



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 5, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the September 5, 2024 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, Kim Way, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin
Jason Deschler, Jamey Chinnock, Gary Alexander

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Thaddeus Boggs, Rati Singh

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the meeting documents and approval of the August 8, 2024 meeting minutes.

Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Alexander, abstain; Mr. Deschler, abstain.

[Motion carried 5-0 with 2 abstentions.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) 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 explained the hearing process that would be followed.

Ms. Call swore in staff and audience members who anticipated providing testimony.

Ms. Call indicated that one case is eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case #24-101AFDP/CU, Yogi's Bar and Grill, and inquired if any PZC member would request the case be moved to the regular agenda for discussion.

No member requested the case be moved to the regular agenda.

CONSENT CASE

- **24-101AFDP/CU – Yogi's Bar and Grill, 3880 Hard Road**

A proposal for exterior modifications and an outdoor dining patio expansion for an existing bar and restaurant. The 17.08-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, NE Quad and is located northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Hard Road.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the Conditional Use with the following conditions:

- 1) The patio amenities are properly stored out of view from the general public during non-peak outdoor dining season.
- 2) The umbrellas contain no logos, signage, names or advertising.

and of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant continues to work with staff on the proposed relocation of the bike racks to be incorporated along the Yogi's Bar & Grill tenant storefront, subject to staff review and approval prior to building permitting.
- 2) That the fence specification, patio furniture and other amenities be compatible with the existing conditions of the site, subject to staff review and approval at building permitting.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

CASE REVIEW

- **24-099INF – Bridge Park, Block H**

An Informal Review and feedback on amendments to a previously approved development consisting of 42 single-family attached units and associated site improvements on two parcels. The combined 2.24-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is located southeast of John Shields Parkway and Mooney Street.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Exec. V. President of Development, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that the blocks proposed for development are the last of the original Bridge Park blocks. The Final Development Plan (FDP) was previously approved in 2017, but many changes have occurred since then. As developer and contractor, they have taken another look at what is right for this site. Before they submit a request for an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP), they are bringing this request for an Informal Review to the Commission to obtain their feedback on the proposed changes. The site includes the last two blocks on the northern end of Bridge Park. This is the place a transition begins to occur from the urban core, which includes John Shields Parkway to the east where the Casto and Pulte communities are located. This is where the scale changes. He is interested in breaking down the scale of these buildings into a more traditional townhouse form than they have previously constructed. They like what they have built to date, but the developments are non-porous; you cannot see through the large block of townhomes. As a developer, they recognize that they are good at mixed-use development; they are not as good at single-family development. They looked for a partner to help with the proposed development and have identified Fischer Homes, who is experienced in building townhomes. They will take an

existing traditional product and make it Bridge Park-appropriate. The proposed development will utilize the same materials that already exist in Bridge Park and create a transition. The existing site is currently grass fields. There are significant topography changes in the site as it extends away from the river and up John Shields Parkway; every one of the buildings along the roadway steps up approximately two feet. The proposed site plan includes some meaningful changes in the FDP. The blocks have been broken apart, and there will now be individual single-family townhouse units. All the units will have garages at the back, and the buildings will not be connected. The vehicular circulation will be different than in the previous blocks. There now will be ability to see into the interior, but it will be controlled. Landscape fencing will be used to block the view. Another significant modification is the curbcut. The existing curbcut is in the middle of the blocks, because they previously had proposed one large building, with one ingress/egress. If that curbcut were maintained, there would be nothing facing Larimer Street, because there is insufficient room with this product type to achieve that. Moving the curbcut to the east will provide ability to place a 3-unit building in the middle of the block. All streets will be faced with the front doors of units. John Shields Parkway will remain the primary roadway; Dale and Mooney Streets will be secondary roadways; Larimer Street will be tertiary in priority. The building materials of the original H1 blocks will be applied to traditional masonry townhomes, maintaining similar Juliette balconies and using white Nichiha. Some of the townhome units originally proposed included rooftop balconies. The option remains to do that, but it would not be necessary for all unit owners to opt into that option. The rooftop units could be seen from John Shields Parkway but not from the interior of Bridge Park due to the limited distance in view. Rather than connecting the building foundations, the buildings will be separated. The break in the buildings will be addressed by creating a masonry wall that hides view of the automobile court to the rear. He stated that Crawford Hoying is seeking Commission feedback to inform their proposed AFDP before advancing to that next step.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that an Informal Review provides opportunity for an applicant to receive feedback from the Commission prior to a formal review. The applicant is seeking feedback on proposed changes to the previously approved FDP and seeking any additional guidance. The considerations tonight are general site layout and access, along with conceptual architecture and integration within the surrounding areas. No determination is required for an Informal Review. At the next step, the applicant may apply for an amendment to the FDP.

