



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 1, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the September 1, 2022 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, Lance Schneier, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Kim Way

Commission members excused: Warren Fishman, Jamey Chinnock

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Jessie Shamp, Zachary Hounshell, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 08-04-22 meeting.

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

[Motion approved 5-0.]

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 who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases.

NEW CASES

1. **Shihab Law Office Building at PID: 273-004511, 22-077INF, Informal Review**

Proposed construction of a one-story, 10,526-square-foot building for a law office on a 2.86-acre site zoned Planned Commerce District, Thomas Kohler, Subarea C, located northwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road with Emerald Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for informal review and nonbinding feedback of a future Final Development Plan for the Shihab Law Office. Development for the site follows the Planned Commerce District process. In 1996, 120 acres were rezoned to Planned Commerce District – Thomas Kohler. The Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and development text were established with the rezoning. This particular site is located within Subarea C of the parcel. This 2.86-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road and Emerald Parkway and currently contains a row of mature trees and a shared used path along the west property line. A 75-foot landscape and bikepath easement, as well as a 30-foot utility easement, are located along the western property line, and a 30-foot utility easement extends along the eastern and southern property lines. The vacant site is proposed to be split into two parcels to construct a single-story, 10,526-foot building containing a law office and fitness center on the southernmost parcel. The application meets the maximum lot coverage and density requirements for Subarea C. If the lot split occurs, staff is concerned that the proposed northern lot will be challenging to develop per development standards due to its narrowness and inability to meet required building and pavement setbacks. The Commission's input is sought on the proposed viability of the remaining lot. A conceptual site plan has been provided for a single-story building on the southeast corner with frontage on Emerald Parkway and Woerner-Temple Road and access from each road. Internal drives are proposed connecting the two access points. Staff is concerned with the two proposed drive aisles due to the amount of pavement and car-centric design and recommends that the applicant proceed with just one of the drive aisles. If the drive aisle remains over the proposed lot split line, a Minor Text Modification will be required with the Final Development Plan (FDP) approval to permit pavement within the side and rear yard setbacks. The proposed curbcut along Emerald Parkway deviates from the PDP, where it was shown split between the proposed site and the Camden Professional office property to the north. Staff is supportive of the Emerald Parkway access point either remaining as shown on the PDP or removed from the proposal. Staff is also supportive of the applicant exploring the opportunity to obtain cross access from the property owner to the north in order to provide connectivity and access to the curbcut further north along Emerald Parkway. Code requires one (1) parking space per 250 square feet for general office use, or 43 parking spaces for a 10,526-square-foot building, as shown on the plans. Parking is shown to the side and rear of the proposed building and along the Emerald Parkway and Woerner Temple Road frontage. The proposal includes an internal 2-car garage located at the rear of the building for the purpose of storage or parking personal vehicles. The applicant is proposing internal sidewalks around the east, south, and west facades. While additional pedestrian connections are not required by the development text, the applicant is encouraged to consider provision of an additional sidewalk through the site and access to the signalized intersection at Emerald Parkway and Woerner Temple Road from the front entrance of the proposed building, and to also consider a pedestrian connection from the rear patio to the adjacent multi-use path. Landscaping details will be required with the Final Development Plan that will meet the Emerald Parkway Landscape Plan, the development text and the Code. Conceptual architecture images have been provided by the applicant. The building is comprised of two wings and a rotunda. The wing extending west will contain the law offices; the rotunda will contain the main lobby area; and the wing extending north will contain the fitness center. The application proposes architecture and materials that are consistent with the development text. Mechanical units will be fully screened by the building architecture and meet the screening requirements. Staff believes the applicant may wish to consider a second story for the proposed building, as they consider modifications to the site layout. The development text defers to the Zoning Code sign regulations, which permit either two wall or

two ground signs for corner lots. The following questions are provided to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed site layout including building placement, (a second story), parking configuration, and drive aisles?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed development with the surrounding established character and conceptual architectural design including roof style, materials (EIFS), colors, etc.?
- 3) Does the Commission find ground signs or wall signs to be more appropriate for the proposed development?
- 4) Does the Commission support the creation of two individual lots?

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Schneier inquired to what extent the Commission should be taking into account potential development on the northern parcel.

Mr. Shamp responded that the Commission can consider the viability of the northern lot along with this application, because the lot split would occur prior to its development.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the proposed curbcuts were already established by existing plans.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) provides for curbcuts on Emerald Parkway and on Woerner Temple Road, but neither exists at this time. The proposed curbcut for Woerner Temple Road is consistent with the PDP, but the proposed Emerald Parkway curbcut deviates from that plan.

