4 stories (Building 6 is 3 stories);
- Increased the unit count to 330 units with 480 parking spaces, for a density of 21 du/acre and 1.5 parking spaces/acre;
- Updated street network into a gridded network;
- Distributed open space toward the Cosgray Ditch and perimeter of the site, opening up the Cosgray corridor by including parallel instead of pull-in parking along the street frontage;
- Incorporated opportunities for flex space for future retail opportunities as the market allows.

Staff has provided the following questions to guide the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed combination of proposed uses throughout the development?
- 2) Does the proposed site layout allow for integration with the surrounding properties?
- 3) Does the proposed open space meet the recommendations of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan?
- 4) Does the Commission support the proposed massing of the residential buildings?

### **Commission Questions for Staff**

Mr. Supelak inquired what is the City's perspective regarding the roadway connections to future sites.

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff has discussed with the applicant how the site would contribute to and enable adjacent sites to develop. The proposed plan would need to include a gridded street system. The City will be embarking on a Metro Center framework plan that will envision how the overall area will be developed in the future, including the feasible street connections that would enable this area to be developed in the desired manner.

Ms. Harter inquired if the turn radius near the covered parking would be tight.

Mr. Hounshell responded that at this point, the plan is purely conceptual; turn radius and road widths are open to the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Harter inquired if there is a wall that separates the site from I-270, and if so, if it is to mitigate noise or to provide screening.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the area does not have a wall. That is an item that is dictated by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and it has not been contemplated for this area. He does not believe there are many walls along the I-270 boundary in Dublin. That was determined with purpose, and the intent is to continue that.

Ms. Harter responded that she did not know if there were any noise concerns, and perhaps this is too soon to discuss.

Ms. Rauch pointed out that is the reason Dublin has focused non-residential land uses along the I-270 corridor -- the City wishes to avoid a need for noise walls. For that reason, there is concern when any residential use is proposed along that freeway.

Ms. Call inquired if the staff is aware of any residential developments in Dublin within the last 10 years that have included covered parking, similar to what is proposed in this application.

Ms. Rauch responded that at the moment, she could not recall any other that the senior living facility on Post Road. Typically, residential developments include either garage parking or standard surface lots.

Ms. Call inquired what is the history behind the language, "residential subordinate to office."

Ms. Rauch responded that it goes back to the intent for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) to address how other uses might be incorporated along with the office in the area. Although office use is the primary driver and key focus of this district, there may be opportunities for particular sites within the DCAP to have a residential use. While it is a potential use that could be considered, the intent is that it be subordinate to the office use.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Aaron Underhill, attorney for the applicant, Underhill and Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, OH stated that this is the Concept Plan stage, so their goal is to obtain the Commission's general support to advance to the next development stage, which will involve greater expenditure of funds for engineering and planning efforts. They believe they have addressed most of the concerns the Commission pointed out previously, other than the concern about use. The Commission had indicated a desire to see some commercial mixed into the development; however, they do not believe the market is sufficiently mature for that use and probably will not be for some time. That is probably the reason no project with a commercial component has been proposed here to date. However, they have tried to design spaces on the first floors of these buildings that would allow them to be easily converted later into a restaurant, retail or service component. He would contemplate writing a zoning text that would allow those uses as permitted or conditional, requiring

them to come back to the Commission for approval of such items as signage and parking. If the plan proceeds to the next stage, their intent would be to accommodate that future use in the plan. In their opinion, a significant multi-family project is needed to jump-start some of the commercial activity that is desired both here and along Frantz Road. The DCAP calls out residential as a supporting use for office use and other future uses. Because PZC has not been supportive of residential along I-270, that limits a large swath of this subdistrict, although a mixed-use component along Frantz Road would be appropriate. The question is whether the inside core of this subdistrict would be suited for multi-family. This project could be a catalyst to encourage the commercial uses that the market does not yet support. They are open to discussing street connections, should they be needed in the future. Their team has balanced their desire for an internal open space with the need to make it inviting to area employees, residents or visitors. They have reduced the amount of interior open space and added more along the perimeter.

### **Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Chinnock inquired where commercial space, such as retail or a restaurant, could be located in the future. If added, would it be intended for the residents or to draw visitors to the site?