The combined ±2.2-acre site consists of two parcels zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood. It is located south of John Shields Parkway, between Mooney Street and Dale Drive, and bisected by Larimer Street. Both parcels are located in Block H and were previously granted approval for Phases H2 and H3 of the block development, with access to each via Larimer Street. The southern parcel (Phase H2) is 1.09 acres in area with frontage on Larimer Street, Dale Drive, and Mooney Street. The northern parcel (Phase H3) is 1.15 acres in size with frontage on all four roads including John Shields Parkway. The site is centrally located within the BSD-SRN Neighborhood District. This District provides a significant opportunity for a well-planned and designed neighborhood with special attention to location and character of buildings, streets and open spaces. John Shields Parkway is identified as a greenway intended to provide linear greenspaces and create bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Sawmill Center Neighborhood. John Shields Parkway, which extends along the north edge of the site has already been dedicated with the original approval of Block H, with the greenway owned and maintained by the City. In

July 2017, the Commission approved a Site Plan Review and Waiver Review for a residential development of 64 condominiums in Block H. Phase H1 with 23 townhomes was completed in 2019. Larimer Street was also constructed as part of that project, and included sidewalks, on-street parking and curb cuts to serve Phases H2 and H3. The Commission strongly supported the previously proposed details and architecture variations, which created a unique and diverse façade within the BSD. The applicant's vision for Phase H2 and H3 has now changed. One of the changes is the townhomes; the second change is relocation of the access points. The applicant is proposing individual townhome units with screen walls between.

The following questions have been provided for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed layout and access?
- 2) Does the Commission support the building design and architectural elements and how they fit within the intended character of the area?
- 3) Does the Commission support the proposed streetscape?
- 4) Any additional considerations from the Commission?

Commission Questions

Mr. Way stated that each unit will have a 2-car garage. Is there space in front of the garage door for additional parking?

Mr. Hunter responded that there is enough space behind the 2-car garage door for a car in one direction of travel.

Ms. Call inquired if the one lane of traffic is large enough only for a passenger vehicle or if it would accommodate emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hunter responded that they have not yet had conversations with the Washington Township Fire Department regarding emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Way inquired if the parking behind the garage door would be considered visitor parking.

Mr. Hunter responded that it could be, but there is some parking available around the blocks, as well.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the changed vision for these blocks creates many dead-end streets. Did they explore other ideas besides the screening wall solution?

Mr. Hunter responded that with the previous design, the connection of the two buildings was difficult due to the significant grade change on the site. Connecting the building foundations would have been complicated and expensive. Even in 2017, those units were expensive. Today's market does not support that expense, so they looked for a solution that would not sacrifice appearance but would be less complicated. Other than joining the two foundations, they are open to any feedback. He thought the masonry wall would be a good way to address the separation; however, there is opportunity for further design at this early stage.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the color scheme looks heavy and dark. He requested clarification of the applicant's selection in articulation, materials and color scheme.

Mr. Hunter stated that the rendering is pulling all the materials that were on the original buildings as a way to make it similar to but not a copy of the existing buildings. If the color scheme feels too dark, however, other materials can be selected. They could look at materials elsewhere in Bridge Park.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the grading and the purpose of the walls. Will the grade fall the same way in the parking lot as it falls in front of the site, or are the walls being used as retaining walls to change the grade between the outside and the inside?

Mr. Hunter responded that they do not yet have a full grading plan.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is simply trying to find a rationale for the walls, not advising what they should/should not do.

Mr. Hunter responded that the purpose of the walls is simply to hide the parking behind the buildings.

Mr. Garvin stated that he believes the proposed walls are a good way to shield the parking. He noted that there were some public comments provided for this case concerning greenspace and lighting.

Ms. Call asked that staff clarify the expectations of the John Shields greenway.

Ms. Singh stated that the expectations of the John Shields Greenway are to connect and provide interconnected greenspaces for a green corridor envisioned for the District. The designated greenway on the northern side of this site will provide a pedestrian/bicycle connection to the east side of the City.

Mr. Garvin inquired the setback distance of the grassy area. Is it 50 feet?

Mr. Hunter responded that he believes it is 50 feet.

Mr. Garvin inquired what building material would transition from the brick on the back side of the townhome units.

Mr. Hunter responded that at this point, that siding material is yet to be determined.

Mr. Garvin noted that it would be important to use a high-quality material.

Mr. Deschler inquired if gates were permitted so that the public could be blocked from parking in the interior parking spaces.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Code does not address that. The nature of Bridge Street is to be open, walkable and have permeable spaces. Staff would look into that further if it were to be part of the development proposal.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there would be public parking for non-residents within the internal area.

Mr. Hunter responded that is not contemplated. There is plenty of available on-street parking. The intent is that the residents would use the internal core parking. Visitors would be expected to use street parking.

Mr. Deschler referred to Block H1 and inquired if there are any current problems with non-residents parking in those spaces.

Mr. Hunter responded that he is not aware of any issues.

Mr. Deschler inquired if consideration had been given to varying the heights of the parapets in the proposal.

Mr. Hunter responded that it could be considered.

Mr. Deschler inquired if all the units would have a balcony, or if it was an option available to the owners.

Mr. Hunter responded that it is currently contemplated as an owner option. Some units might have them, others not. It is an item on which they would like Commission feedback.