Mr. Way stated that the curbcut on Woerner Temple would be a right-out, left-in turn. Would Woerner Temple accommodate that type of turning movement?

Ms. Mullinax stated that the applicant is showing a right-in, right-out and a left-in turn movement. The road does accommodate that movement.

Mr. Way inquired if there is an existing left turn lane on Emerald Parkway, which would be used to provide access to this site. [The question was deferred to Engineering staff.]

Ms. Call inquired if a gas station or automobile repair facility exists in this area.

Ms. Call responded that there is no gas station, but an auto repair shop is located north on Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Rauch noted that the auto repair shop has a different zoning than this site.

Mr. Way re-stated his earlier question regarding an existing left turn lane from Woerner Temple to Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there is an existing left turn lane.

Mr. Way inquired if this site would be taking advantage of that.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there is an existing curbcut, which would be utilized for full access.

Mr. Way inquired if in terms of traffic movement, it is acceptable to make an early left turn from an existing left turn lane.

Mr. Hendershot responded affirmatively.

Applicant Presentation

Gus Shihab, 6618 Traquair Pl, Dublin OH 43016, stated that this development proposal is intended to house their law offices. He has practiced immigration law for nearly 30 years in downtown

Columbus, and they would like to relocate their practice to Dublin. Their current office space is limited. The proposed building will provide 6,000 square feet for their law practice, which will provide opportunity for them to grow their practice. They specialize in immigration employment, servicing technological companies, engineers, architects and colleges and universities. A portion of the proposed building will house an approximately 3,000-square-foot fitness center, which will contain showers.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired the reason the applicant is proposing to subdivide the site rather than developing the entire parcel.

Mr. Shihab responded that they are interested in developing only the corner site, which is attractive due to its prime location. To offset the cost of the site, the property owner has proposed to split the site, allowing the applicant to purchase the corner parcel for their proposed use; the owner would sell the remaining parcel to another user.

Mr. Way stated that the applicant is proposing two uses. He would suggest that rather than two buildings and potentially three tenants on the site, there could be one larger building that could accommodate three uses.

Mr. Shihab responded that the proposed L-shaped building fits their needs and their proposed uses. They could not afford the cost of developing the entire site.

Ms. Harter stated that staff referenced the possibility of adding a second floor to the proposed building. What is the applicant's intent in that regard? If it is to add a second floor, would it be possible, instead, to make the single-story building larger and utilize the entire site?

Mr. Shihab responded that they have no plans to add a second story. The two proposed uses, law office and fitness center, are not compatible in square footage or in use to one being located above the other. An L-shaped building on the corner would maximize the visibility for both uses.

Ms. Harter inquired the applicant's intent regarding signage.

Mr. Shihab responded that they would prefer wall signs. There is a precedence for wall signs within the area.

Ms. Call inquired what is the expectation for the two-car, rear-loaded garage.

Mr. Shihab responded that the garage space is proposed both as a parking convenience and storage space.

Charles Driscoll, The Edwards Land Company, 495 S. High Street, Ste. 150 Columbus OH 43215, indicated that he would address the site access issue. There is actually a significant access issue on the site. Although the Woerner Temple side works well, there is no way to access Emerald Parkway. The original intent was to have a right-in/right-out access, straddling the property line to the north, but a dumpster is located there. Consequently, they are proposing a right-in/right-out access entirely on their site, a distance from the dumpster. While staff agrees a problem exists, they do not agree on the solution. Staff would prefer to use the original right-in/right-out access, which runs into the dumpster, and determine a way to convince the property owner to move the dumpster and provide an easement. He does not believe that is an optimistic approach. Their proposed solution would involve moving the access point 12 feet onto their proposed site, where the site access will work appropriately. Staff, however, is concerned that the minor adjustment would impact the left turn lane for southbound traffic on Emerald Parkway to Woerner Temple Road. Currently, there is a stacking space of 279 feet, which accommodates 14 cars. Moving the

access 12 feet would continue to permit 13 cars to stack there. The turn lane on Emerald Parkway has existed for 25 years, so we are aware of the realistic impact. The City approved the site plan for the office building next door and the dumpster in that driveway without using the access provided on the original plan. If the original plan had been enforced with the previous development, the dumpster issue would not exist today. It is a problem for both this user and future users.

Mr. Hendershot stated the PDP shows the access point straddling the north property line. Although staff is not supportive of that location, they are respectful of the previous decision and approvals that were made. Shifting the access any further south would further perpetuate a condition that staff does not support. They are also concerned about potential traffic conflicts. If vehicle stacking is occurring here, a vehicle leaving the proposed site would introduce a conflict point. It would also be difficult for a vehicle leaving the site to traverse multiple lanes to access the southbound left turn lane. The existing location is not ideal and staff is not supportive of moving it even 12 feet further to the south.