Mr. Underhill invited a Pizutti representative to respond. He noted that (in reference to the Commission's previous discussion) he believes there is an intent to include art in the clubhouse.

Eric Buck, Vice President of Development, Pizutti Companies, 629 N. High Street, Suite 500, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that a curated art program is important with Pizutti projects. They focus on art programs inside the residential buildings and also public-facing art. This is a conceptual plan, so they are willing to work with the City on the location of the art. Ideally, the art would be located in one of the buildings along the north-south connector.

Mr. Underhill stated that initially, those buildings will have co-working spaces for the residents of the community. When the market permits, those spaces can be used for public dining, entertainment or service opportunities.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the central green is intended to be pedestrian only, or will there be vehicular access through that area. Is there a structure in the central green area?

Mr. Buck responded that if he is referring to the north-south piece, it will allow vehicular access with parallel parking on each side. Although it will be pedestrian-focused, it will have vehicular access. Materials such as pavers will be used to make that access more attractive, but it is intended to be a north-south vehicular road.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the covered parking element was critical to the project or negotiable.

Mr. Buck responded that the covered parking was added in response to a comment that was made at the previous Informal Review hearing. It is not critical to their plan, so they are willing to work with the Commission on that element.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the curated art would be contained within a building, and if it were in a different building than the clubhouse, if it would be accessible to the public.

Mr. Buck responded that typically, they have art in all of their buildings, and each of these buildings will have some type of curated art component.

Mr. Schneier inquired how Pizutti would build the first floor with co-working spaces that could be converted to a different use later.

Mr. Buck responded that there would be areas within the buildings that initially would provide co-working space for the residents, but those spaces would be built in such a way that when the market demand in the area permits, they could be converted to retail. Retail would be a great amenity when the market for it exists. They would design the spaces so they could be easily converted.

Mr. Schneier inquired if, because the clubhouse is the most publicly accessible building, Pizutti had considered future retail there.

Mr. Buck responded that they would be willing to work with the Commission on the possibility. There will be co-working spaces in the clubhouse, as well. Most of the buildings will have some type of co-working space because of the distance from the building to the clubhouse. The buildings on the north-south connector will be closer to the clubhouse.

Mr. Underhill stated that if the goal is to have commercial uses in the future, their interests are aligned, as it would be a financial advantage for the property owner to have those spaces leased by commercial tenants.

Mr. Way stated that the buildings they are proposing are mostly four stories and one three-story building. The DCAP allows for six stories. What is the reason the developer is not attempting to take advantage of the maximum height and capacity of the site?

Mr. Buck responded that the higher the building, the more parking needed. The greater the density, the greater the parking and less greenspace.

Mr. Way inquired if they had considered providing parking under the buildings, which would permit them to have higher buildings and less surface parking,

Mr. Buck responded that they have considered it, but unfortunately, it is not economically feasible with this project. They have been very thoughtful with how the proposed parking is laid out, so that residents are able to park as close to their front doors as possible.

Mr. Way requested clarification of his reference to economically feasible. Is he saying that they would not have a sufficient number of units to offset the cost of underground parking?

Mr. Buck responded that it would be because of an insufficient number of units and rent revenue to pay off the debt service for the underground parking. They focused their attention on where the renters would be living, not on where they would be parking.

Mr. Fishman stated the developer is adding 30 units but only 30 parking places. He remains unconvinced that each of these units will have only one vehicle. The Bridge Park rentals are held primarily by young professionals with two cars per unit. He would not anticipate the experience here to be any different. With the proposed plan, there would be parking around the perimeter and on the street in addition to the surface parking, which is not an attractive view.

Mr. Buck responded that their parking ratio was based off the ULI shared parking standards.

Mr. Fishman stated that the other issue is the residential buildings' proximity to the highway, where there is traffic noise. Dublin does not have and does not want sound walls. After these buildings are occupied, the residents will be coming before City Council demanding sound walls.

Mr. Underhill responded that they anticipate eventually having buildings between this project and the highway, which would provide a natural barrier and buffer.

Mr. Way stated that this would be a pioneer project in this area. He understands that at this point in time, there cannot be retail here nor any other more street-engaging use. There was previous discussion of the idea of creating a destination here that would not only support or serve this development but could potentially serve the existing wider area. It would create a place that does not now exist, perhaps a recreational use, which would draw people to the site, support the development and help energize the rest of the area. Have they given any more thought to that?