Mr. Deschler referred to an existing example of 3-story townhomes at Rich and Front Streets in the City of Columbus. Some of the townhome units have balconies, others do not. He believes that some order will be needed in any differentiation in balconies.

Ms. Harter inquired if parcel deliveries would be to the front doors, not the rear of the units.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if there would be room for benches or another amenity in front of the screen wall.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. There is more breathing room on the corners with this plan than there was with the previous plan. There is a possibility that they could be pocket parks.

Ms. Harter inquired if there would be sufficient space by the front doors that could serve as a fenced space for the owners, in which they could add their own landscaping.

Mr. Hunter responded that typically, a homeowners association (HOA) controls the landscaping of the community. It is an interesting idea, but he does not know if it would be viable. There is plenty of space, however.

Ms. Harter inquired if the trash receptacles for each unit would be located in the garages.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. On trash day, the receptacles would be moved outside for collection.

Mr. Way stated that in the dead-end areas, the dimension from the garage door to the curb is 18-20 feet, which gives very little room to back a car out of the garage. If there are 2 cars in the garage, he is not sure there is adequate maneuverability.

Ms. Call stated that there appear to be 13 units that would have that situation.

Mr. Hunter responded that he does not recall it being that tight. He believed the space was closer to 26 feet. With a car 16-18 feet in length, there would be just enough room for another car to pass. However, this plan has not been engineered at this point. He is looking for general support from the Commission, then they will work through the issues involved in making the plan work.

Ms. Call stated that in 2017, there were 64 units, 23 of which were built. There are now 42 units remaining for this proposal. Is an additional unit being created with this plan?

Mr. Hunter responded that he is not aware of that answer.

Ms. Call reminded the public that at this point, the plan is in the initial design stage.

Mr. Boggs noted that as a matter of clarification, with this particular application, although this is an Informal Review, the next step could be the final review step, as it is an AFDP. The FDP is already approved.

Public Comment

There were no public comments regarding the case.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is generally supportive of the proposed amendments to the plan. The changes will open up the views to the interior of the site, so the architecture of the rear elevation should be as high quality as the front elevation. At the next step, more clarity of the articulation of the elevations will be important. In regard to the walls and dead-end corridors, more study is needed of the grading issues. He believes the architecture of this proposal is more attractive than the previous. John Shields is the bookend of Bridge Park, so it would be nice to have something different and special there. Something special also could happen in the space between the courtyard of Block H and this development.

Ms. Harter stated that she likes the garages at the rear with the balconies on top. She would recommend that the front courtyard of the units permit landscaping added by the individual unit owners. It would enhance the street. Adding some heavier landscaping would make a difference. She likes the proposed architecture. Perhaps if a unit owner does not want a rooftop patio, there would be the opportunity for them to have solar units. She believes the screen wall should be made special or unique, perhaps by adding art.

Mr. Way that he believes the site design is fine. There are some functional issues to work through. Two things stand out that are different from the previous project that has already been built. One is the corners. The beauty of the previous project was how the corners were resolved. They embrace the urban environment. The permeability of what they are now proposing erodes strong corners. This is mentioned as a transitional site. He thinks of it as the opposite. It could be considered a gateway site coming into Bridge Park. The corners and the John Shields frontage provide an important edge to the entire development, so the character and quality of that edge needs to be something special. He believes the proposed architecture is bland. Phase 1, which is already built, offers some real interest. Architecturally, the urban design does all the right things to support Bridge Park. These subsequently proposed phases are not living up to that. As the gateway edge to this part of the development, they should do so even better. He believes they need to think of this site as a gateway piece, not just a transition to the east.

Mr. Garvin stated that he supports the proposed changes including garage parking rather than street parking. He supports the use of the brick building material. He believes pocket parks on the corners would not only be a nice amenity for the unit owners but also provide visual interest for the public.

Mr. Deschler stated that he agrees with other members' comments. On the John Shields edge, he believes something significant is needed to add interest to the gap walls. He is supportive of the proposed amendment to the FDP with some additional modifications.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is very supportive of the proposed layout. The housing is a typical urban form, but they have created a successful variety. He would not take the variety too far. The applicant is already stepping the units and differentiating the units. It is possible to "read" the separate units. That was an issue with the earlier buildings and the reason he found them somewhat chaotic. It is possible to see the row house type of units but with variation. His reservation is with the back elevations. Although the units have been articulated on the front, there is no articulation and variation of the rear facades. He is not so concerned with the material change, but every elevation and window pattern around the courtyard should not be the same. The effort invested in the front elevations is not yet evidenced on the rear of the units. As a design professional, he would not articulate the corners heavily. These are not major streets where vehicles are turning. There is building mass, and the street wall is being continued in both locations. It is not similar to the corner of John Shields and Riverside Drive, which would be an important point to differentiate. He could see more articulation on the side units in those locations, recognizing the importance. At the same time, it would erode the idea of the continuity of the row houses. The continuity is quite successful and desirable. He would prefer that it was possible for there to be access to the interior space from John Shields. John Shields Parkway is the most important part of the urban design, not the corners. It would be nice to be able to experience

walking from the greenway back to the rear of the units. He is very support of the proposed amendment.