Mr. Way inquired what was the possibility for moving the dumpster on the property to the north and accommodating the existing access.

Ms. Call inquired if the City had discussed that possibility with the property owner.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the City has not. However, it would be necessary to work with the property owner to relocate that dumpster.

Mr. Way inquired if there is another location on that site that would be appropriate for the dumpster.

Ms. Mullinax responded that there are multiple potential dumpster locations on the northern portion of the site.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the building to the north is already built.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Harter stated that she likes the proposed uses and is supportive of the proposed wall signs. She is in favor of four-sided architecture. She is concerned that the four parking spaces next to the patio would detract from the patio experience; landscaping will be important. She is not opposed to the proposed garage. She is concerned about the viability of the proposed northern parcel.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission often receives proposals where only a portion of a site is being planned for development, which makes it very difficult to understand the context. He is struggling with the issue of the proposed lot split, leaving one site where we do not know what might happen. That site is extremely small, and there is little that would fit on it along with any supportive parking. He believes the applicant's desire to embrace the corner is logical, and he likes the fact that the proposed building would be multi-tenant with a mix of uses. However, the parking provided near the fitness center is minimal. He is concerned about the distribution of the parking. He assumes the fitness center area will experience in/out traffic movements throughout the day, while the law office would experience a lower volume of traffic movement, so its parking could be more discreet. The parking distribution needs to be explored further. A significant amount of paving is proposed for the site, almost duplicative of the need. It is difficult to evaluate this proposal without understanding the entire site, so the Commission will need to be shown more about what would happen for the entire site, not just the corner site. The applicant has indicated

they would not be interested in adding a second story. Perhaps the building could be made larger, so that another tenant could be accommodated. The site planning components – parking, access and circulation – need to be explored further. He has no concerns with the conceptual architecture, and either a ground or building-mounted sign could be done well. While he could support the lot split, he would be able to provide better feedback if a proposal were provided that showed development of the full site.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees that there are concerns about the site layout, due to the adjacent, remnant site. While that parcel is outside the applicant's purview of their own project, it is the responsibility of the Commission to protect all the land within the City. Therefore, it will be necessary to provide some preliminary thoughts of how that remnant side potentially could develop in concert with the proposed project site. The conceptual architecture is attractive and consistent with the adjacent neighborhood. He agrees that the proposed parking distribution does not work well with the fitness center and present site layout. The volume of parking associated with the spaces needs to be considered more robustly. While either a wall-mounted or ground sign would be appropriate, it would make sense to associate the signs with the canopies. The architectural palette is attractive. He would advocate adding tie-backs to the canopies. The rotunda addressing the corner is significant. The proposed design appears to differentiate the rotunda from the adjoining walls, which will cause the roofline to be adjusted in that space, as well. Providing four-sided architecture will be important; presently, the architecture of the rear façade is lacking. He reiterated the concern that the remaining lot will be "pinched" to an unusable size.

Mr. Schneier stated that he understands the applicant's position about a second story; but he would encourage them to work with staff to identify a configuration with the drive aisles that does not force a second story, which would result in different economics. The architecture is good; the rotunda complements the area. He has no concerns with the proposed signage. He is concerned with the lot split. Legal issues could result, if the Commission approves the development plan for one lot that would also create an orphan lot on which, hypothetically, no project would work. Although a master plan may not resolve that issue, some thought must be dedicated to that potentially orphan lot. He commends the applicant on the design.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission frequently sees lots that are too pinched to meet Code requirements, and often, the Commission is either forced to deny the project or set a precedent by "cutting corners." That should not be the expectation here in Dublin. In Dublin, the parking is placed at the rear of buildings, so that the view from larger roads is not a sea of parking lots. Because this lot is adjacent to larger thoroughfares, the parking should be provided within the site interior. She is concerned about the parking provided within the interior of the building, not as it relates to the law office, but in view of potential future tenants of the building. The development text states that, "the maximum number of free-standing restaurants within the entire 118.7-acre development shall be limited to five, and there shall be no more than one gas station and one automobile repair facility." Although the applicant does not anticipate relocating elsewhere, if they were to outgrow the building and move, an automobile repair use could find the building attractive, due to its interior parking stalls. From a planning perspective, the Commission must consider future uses as well as present uses. Providing a master plan for the entire site is not the responsibility of the applicant, but from the perspective of the current property owner, having a feasible master plan could enable them to market the second site. Although full design details are not provided at this point in the development review process, a vision should be provided that indicates the second site will work.