Mr. Buck responded that they have given much consideration to the best uses they could put on the site. Relying on one thing to create sufficient activity to provide other opportunities for retail would be difficult to design and accomplish. They are excited about the plan they have proposed, which they believe addresses many of the concerns the Commission raised in the earlier review. They understand the City wants retail in this area in the future, but it cannot happen at this time. They have provided flexibility with this plan so that in the future, it would be possible to add it.

Mr. Chinnock stated that we have discussed the potential for mixed use, but that could cause a parking issue. Is the parking count based on the residential needs? Potential restaurant or retail would result in more traffic and a demand for more parking. We need to consider that potential issue.

Mr. Buck responded that they can continue to work on that during the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP).

Mr. Underhill noted that when they return with the PDP, they could provide more data from the parking studies used.

Mr. Supelak stated that he hears their concern about including retail too early and the potential for it to be possible later, probably on the ground floor of the buildings. Realistically, retail spaces usually warrant higher ceilings or potential ability to provide back of house needs; that could prove problematic relative to the infrastructure that will be put in place. Realistically, what commercial use could be placed here?

Mr. Buck responded that, typically, they like to have higher ceilings in their amenity spaces, regardless. In the next step, they will look at how the buildings must be laid out to adequately handle those types of situations.

Mr. Supelak stated that we talked about the paved area down the center green area. What is the design intent of that central green?

Jeff Pongonis, Principal Landscape Architect, MKSK, 462 S Ludlow St, Columbus, OH stated that the project is in its conceptual stage. In this updated concept, they have attempted to create a series of courtyards around the buildings, which can be programmed with amenities for the residents. Additionally, there would be the clubhouse, access to a dog park on the south and the Cosgray corridor to the north. Their proposal has been referred to as a pioneer project in the area. The question is whether the intent is to take an incremental step forward to help create market conditions for future mixed use. Creating those market conditions could occur by creating a residential use here. They recognize the project would be surrounded by a large amount of parking. Traditionally, a project of this scale would be designed in the inverse, with the parking in the center of the block. However, both the east and southwest sides of the property are adjacent to office parking lots and the working ends of office buildings – loading docks and access areas. The site has very little frontage along Blazer Parkway. The best direction is to create an opportunity for a

street grid, place the buildings as close as possible to Blazer Parkway, creating an architectural frontage and creating conditions where the area feels connected, urban and walkable.

Ms. Harter inquired if the bump-up on the roofline indicates vaulted ceilings inside.

Mr. Buck reiterated that the plan is conceptual in nature. At the moment, it is just shown as a parapet architectural feature.

Ms. Harter inquired if they have reached out to the area businesses to inquire if their employees might be interested in living here due to the convenience.

Mr. Buck responded that they have done so, and he believes a representative of one of those businesses is present tonight to speak during the Public Comment portion of the meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Candace Klepacz, Director of Strategy and Development, Pepper Construction of Ohio, 5185 Blazer Parkway – Suite 101, Dublin, OH stated that they believe this project is an opportunity to further activate Blazer Parkway for the local businesses and an area for their employees to live, work and play. This could be important for employee recruitment and retention. They are excited about the proposed connections to the nature trails that would provide opportunities for their employees during their lunch or breaks, even if they do not live here.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Schneier stated that he supports the project and having a residential development here. However, he would like to see more mixed use. He is not concerned about the parking density at this point. He would not be in favor of underground parking on this site due to affordability. He would like to see an affordable residential use here. Typically, covered parking is not done well and is not attractive. His main concern is the lack of retail in the proposal. He referred to the Starbucks Center, a new outlier retail on Frantz Road. He believes the existing density of office use in this area would support some sort of retail here, as well. He would be more in favor of this project if they would include some retail commitment from the beginning.