Ms. Call stated that there are a lot of buildings that are boxes and rectangles in Bridge Park, with which we have attempted to provide some deviation. Here, we are adapting a large form factor, color scheme and material scheme into a different product. She struggles with that. She appreciates the obfuscation of the parking. She is concerned about the parking and circulation. She would look carefully at the rear circulation. One of the ways to relax that situation is by returning to the original unit count and deleting the additional proposed unit. It would free up a little more space within the block. She noted that there are no landscape water features in this block. There are two opportunities in this block to do something remarkable. John Shields Parkway plays to the applicant's favor with this site. She appreciates the need to deviate from the mass form foundation to the individual unit foundation. She noted that no formal action is needed tonight and inquired if Mr. Hunter would like any additional clarification.

Mr. Hunter responded that they needed no additional clarification.

- **24-106CP – Irish Village, 5745 Avery Road, 6363 Woerner Temple Road, & PID 274-000032**

A Concept Plan review and feedback for a mixed-use development consisting of +/-30,000 square feet of commercial space, 125-150 residential units, and associated site improvements. The combined +/-11.76-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District, TF, Technology Flex District, and PUD, Planned Unit Development District – Woerner Temple Park and Pool and is located southwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road and Avery Road.

Applicant Presentation

Christopher Ingram, attorney, Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP, 52 East Gay Street, Columbus, stated that he is present on behalf of the applicant. He is joined tonight by Michael Fite, Seve Stavroff, Kevin McCauley and Greg Chillog. This is the second time this project has been before the Commission. Some members present tonight were not present at the previous Informal Review. Their proposal is for a mixed-use development for an approximately 12-acre site at the southwest corner of Avery Road and Woerner-Temple Road. They are proposing to redevelop an existing industrial use and vacant land with a mixed-use development comprised of approximately 30,000 SF of commercial space and 125-150 residential units. Since the last hearing, they have held a third meeting with the Ballantrae Community Association and made revisions in the proposed Concept Plan, which is before the Commission tonight. Mr. Fite will describe the changes that were made in the plan.

Michael Fite, 6689 Dublin Center Drive, Dublin, stated that they had three goals when they started this project. One was to take an industrial use and a vacant piece of property and turn it into a vibrant community. They believe they have done that. Along the way, they developed another goal, which was to extend the charm of the Ballantrae development out to this community and Avery Road, providing a type of gateway to the Ballantrae community on one side only. They have attempted to understand and embrace the Community Plan. They believe they have done it with the proposed mix of uses – retail, commercial and residential. The Concept Plan is a refinement of the Informal Review plan, implementing the Commission's previous comments. He reviewed the changes made:

- The southeast corner of their property is no longer included in the Concept Plan, because they did not resolve contract terms with a landscape company. With the absence of that land piece, the curb cut is pushed closer to Woerner Temple.
- In the Informal Review, they showed the same location for the road extending from Woerner Temple down past the pool. While the road is in the same general location, in the revised plan, there is a piece of the property owned by the City of Dublin. They have been working with staff on a resolution of the issue.
- The height of some of the buildings has been reduced. On Avery and Woerner-Temple Road the buildings will be 2-story, 35 feet in height, consistent with the approved height in Ballantrae and the existing zoning. They had mentioned with the Informal Review that they would like opportunity to increase the height to 45 feet, 3 stories, in certain locations. They have designated the places in which 3-story buildings are proposed to add architectural interest to the site and to add more units, which will make the development more economically viable.
- Setbacks along Woerner-Temple and Avery roads. The Ballantrae resident group has expressed concern about this. In their revised plan, the setback is 50 feet. There are some opportunities for patios within that space.
- 5 acres of the 12-acre development is comprised of various types of greenspace (setbacks, right-of-way and yards).
- In the Informal Review, all the streets were private streets. Now, there is a mix of private streets and public streets built to public standards. Open space and public right-of-ways total 8 acres.
- The proposed architecture varies from 2-story to 3-story structures, utilizing some stone to make it cohesive with the Ballantrae development. There will be porches and gables.
- As mentioned last time, the Concept Plan now includes two drive-through businesses, such as a Starbucks or Graeters. These uses will be consistent with a pedestrian community.
- There is a question as to whether the building on Woerner-Temple by the pool entrance will be all residential or a mixed-use of retail and residential. It could be a mix of uses horizontally or vertically. Currently, the plan shows it as residential.
- The Community Plan designates the setback along Avery Road as 100-200 feet. In the context of this site, they believe that is excessive. What exists across the street does not have that setback. With their proposed 50-foot setback, done with stonewalls and monoliths representative of the Ballantrae character, the development would not be set so far back from the street that it lacks the charm of a village.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated the Concept Plan stage is similar to the Informal Review stage, as the Commission provides non-binding feedback, no formal action. Greater details in the plan would be provided in the next stage, the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). The applicant proposes a mixed-use development consisting of ±30,000 square feet of commercial space, 125-150 residential units, and associated site improvements on the ±11.76-acre site. The overall character and mix of uses are consistent with the Informal Review, although the site layout has been refined. Notable differences include the exclusion of the property at the southeast corner of the original site and the inclusion of a portion of the community pool property at the northwest corner. That property provides an access drive to the pool and a detention pond. The intent is to reconfigure the alignment of that road and allow for a public street that could potentially connect further south. The existing zoning on the southern half of the property is Tech Flex, and the undeveloped piece

on the northern half is zoned residential. At the previous Informal Review, the Commission provided the following feedback:

- General support for the overall mix of uses, layout and architectural theme as a complement to the surrounding communities.
- Support for the "big house" concept, noting the importance of the architectural details and design variations.
- Need for maintaining park-like settings along the roadway frontages, either in the form of larger setbacks or patios and other amenities that could activate the frontages while maintaining view corridors to the nearby parks.
- Need to limit the building heights to 2 stories, although occasional third floors could be utilized strategically if the overall character is maintained.
- Importance of pedestrian connectivity, architectural details, orientation towards the internal and external streets, and possibly replacing the residential building along the Avery Road frontage with an additional neighborhood commercial structure.

Mr. Bitar noted that the major difference in this revised plan is that the roadway alignment reflects a grid system and will allow for future connectivity to the south. The access from Avery Road is at a location not consistent with the standard distance from the intersection of Avery and Woerner Temple Roads, and there are conflicts with several driveways on the south and east sides of the road. With a rezoning, there must be a traffic impact study (TIS) that evaluates whether that full access is feasible at that location. There are similar concerns with the right in/right out proposed on the Woerner-Temple Road frontage. The revised plan includes two drive-thru or drive-up facilities. The new Community Plan identifies this site as mixed-use, so the intent is to allow for neighborhood services located near future existing residential neighborhoods that are walkable, auto-accessible, landscaped neighborhoods. The uses include those proposed in this plan as well as supporting uses. At this point, the building along the Woerner-Temple frontage could be entirely residential or include another use on the first floor. In the proposed plan, the setbacks are 50 feet along both major roadways. The Community Plan's Thoroughfare Plan recommends a setback of 100-200 feet. The intent is to maintain the rural character and view corridors to the existing sections on the north and east sides of this development. At the previous meeting, some Commissioners indicated the potential of accepting a smaller setback if the frontage is activated. The Concept Plan indicates some patios and bio-retention ponds. The east-west roadway and the north-south roadway shared with the Community Pool would be public streets. The other north-south roadway could be either public or private, to be determined at the next phase. The development includes a few private drives that would allow for circulation through the residential area and access to the commercial building parking lots. The garages are integrated into the buildings, but the number that would have direct access to the streets has been limited. The remaining difference from the previous Informal Review plan is that there are two 3-story buildings on the southern end of the development with detached garages.

Mr. Bitar drew the Commission's attention to the following three discussion questions provided to guide their discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the inclusion of drive-through/drive-up facilities and the potential wholly residential building along Woerner Temple Road?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed building height and character?

Commission Questions

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Bitar attended any of the neighborhood meetings and if so, if he could comment on those.

Mr. Bitar responded that he attended only the one that was held before the Informal Review. He was unable to attend the most recent meeting.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there is a distinct difference between a drive-up and a drive-through facility. Will there be menu boards and vehicle stacking or food delivery and pick-up only?

Mr. Ingram stated that at this current conceptual stage, they prefer to have flexibility for either. Consumer preferences are changing in how they interact with restaurants. Some restaurants have replaced the previous menu board/pull-up option with an order app and pick-up only when food is ready. They will evaluate consumer demands when they attempt to define the details of this plan. Mr. Chinnock inquired if they were not ruling out menu boards but leaving that question open for determination.

Mr. Ingram responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the number of commercial spaces in the development has increased, and if so, by how many spaces.

Mr. Fite responded that the commercial space remains the same as previously proposed – 30,000 SF. Commercial tenants have different parking requirements, and 30,000 SF is the most they could place here.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the required setbacks on Woerner-Temple and Avery Roads.

Mr. Bitar responded that it is 100 feet on Avery Road and 100-200 feet on Woerner-Temple.

Mr. Way inquired if the stormwater facility shown at (i) on the site map was a theoretical location.

Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively. It has not been completely engineered. The intent is to reorganize the existing facility.

Mr. Way inquired if it has been determined that this would be the extent of needed stormwater management or if it was undetermined at this point.

Mr. Fite stated that they are working on several versions of stormwater management. They will narrow those options and present the proposed options at the next phase.

Mr. Alexander stated that the applicant has organized the second site plan differently from the previous site plan. In this plan, all the residential uses are on one side of the property. In the previous site plan, most of the residential uses were to the south on the property.

Mr. Fite responded affirmatively. The residential uses are consolidated on the south except for the building on Woerner-Temple Road.

Mr. Alexander inquired if most of the residential in the Informal Review plan had been located to the south of Private Drive B.