Mr. Way stated that reference has been made to a need for four-sided architecture. The Commission would not be supportive of EIFS in the back at the ground level.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant needed any additional clarification.

Mr. Shihab referred to the reference regarding a potential future automobile repair use in the building. Could a limitation be added to the development on this site to exclude those uses?

Ms. Call stated that a Minor Text Modification to the development text would be necessary, which would impact 118 acres, not just this parcel.

Mr. Shihab inquired if there are other undeveloped lots within that 118-acre area.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff would look into that. However, text modifications to subareas or specific sites are possible, so it is possible to accommodate his suggestion.

Mr. Shihab referred to the concern expressed about the distance of the parking area from the fitness center. However, that should not be a concern for people seeking fitness. The Lifetime Fitness Center is very large and has an equally large parking area. This lot is only 1.86 acres and much of it is taken up by the pedestrian easement. The distance from the parking to the fitness center should not be significant. Staff advised them to place the building closer to the corner to eliminate parking visibility from the street. Redistributing any of the parking could result in some being closer to the street. Concerning the right-in/right-out access – they met with the property owner to the north 6 months ago. Since then, Mr. Driscoll has attempted to communicate with the property owner, who does not seem interested in working with them. An access should have been constructed when that property owner built his subdivision. Unfortunately, the City did not review that site from the perspective of an overall master plan, a need referenced by this Commission. They are faced with the consequences of that earlier decision. They are willing to move the access 12 feet to the south. He is a licensed professional engineer with the State of Ohio, and previously worked with the Ohio Department of Transportation. He does not believe that moving the driveway access 12 feet, which is half of a car length of 20 feet, would pose a traffic issue. The impact on the left-turn stacking lane and the need for vehicles exiting the site to traverse lanes to turn left would be minimal. If the City is able to convince the property owner to the left to facilitate a right-in/right-out on the adjoining property line, they would be willing to do that. However, they have no ability to force the property owner to do so and have proposed an alternative solution. In regard to the fitness center, the intent is that it be a neighborhood-oriented gym. It would be similar to a full-service, workout facility within a large hotel.

Ms. Call invited Mr. Hendershot to respond regarding an egress/ingress on Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Supelak inquired what would be ideal at this point, in view of the fact that the adjacent parcel could potentially have a second access point.

Mr. Hendershot stated that the requirements of Washington Township Fire Department in regard to number of access points must be considered, as well. City staff reviews proposed projects in concert with Washington Township Fire Department. City Transportation & Mobility staff were not supportive of shifting the access south 12 feet. As shown in the Preliminary Development Plan, it is not in an ideal location, because it is within the influence of that intersection. Staff understands the challenges with the property owner to the north not being willing to work with this applicant. However, the intent all along was for cross access to be provided, so that the northern access point on the north property could be utilized to turn southbound on Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Supelak inquired how best to engage with the northern property owner.

Ms. Call responded that perhaps the Commission could direct staff to work with the applicant and the adjacent parcel owner.

Mr. Hendershot stated that staff understands the challenges with the site layout and access points and access management, but they are also looking out for the public roadway network and health and safety of the public. In their professional opinion, staff would not be supportive of moving the access point.

Public Comment

Ms. Call stated that the Commission received an earlier public comment on this case. No additional public comments were made.

Ms. Call summarized that the Commission appreciates the proposal and believes the use would be complementary to the surrounding area. The Commission believes it can be designed to be an acceptable project on the parcel and looks forward to seeing the applicant at future steps in the development process.

2. Valentina’s Sign at 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 22-095MSP, Master Sign Plan

A proposed amendment to a Master Sign Plan for an awning edge sign, projecting sign, and wall signs for an existing tenant space on a 1.30-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with Bridge Park Avenue.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that in October 2021, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and approved a Minor Project for façade and site modifications to accommodate the Valentina’s restaurant. The approval included storefront alterations, enclosed and covered patio spaces, and streetscape improvements. The Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Block B allows for a variety of building-mounted sign types permitted throughout the Bridge Park development, including wall signs, projecting signs, placemaking art signs, awning signs, and canopy edge signs. Signs that meet the requirements of the approved MSP are permitted to submit directly for sign permits. Amendments to the MSP for specific tenants may come back to the Commission for review. The proposed sign is a combination of two sign types – an awning sign and a canopy edge sign. Canopy edge signs are channel letter signs that are mounted on top, underneath, or to the face of a horizontal canopy structure. Awning signs are generally described as sign graphics printed on the canvas of a solid awning. The proposed amended Master Sign Plan is for an awning edge sign, a canopy edge sign and a projecting sign.