Mr. Fishman concurred. He would be more in favor of having retail from the beginning. He remains concerned about the parking. If it is not economically feasible to include underground parking, he believes the covered parking should be replaced with garages for the residential units. It would be more attractive to prospective renters and visually, as well. With the level of vehicle theft and vandalism occurring, this would be an important security element. Regardless of the parking studies, most units in Dublin have two vehicles. The renters in Bridge Park value the parking that has been provided. He likes the suggestion for a future additional building to provide a noise buffer between the residential use and the highway. The question is the length of time before that might exist. The revised plan is an improvement, but Dublin is looking for a quality development, not more cars. He could support the project under the right circumstances, including the addition of garages.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is not excited with this proposal. There is a very real appetite to do some wonderful things in this area, which is in desperate need of just that. It is difficult to bank on what might occur in the future. He is not supportive of covered parking. He is supportive of taller buildings and mixed use. The DCAP calls for a variety of uses. He believes that means a variety of uses on each site, not a variety of uses next to each other. Having a variety of uses on each site would produce mixed use and an urban environment, which is the vision for this area. The language calls



for infill residential with the requirement that it be subordinate to the office use. The treatment of open space in the proposal is very good. The intent is to have a high quality development here in an area attempting to re-shape its image. The proposal reflects good work done by professionals with a nice touch. This is not an easy site, therefore, not an easy project to create.

Mr. Way complimented the applicant for listening and attempting to incorporate some of the Commission's comments. He believes the proposal is close to providing a street grid framework that will work for the site and connect it on all sides, as the area evolves. He appreciates the attention given to the Cosgray corridor, an important amenity opportunity. At the last meeting, he posed the question as to whether this project would be the last step in a way of doing things or the first step in rethinking the future of this area. This is an aging office park surrounded by surface parking, and what you are offering us is a residential development surrounded by surface parking. To me, the proposal captures the spirit of what was, as opposed to the spirit of what is. There are opportunities to have more density by tucking the parking underground. With that, there also can be street circulation with on-street parking. He believes that is the future of this area. As the City goes through its planning process and rethinks Metro Center and the DCAP area, it will probably be with the idea of having structured parking supporting new building infill. Because it is currently undeveloped, this 20-acre site has the ability to set the tone for the rest of the development. As Mr. Supelak noted, the magic is presently missing, but there is magic to be had here in terms of this site being the model for the future, something unique and different. In summary, the framework is close to what is needed; the parking needs to be hidden. The economics is an issue for the developer to solve. The applicant should consider what they could do in this early stage to create a destination that will draw people from the surrounding office buildings in the middle of the day. Perhaps it is recreational, the Cosgray corridor or a combined recreation/retail opportunity.

Ms. Harter commended the applicant for listening to and attempting to incorporate the Commission's comments. She believes there would be sufficient interest to include an eating or recreational opportunity here. She likes the pedestrian opportunities provided. In the next stage, she is looking forward to seeing the architectural details and art component. She believes there may be some opportunities for covered parking structures, such as rooftop solar panels or rooftop green areas. She would like to see balconies that are usable, able to accommodate a table and two chairs at a minimum. She would like the applicant to look into the possibility for underground parking. This is such an important area, the development needs to be something spectacular.

Mr. Chinnock stated he agrees that the needed street grid framework is here. He likes the overall direction of the revised concept. Tonight's discussion has pointed out many concerns, which potentially can be resolved, perhaps easily. All the Commissioners are struggling with the mixed-use component. Perhaps it is not a restaurant but something more unique that could attract, not compete with what already exists within the area. He is disappointed that the concept proposes vehicular traffic through the central green area. The site seems to be very broken up with a good amount of vehicular traffic throughout. Pedestrian safety is a concern. If the connector does occur, there would be a lot of traffic going through this small site. The greenspace and Cosgray corridor elements are great and work in the applicant's favor. As the plan progresses, he would encourage the use of a variety of architectural materials. He is not supportive of covered parking. They are difficult to do nicely; even with solar panels, they look like carports.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has the Interim Land Use Principles to use in reviewing development applications in certain strategic areas, such as the DCAP and Blazer Parkway subarea.

This area is zoned for Office, Laboratory and Research. The Land Use Principles challenge us to think comprehensively. We are looking at one parcel within a greater area that will be undergoing significant redevelopment in the next few years. The issue here is the layout. Currently, the site layout mirrors the surrounding area, which has surface parking surrounding the buildings. The challenge starts with the public realm. The Commission has stressed the need to provide ground level activation. The applicant has stated economically, rooftops are needed to support the ancillary uses. However, the City needs the ancillary uses to support the area development. The concept plan's use of the open space and the Cosgray Ditch is done well. The walkability component is also good. She is not supportive of covered parking. The Commission is cautiously supportive of a residential component in this area, if done well and addresses the associated needs. It is a challenge to be the first residential development within this area, and unfortunately, what has been proposed is not quite what it needs to be.