Mr. Fite responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander stated that in the revised site plan, all of the residential use has been shifted to the west.

Mr. Fite responded that because the roads changed, some shifting of the residential buildings may have occurred, but they are in the same general location as in the Informal Review.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there would be any residential to the east of Street C and incorporated in the buildings out at the corner.

Mr. Fite responded that at this time, there is no residential located there.

Mr. Alexander inquired what use would be located in the second story of those buildings.

Mr. Fite stated that the retail use could be office use, or perhaps the second story could be fake architecture with nothing located there.

Mr. Alexander stated that their first conceptual plan identified some of the buildings as A – Village Retail but in the revised plan, they are identified as E – Neighborhood. Is there some distinction in the uses within those buildings?

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Real Estate, 6689 Dublin Center Drive, Dublin, explained that their re-labeling was only an attempt to be consistent with the Community Plan method of labeling. There is no change in the function of the buildings.

Mr. Alexander stated that staff's presentation identified one potential mixed-use building on the site. Where is that located?

Mr. Bitar pointed out the building on Woerner-Temple Road, which could be either mixed-use or residential.

Ms. Harter inquired if the stormwater feature is owned by the City. Is the maintenance shared?

Mr. Bitar responded that has yet to be determined. There is no agreement at this point with the City. It is only conceptual.

Ms. Harter inquired how the neighborhood meetings went.

Mr. Fite responded that he believes the meetings went well, and they tried to incorporate some of their opinions. He believes it will be a welcome addition for the neighborhood. They will be able to walk or bike to a local service to have a dinner. He believes everyone is accepting of that idea, although some may disagree about proposed setback widths.

Mr. Garvin inquired what size the residential units would be in terms of bedrooms. Is there a proposed price point?

Mr. Fite responded that he could respond only in general terms, because it is undecided at this point. There should be a mix of one-, two- and maybe some three-bedroom units, 1,000-1,800 SF. The units will have 2-car enclosed garages. The buildings will look like big houses, not apartment buildings. The price point will be higher for a demographic of residents who might live here only six months of the year. This will be a quiet community.

Mr. Garvin inquired if they anticipate the commercial uses to draw kids from the South Pool across the street.

Mr. Fite responded affirmatively.

Mr. Garvin responded that there would need to be some considerations in place to make pedestrian crossing safe there.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is concerned about the traffic issues, but should the Commission not comment on those until the TIS has been completed?

Mr. Bitar responded that the Commission can address the site layout and nature of the streets at this point. The specific traffic details and any recommended traffic mitigation will be carefully studied before the Commission's next review.

Mr. Deschler noted that staff has already identified a problem with the Road C access to Avery Road.

Mr. Bitar responded that it is not the typical access location.

Mr. Deschler stated that the right in/right out access will force Ballantrae residents to go down the other public street to the pool to take a left. He believes there needs to be significant reevaluation of the in/out for pedestrians and vehicles.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the buildings are intended to be condos or apartments.

Mr. Boggs responded that as a land use question, it is residential regardless of the ownership and transfer of funds for occupants.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the Commission does not have the authority to make recommendations concerning owner-owned versus leased units.

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there are any apartments in Ballantrae already.

[Audience response – no.]

Mr. Fite responded that there are no apartments for rent in Ballantrae. There are many owner-occupied condominiums.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there would be an additional exit for the drive-thrus or if the drive-thrus would be solely internal to the development.

Mr. McCauley responded that it would be an internal access with no additional access to Avery Road or Woerner-Temple Road.

Mr. Fite stated that the intent is that all the parking would be behind the buildings, so the vehicles could not be seen from Avery Road. The situation should be similar to the Starbucks at Four Corners. That business has a drive-thru that is very nicely done.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had considered vertical mixed-use since the previous Informal Review.

Mr. Fite responded affirmatively. They continue to consider it. They would love to do that, but it needs to be studied. It probably could be office use located above retail use. It is not the typical approach, however. They are not opposed to it, but parking is the issue.

Ms. Call inquired if it would be feasible to shift the stormwater management facility to the east side of the site.

Mr. Fite responded that it would depend on its size. If it were to take up four acres, it would leave limited space for buildings.

Mr. Way stated that the residential renderings are very nice. One of the things we struggle with is the location of parking and the fronts of the units. The renderings typically are of the front of the units. How will the units be oriented? Are the garages at the back or the front of the buildings?

Mr. Fite responded that the garages are located at the back, and that is where the vehicle movement is intended. However, the architecture of the rear facades is intended not to look like the back of a building.

Public Comment

Online Public Comments:

Ms. Rauch stated that an online public comment was received, which has been placed in the Commission's OneDrive packet folder.

In-Meeting Public Comments:

Nathan Williams, 5750 Avery Road, Dublin, stated that he lives right across the street from the proposed development. He believes this development would be better placed somewhere else. He would prefer more mixed-use and fewer condo units.