Awning Edge Sign

Proposed is a 42-square-foot (SF) awning edge sign on the west elevation of the tenant space. The sign will be mounted on the northernmost awning of the tenant space, adjacent to the northwest corner of the restaurant. The sign will be mounted at a maximum height of 12 feet – 10 inches from established grade. The inside surface of the 2.5-inch deep reverse channel letters is painted a dark yellow-green color (PMS 417 C), with the exterior of the letters painted white. The sign will be internally illuminated with exposed LED neon lights within the channel letters.

Staff is supportive of the proposed awning edge sign and amendment to the Master Sign Plan. This is a sign type that is not seen elsewhere within the District. It will contribute to the vibrancy of the District.

The next two signs would be permitted to advance to Building Permitting, as they do meet the MSP requirements.

Canopy Edge Sign

Also proposed is a 42-SF canopy edge sign, which would be located on a 2-inch tall raceway. The canopy sign design matches the proposed awning edge sign. Below the canopy edge sign is a 2.3 SF secondary canopy edge sign that will be stud mounted to the face of the canopy and painted white. The two signs would be considered a single canopy edge sign and meet the maximum 50 SF for canopy edge signs. The secondary sign will not be illuminated.

Projecting Sign

Also proposed is a 5-SF projecting sign on the east end of the approved canopy. The projecting sign will hang below the canopy and will be oriented east-west along the sidewalk on the north side of the tenant space. The sign will project approximately 1.5 feet below the canopy, providing a clearance of 8 feet–7 inches, meeting the minimum 8-foot requirement per the MSP. The projecting sign will be painted Metallic Grey (PMS 446 C) to match the metal canopy and will be internally illuminated through the .5-inch white acrylic push-through letters.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition, that the awning edge sign be permitted only for this tenant.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant had no presentation.

Commission Questions

Ms. Harter inquired if the awning on the front facade would obscure the street number on the Bridge Park Avenue facade.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the street number is located close to the building entrance. It would not be located on the metal canopy.

Ms. Harter inquired if the street numbers are required to be visible to both pedestrians and passing traffic.

Randy Roberty, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 West Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, OH 43215, stated that the renderings provided in the packet were earlier views. The updated rendering with signs is shown on the presentation screen. The street number is located on the building.

Mr. Supelak inquired if consideration was given to vertical signage on one of the brick piers on the Riverside Drive elevation.

Mr. Roberty responded that based on the scale of the space and the height of the building above, signage on the piers would appear to be for the space above. It would not relate well to the tenant space or the façade. It is technically not an awning. It is part of the actual building footprint space below with walls, foundations and windows. It is a roof disguised to look like an awning. As reflected from earlier discussions, the goal was to make this addition feel less like a permanent addition. The roof used, although permanent, has an awning aesthetic. It is a membrane roof with fabric draped over it.

Mr. Way stated that there is a bar that runs along the canopy, to which the letters are attached. The bar appears to be painted to match the awning.

Mr. Roberty responded that it is a support structure. The intent is to disguise it to the extent possible. It blends into the canopy and the letters appear to float.

Ms. Harter inquired if an attempt is being made to align the letters with the lines of the awning.

Mr. Roberty responded that the letters are disconnected from the lines; the letters are a different width than the repetitive stripes. The graphic used by the sign company is misleading, but the renderings provided in the packet are an actual reflection of the aesthetic.

Mr. Supelak inquired if, in the event the bar painted to match the canopy stripe rhythm does not turn out as anticipated, the applicant would replace the paint with only one of the associated colors.

Mr. Roberty responded that if the results should turn out to be awkward, it would be modified.

Mr. Supelak inquired the reason for the sign box below the canopy.

Mr. Roberty responded that the lower sign relates to the pedestrian scale. The two larger signs provide vehicular view.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the striped canopy material.

Mr. Roberty responded that the canopy is a conventionally framed roof and wall, metal stud bearing, with a membrane roof, plywood roof deck. The striped material is a Sunbrella canvas awning fabric draped over the roof system.

Mr. Way inquired how difficult it would be to replace the canvas material when needed.

Mr. Roberty responded that it would be a straightforward, one-for-one replacement – a simple awning swap.

Ms. Harter inquired if, due to its slope, snow lingering on the awning might pose a hazard to guests.

Mr. Roberty responded that he does not believe it will be an issue. Most other canopy signs are sloped, as well; although typically concealed by a flat edge, snowdrift occurs behind the signs.