Mr. Fishman stated that when the developers built the first office project in this area 50 years ago, it was considered a "wow" project in its use of open space, glass and contemporary design. It has since worn out, but what we need here once again is a similar "wow" project.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant needed any further feedback from the Commission. The applicant indicated they did not.

Because this was a Concept Plan review, no actions were taken.

## **DISCUSSIONS**

- **Administrative Approvals**

Ms. Rauch provided the list of items currently addressed by administrative review and a list of typical Consent Agenda items. If any of those items were to be added to the list of administrative review projects, they would no longer be reviewed by PZC. She described the administrative review process and documentation of reviewed projects. Many of the items are raised during the building permit stage. The intent is not to diminish the quality or expectation of something already approved; any modifications must be equal to or greater. Example of administrative review items include lot line adjustments; plant material relocation or substitution; sign face, lighting or landscaping changes; building footprint modifications less than 10%. Since 2018, 65 administrative review approvals have been granted within planned districts, and 85 administrative review approvals have been granted within the Bridge Street District. Consent agenda cases are items the Planning Director does not have authority to approve, but are typically minor in nature, such as sign or building material changes. They are items on which staff and the applicant are in agreement concerning proposed conditions for approval and on which no public comment has been received. In the last 5 years, 78 cases have been on the Consent Agenda, 20 of which were pulled off for discussion purposes. Conditional Use applications for minor use changes are also typically approved by the Commission without discussion. Those are items that potentially could be considered for administrative review approval. When Preliminary and Final Development Plans are approved, the associated Preliminary and Final Plats are also approved without discussion, but those items are not recommended for administrative review. Previously, there was a Commission suggestion that menu boards be considered for administrative review.

## **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Fishman stated that there is need to tighten the PUD review process, so that we can achieve the quality development desired. When there are different driveway materials permitted, for example, the applicant will always choose blacktop, the least expensive, less durable and less attractive material.

Mr. Boggs responded that Council recently addressed that need through adoption of the Residential Design Guidelines, which address, among other items, driveway materials. The developer will now have those design guidelines to work with from the outset as they prepare their application. When that application is submitted, staff will compare it against the guidelines. If the application diverges from the guidelines, staff will advise the applicant that their application is not likely to be approved by the Commission. With a PUD, the Commission is able to accept, reject or modify what is proposed before it is ultimately approved by City Council.

Ms. Call stated that in regard to Consent Agenda items, the Commission still prefers to see Conditional Use applications and the Preliminary and Final Plats. Review of menu board signs could be considered for inclusion as an administrative review item.

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes Conditional Use applications could be handled via the administrative review process. He also believes some sign applications could be reviewed administratively.

Ms. Call stated that, typically, the Commission does not review minor sign applications. The Commission reviews Master Sign applications, because they are requesting something more than what the Code permits. She suggested that staff provide clarification distinguishing between Conditional Use changes and like for like applications.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff would pull together that information for future Commission consideration.

- **September Tour**

Ms. Rauch stated that the September site tour is scheduled for September 14. The tour is intended to include a variety of commercial, residential, parks and open space and Bridge Park projects that have come before the Commission. Some of the projects have been constructed and others currently are under construction. Commission members are invited to provide a list of sites and topics that they would like to be included in the tour.

Commission members will review the proposed list of sites and forward recommendations to staff for refinement of the list of tour sites for consideration at the first September meeting.

Ms. Rauch noted that the tour is considered a public meeting and will be advertised as such. There will be an additional vehicle to accommodate members of the public who want to join the tour. There will be some discussion on the tour, so staff will take notes documenting any discussion. An overview and summary of the tour will be scheduled as a discussion item on an upcoming Commission meeting agenda.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

- The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 17, 2023.
- A Community Plan open house will be held on Tuesday, August 29 at the City Development building.
- The Council-PZC-ARB-BZA joint work session is scheduled for Wednesday, August 30.
- The Commission tour of approved and developed or developing project sites within the City is scheduled for September 14, 2023.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.



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



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