Tara Rowe, 5749 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, stated that she has lived in Ballantrae for 20 years. They built their first house there and are now on their third house in Ballantrae. It is a very walkable, beautiful neighborhood. This proposal introduces an entirely different element to the neighborhood. It does not feel aligned with the Ballantrae brand, which is that of beautiful open space and places for children to walk. She is very opposed to the idea of a drive-thru. She has two young kids and while she would appreciate the convenience of a drive-thru, it contradicts with the character of Ballantrae. Currently, it is a walkable neighborhood. The proposal would introduce a whole different dynamic. A road is proposed. Many people walk and bike on the main pathway on Woerner-Temple. Having cars turning in/out will interrupt that pedestrian flow and limit the ability for pedestrians and bikers to be safe and move freely within the neighborhood. There are no apartments in Ballantrae, a dynamic the proposal also would be bringing to their neighborhood. There are several components that need to be re-thought with this plan. She is not sure who in their neighborhood has had an opportunity to speak with the developers. There seems to be a communication issue within the Ballantrae community that needs to be addressed, as many residents are hearing about this proposed development for the first time. The indication that the residents are all in alignment is not true.

Ben Noble, 5892 Baronscourt Way, Dublin, stated he spoke at the Informal Review. He reiterates his position of being opposed to the large, high-density development. The group that spoke at the previous meeting indicated the developers were in good standing with neighbors who expressed interest in potentially joining and becoming a part of this project, insinuating the intent to grow closer to a community vision that was presented. Instead, the development has become smaller, as R&R Landscaping is no longer part of the proposed development. He has a question about the number of residential units included in this proposal. It appears to be the same SF, but previously it was 175-200 units; now they are indicating 100-125 units. Where did the other units go? Are some of the units now larger? At the April meeting, the developer acknowledged that the neighbors were opposed to drive-up/drive-thru businesses within the retail areas. Now, two such units are proposed. He can assure the Commission that most of the community remains opposed to drive-thru businesses here. It is not in the spirit of the neighborhood or this development. There are 7 Starbucks within 3 miles and 5 ice cream shoppes within 4.2 miles. Chipotle has had an online order/drive-up app for 5 years. There is no new, rapidly changing market dynamic. It will create traffic congestion within the area. This summary, this development has strayed very far from the original community vision for the Avery Road Corridor, and he implores the Commission to provide redirection to that earlier vision, if anything must go forward. The primary concerns from every public comment, as well as every member of the Commission previously were related to setbacks and building heights. All Commissioners expressed a preference for one- to two-story buildings, three stories, if hidden at the back. He will share only Ms. Call's previous comment: "I love the large-home concept. 100-foot setbacks along Avery Road offers an open view corridor into the Ballantrae community and park space. If we shrink that setback, it is a totally different experience." The developer has shrunk that setback. "The Ballantrae development text is purposeful: 'one - two stories,' so if we come back and have two stories across the board, I think we are going to have some challenges." The plan is now two stories across the board with some three stories. The developer says they have listened to the Commission's feedback; however, it seems the Commission is being ignored as are the rest of us who are not involved in the HOA discussions.

Hilary Jeffers, 6650 Tricore Place, Dublin, thanked Mr. Noble for reiterating the neighborhood's sentiment. There has been a disconnect between what people want and what was proposed today. Will the new residential development have any impact on the school? She assumes the children of the new residents would attend Washington Elementary. She wants to ensure there are no negative impacts to the school.

Ms. Call stated that this body communicates with the school districts via staff and the Community Plan. That discussion is outside the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission. The schools are involved in the discussions that determine the Community Plan's Land Use Plan recommendations. Therefore, the schools are able to forecast their growth projections based on the adopted plans of the cities encompassed within their boundaries; in this case, Hilliard and Dublin.

Mr. Boggs pointed out that this is a request for a planned unit development (PUD), so it is a little different process than the previous proposal for the Bridge Street District. Before the Commission would vote, there will be much more information presented. Part of that information would be a development text, which would set forth the rules for land uses, setbacks and other development standards for this application. The applicant presented the idea for a drive-thru; however, that has not been proposed in a development text either as a Permitted Use or a Conditional Use.

Joe Rock, 5734 Ennishannon Place, Dublin, stated that as he looks at the plan, he sees three different zoning designations. He requested clarification of what is proposed in terms of the zoning. Ms. Call responded that the Planning and Zoning Commission is a recommending body to City Council when platting of property or rezoning are under consideration. A rezoning is only a recommendation that we make to City Council. Should this move forward, it would be necessary for a rezoning and a development text for the proposed development to be adopted by City Council in a future public meeting.

Mr. Rock inquired what R1 stands for. Currently, what could go in there?

Ms. Call stated that the R1 permits only Residential. She requested Ms. Rauch to clarify the Tech Flex zoning on the southern parcel.

Ms. Rauch responded that the R1 is Single-Family Residential. It would be similar to portions of Ballantrae. The TF-TechFlex is Research and Development use. It would be comparable to the development located south of this property. If the developer wanted to develop according to the confines of those two zonings, they could do so. However, with the proposal they are making, it would require them to rezone the site to permit a mixed-use development. A development text would establish the new zoning standards.