Ms. Call noted that most canopies do not have letters blocking the edge of the slope.

Mr. Roberty responded that the angle the sign rests upon is not flush; it is elevated. There is a gap below it, and water can run free below it.

Ms. Harter inquired if repair is needed, who would be called for service.

Mr. Roberty responded that their awning vendor, Capital City Awning, would be contacted.

Ms. Call stated that some of the renderings have additional text on four of the signs. She assumes that text would not be present on the awnings.

Mr. Roberty responded that is correct.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that the signs are attractive, and he likes the proposed construction. However, he is not convinced the better solution would not be a vertical sign on the brick pier further down; it would extend the space. Currently, all the signage is right at the corner.

Mr. Way stated that it initially seemed strange to put the signage on the awning, but he now better understands the proposal, and it will be a one-time type of approval. Because there is a consistency for edge signs along the street, although not on awnings, the proposed sign could be considered consistent. As staff noted, this is a unique sign, designed to make this corner special. There has been a significant amount of discussion about making the corner unique. He is supportive of the sign, which is consistent, yet interesting and will make this corner special.

Mr. Schneier stated he also is supportive of the sign. It is the right look for this corner, where the pedestrian bridge lands. The sign blends with the street, yet is unique and inviting. It provides the kind of energy that the City is attempting to achieve here. He has no issues with the sign.

Mr. Harter stated that, initially, she had concerns about the stripes and use of color. However, per the discussion, she likes the color tones, the art, the surprise it provides, and the consistency with other street signage.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with fellow Commissioners. She appreciates that the approval would only be for this tenant. The Commission likes master sign plans, which permit members to look at the signage in totality. One of the challenges with this proposal is that the awning is asked to be an awning, structural architecture and also a sign base. If we had looked at it earlier, the awning would have been considered a marquis sign for this corner, and it probably would not have met sign requirements, such as square footage. She likes the vertical suggestion. However, the proposed sign is cohesive, and for that reason, she is supportive.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one (1) condition:
(1) That the awning edge sign is permitted only for this tenant and will not apply to other tenant spaces within Block B.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0]

3. The Corners, Phase 2 at PID: 273-013223, 22-098FDP, Final Development Plan

A proposal for construction of a ±7,100-square-foot commercial building to accommodate a medical office tenant and a future commercial tenant. The 13.5-acre site, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) – The Corners, is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation:

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for The Corners development. The 1.48-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Frantz Road within The Corners Planned Unit Development (PUD), Phase 2, Subarea B2. The total area of the PUD is approximately 13.5 acres. The site is located directly north of The Field of Corn (Sam and Eulalia Frantz Park) Public Park and art installation. The City of Dublin Department of Development initiated a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in May 2018 to identify a suitable developer for collaboration on the 10-acre site retained by the City. The Daimler Group was the selected developer and partnered with the City on The Corners development. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the Zoning/Preliminary Development Plan

(Z/PDP) in September 2019, to establish the development text, uses, phasing and subareas, site layout and circulation, parking location and amounts, and sign requirements. City Council approved the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan on December 2, 2019 from OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District to PUD, Planned Unit Development for the future Corners development, to permit up to 70,000 SF of commercial and office uses and a public park. A Final Plat was approved by City Council on April 13, 2020 to subdivide the site into three lots. The Final Development Plan (FDP) and Conditional Use for the Corners Phase 1 were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on July 9, 2020 for ±23,500-square-feet of commercial space in three buildings, approximately 2,000 SF of patio space, a 3.8 acre public park, and associated site improvements. The Corners development includes the following four subareas:

- Subarea A - a 3.8-acre public park – approved in Phase I
- Subarea B1 - 23,500 SF commercial use in three buildings - approved in Phase I, and 23,500 SF commercial use in two future buildings – future approval required
- Subarea B2 - 7,090 SF proposed office building in one building – current request for approval
- Subarea B3 - 12,000 SF future office in one building – future approval required

Subareas B1, B2, and B3 are limited to a total of 70 percent lot coverage across Subarea B. The total acreage for Subarea B is 9.67 acres (421,225 SF); the permitted total lot coverage for Subarea B is 294,858 square feet (SF). The developed areas of B1 and the proposed area of B2 will total 221,985 SF or 52%, leaving a remainder of 72,873 SF of undeveloped and unapproved areas in Subarea B to be developed and not exceed the 70% maximum lot coverage. Access to Rings Road is obtained from the existing private drive immediately east of the property. The proposed building has frontage along Rings Road; the parking lot will be internal to the site, between the building and the public park. The density requirements for the proposed building, setbacks and minimum yard requirements are met. The applicant is proposing 38 parking spaces, which will include 2 handicapped spaces; only 28 spaces are required. The development text requires all parking within Subareas A and B and the adjacent park to be shared. The applicant is required to provide cross access easements for shared parking and public access to open space in accordance with the approved development text and infrastructure agreement. Existing sidewalks are located along the eastern and northern property lines. The applicant is proposing sidewalk connections to all building entrances as required by the development text. The development text also requires a pedestrian connection to the park and open space area from existing sidewalks and shared use paths, which has not been provided. Staff recommends the plans be revised to include two additional sidewalk connections to the shared-use path and the public park. The Code requires pedestrian lighting along all sidewalks, which has not yet been provided. Currently, the applicant is utilizing the same building-mounted and site lighting approved in Subarea B1.

The proposed materials include stone veneer and Hardie board as the primary building materials, aluminum storefront windows, and a mix of asphalt shingles and standing seam metal. The proposed materials match Phase I materials while introducing variation with the proposed roof materials. Staff is supportive of the scale, massing, and the amount of balanced fenestration of the proposed architecture. The maximum permitted building height in Subarea B2 is 40 feet, which is met. Additional architectural features, such as window muntins, canopies, and exterior lighting approved on Phase 1 buildings are reflected in the proposed architecture. Asphalt shingle is permitted by the development text, but the weight is required to be over 325 pounds. The applicant will need to revise the materials to include a shingle with an increased weight. The application meets all landscaping requirements for interior landscaping and screening for vehicular use areas, tree plantings, and site plantings. As a condition of approval, street trees should be planted along

the private access drive prior to building occupancy. Additional foundation plantings should be added to fill in the areas surrounding the building where plantings are not shown, and should be at least 42 inches wide. Thematic fencing is proposed at both corners of the building along Rings Road, which is consistent with the fencing approved for Subarea B1. Staff is recommending a vehicular screening hedge and tree treatment be implemented on the south side of the parking lot. Staff recommends the two proposed bike racks be located closer to the shared use path and the bench be located closer to the building between the tenant spaces. The development text includes a Sign Regulation and Guidelines Document, which outlines examples of high quality sign design. Additionally, the applicant is required to obtain approval of the proposed signs from the developer (Daimler) and the architect (Bean Architects). Two wall signs are proposed for the primary building tenant: a 26-SF canopy edge sign facing the Rings Road frontage and an 8-SF sign for the main entry, internal to the site. The canopy edge sign is internally illuminated by white, 3-inch LED channel letters with acrylic faces attached to the canopy. The proposed sign area and secondary copy meet the development text requirements. The height of the canopy edge sign was not provided, so the plans will need to be revised to include the height, ensuring the permitted maximum height of 15 feet is met. The proposal includes a proposed wall sign location for the future tenant sign adjacent to the main entry. The future tenant sign will be required to meet the approved development text, subject to staff approval. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Final Development Plan with 10 conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Vance Thornton, Advance Construction, Inc, 9313 Lake of the Woods Drive, Galena, Ohio and Taghreed As-Sanie, DDS, business owner, were present. Mr. Thornton stated that due to an unexpected situation, the applicant and the architect were not present. As the contractor on the project, he will answer questions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired the reason that the entrance to the parking area was moved since the initial concept.

Ms. Mullinax responded that although the entrance to the site from the private drive deviates from the Preliminary Plan, staff is supportive of the proposed location. The access shown in the Preliminary Development Plan was on the corner of the private drive, which would make it challenging for fire truck maneuverability.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the landscape box depicted in the presentation.

Ms. Mullinax responded that staff is recommending the same landscape treatment for the vehicular perimeter screening, with trees replicated next to the handicapped spaces.

Mr. Way referred to the proposed signage. The copy states "Dental Reflections Dublin." Is the word "Dublin" part of the business name?

Dr. As-Sanie responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the dumpster is in the correct location.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively, and there are no issues. The applicant is proposing to use the same stone reflected on the building, as well as the same board and batten material for the gate. The dumpster will be screened with landscaping.

Mr. Way referred to the walkway connection to the north from the parking lot. There is no pedestrian island or point of connection within the parking lot. However, the parking layout

indicates space would be available to pull the parking to the west and east and allow room for an island where the walk is proposed.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the Preliminary Development Plan shows the parking area located against the existing sidewalk, which extends east to west, and staff has recommended a sidewalk connection. She deferred to the applicant to respond to the suggestion regarding a landscape island.

Mr. Way referred to the graphic depicting the sidewalk on the north side, and inquired if it would be possible to add a 6-foot island in the parking lot by locating the parking 3 feet to the east and 3 feet to the west.

Ms. Mullinax responded that she believes it would be possible but would defer to the applicant to comment further.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant had reviewed the conditions and considers them acceptable. The applicant responded affirmatively.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the proposed plan complements what the City has already approved in this area. The materials are interesting but also complement what has been approved thus far. He is generally supportive of the conditions but believes they may need some clarification.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is an attractive, well thought-out building and makes good use of the site. He believes some small improvements are needed, including the pathway connections. He agrees that if the sidewalk will connect to the parking lot, adjustments of the parking space locations should be made to provide a point of arrival within the parking lot. The landscaping seems to be lacking in the proposed foundation landscaping, but staff has addressed that in the recommended conditions. While the stone is attractive, he would not be adverse to a lighter, buff tone color.

Mr. Way stated that staff has identified and addressed most of the concerns, including the lightness of the foundation landscaping. The proposed bike rack location also should be a landscaped area. He advocates for an area to be added to the parking lot as a reception point for the walkway to the north. Much of the landscape plan consists of perennial plants; he would recommend evergreen plant materials be added to provide balanced seasonal landscaping.

Ms. Harter stated that the proposed project complements the new development located nearby. She is supportive of the proposed conditions.

Ms. Call stated that she concurs with fellow Commissioners' comments. She is not typically supportive of additional parking, but the amount proposed is appropriate in this location. She believes that if the pedestrian walkway were separated with one section located at the entrance, it could be used by those waiting on patients. In cases such as this with a circular drive aisle, it would be good to identify areas for snow stacking, ensuring that the landscaping is protected. She believes the proposed plan is consistent with what we were looking for in the area.

Mr. Way inquired how the base of the light pole in the parking lot would be addressed to provide protection from the parking.

Ms. Rauch responded that perhaps it could be moved to the proposed parking island.

Mr. Way inquired if it were located within the island, the photometrics would be negatively impacted.

Ms. Rauch responded that the measurements could be re-run to ensure there would be no issues.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has recommended two modifications to the conditions. [Discussion of the modifications ensued.]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant has any objections to the proposed modified conditions. The applicant indicated that they had no objection to the conditions.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following ten (10) conditions:

- 1) The applicant extend the sidewalk on the west side of the site to connect with the shared-use path, to the parking lot to the public park, and work with staff on additional pedestrian path circulation throughout the site, prior to submitting for building permits;
- 2) The bike racks be located closer to the shared use path immediately west of the site, and the bench shown on the renderings be provided between the tenant entries;
- 3) The applicant revise the plans to demonstrate that the canopy edge sign meets the height requirement, and the future tenant sign meets the development text and sign design guidelines, subject to staff approval;
- 4) The applicant revise the proposal to select an asphalt roof shingle of similar design and color that is 325 lbs. or greater in weight;
- 5) The applicant add pedestrian lighting to walkways throughout the site, relocate parking lot light fixtures to the parking lot island, and revise the photometric plan to ensure the foot-candle requirements are met, subject to staff approval prior to building permitting;
- 6) The applicant revise the landscape plan prior to building permitting to include:
 - a. specifications for the plantings around the dumpster enclosure,
 - b. foundation plantings at least 42 inches wide to fill in the areas surrounding the building where plantings are not shown and should be,
 - c. hedge and tree treatment adjacent the handicap parking area,
 - d. clarification of the site plantings labeled "TI and TH" and make appropriate substitutions should that not be an appropriate planting material; and
 - e. incorporate evergreens to ensure year-round landscaping on site.
- 7) The applicant modify the location of the fencing out of any utility lines and easements, and provide a detail of the fencing and landscaping along the Rings Road frontage, subject to staff approval;
- 8) All street trees be planted along the access drive (east side) prior to the occupancy of the proposed building and that written documentation be provided with the building permit submission that the street trees would be planted by the developer;
- 9) The applicant provide cross access easements for shared parking and public access to open space in accordance with the development text and infrastructure agreement, which should be recorded prior to occupancy; and

- 10) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that:

- Staff is working on an alternative method for sharing digital meeting packets with board and commission members.
- There are currently two vacant Planning positions. Until new hires have been completed, consultant assistance will be utilized.
- Mr. Way stated that the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Planning Conference is scheduled September 29-30, 2022 in Louisville, Ky. At that conference, a Planning Commissioners training session will be provided.
Ms. Rauch noted that she would email conference details to the Commissioners.
- Review of the remaining 2022 PZC meeting dates will be added to the 09-15-22 PZC agenda.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, September 15, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council