Mr. Rock inquired if this proposed project could not proceed without that occurring.

Ms. Rauch responded affirmatively. The applicant would need to rezone the site to do what they are contemplating.

Ms. Call asked her to explain the Community Plan's role.

Ms. Rauch stated that the zoning is what is legally permitted on the site and determines the related process. The Community Plan defines the Future Land Use (FLU) designation for the site. When an application comes before the Planning and Zoning Commission, they look at the Community Plan, of which an update was just adopted one month ago, to identify the FLU for the site. The Commission and City Council are charged with referring to that Community Plan document in their determination for the zoning. For this particular site, the Mixed-Use Neighborhood is the FLU

designation. The Commission is discussing whether this proposal meets the FLU recommendation. The development review eventually focuses on the fine details, which are captured in the Development Text. That text serves as the law for the development. The applicant would need to abide by those terms, as the project develops.

Mr. Rock inquired the meaning of mixed use vertical.

Ms. Call responded that mixed use is a mixture of uses. There are multiple ways to incorporate mixed use, one is to have one segment of a parcel that is all residential and a different section that is all commercial; that is horizontal mixed use. Vertical mixed use would be commercial use on the bottom floor and residential above, or something similar.

Kurt Smith, 6692 Roundstone Loop, Dublin, stated that he has lived in a condominium development within Ballantrae for 10 years. He was one of the individuals in the community who was invited to review the plans and discuss them with the developers. He is not representative of the community, but personally, he is supportive of the proposed plans. He is aware that the developer is interested in developing this particular corner. He has been very concerned as to what would happen there since he saw the "Site Available" sign. There are security lights on the drilling equipment just to the south of Woerner-Temple Road. He was hoping to see something nice and organized in that corner. He is hoping that this process results in a plan that will make the community members happy and comfortable and serve the good of Dublin at large. If done right, this could be an area to benefit senior citizens and individuals looking for a work-life balance environment. The developer has been open, listening and interested in developing something that the community wants. The one element that he saw tonight that was different was the addition of the Avery Road access. If that could be worked out, it would do much to alleviate the traffic concerns on Woerner-Temple Road. He was reassured to hear this development is consistent with the Community Plan recommendations. He had been concerned about what might go into the Tech Flex area, as he considers that area to be a gateway to Ballantrae. He loves the Ballantrae community and considers himself privileged to live there. He appreciates the Commission's time in listening to their comments and looks forward to watching the development process.

Terry Bevilaqua, 5923 Baronscourt Way, Dublin, stated that she has lived in various places throughout the country and abroad. She is very concerned about the proposed density. If 8 acres of the site are dedicated to greenspace, that places a significant density of people and cars within the remaining site. That is too much density and does not align with the Ballantrae community. She would not have purchased a home in Ballantrae if she thought that level of density could be placed next door.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested Commission members to provide feedback to the discussion questions.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is supportive of a mixed-use development. He does believe that it makes sense to have some single-story development along the Avery Road and Woerner-Temple Road frontages. He is not supportive of only 2-story along those major roadways. The proposed residential seems too dense. He is not supportive of apartment units; he would be more supportive of condominium/townhouse units.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is not supportive of the drive-thru use, especially with it being so open-ended as to what could go in there. He finds it difficult to identify a drive-thru use that would be appropriate here, including the examples provided. He is very supportive of the large house style. Drive-thrus do not work into the feel of a super-sized single-family neighborhood. In regard to the site layout and a residential building along Woerner-Temple, he does not have a preference between wholly residential and mixed-use along Woerner-Temple Road. If it is wholly residential, however, it becomes far more important to honor the existing setback recommendation. A residential use so close to Woerner Temple Road would be jarring. It needs to be set back and look more residential. He was not involved in the earlier discussion, but the minutes reflect that the Commissioners pushed for a 2-story height cap. Within the large home design, where there is a third story in the center of the building, that height works. He is not supportive of the C2 units at the back of the proposed layout being three stories. If the properties directly south of this development were to be redeveloped, which, with the road stub, probably could be expected, then 3-story buildings would no longer be hidden. They would front whatever that new development might be. Allowing three-story heights there would lend itself to additional three-story development and greater density. Although the density of the previous plan has been reduced, he believes the proposed density still seems too high. It seems like a heavy residential use in comparison to the surrounding neighborhood. He likes the proposed architectural materials. It will be important that they not only be visually similar but similar in substance, as well.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes this second plan has regressed from the previous plan. The scale of the earlier proposal was very nice. He believes there was more articulation in the commercial spaces in the initial plan. This has a more strip center feel. We have lost some of the walkability of the site. He liked the central, meandering pathway. The Community Plan indicates one to three stories, but there is a caveat that it be residentially scaled. In this case, he does not believe three stories makes sense. To truly fit within this community, two stories would be as high as we would want these buildings to go. He appreciates the four-sided architecture. We need to re-think the scale of these larger buildings that are proposed. We have taken a few steps in the wrong direction. He encourages the applicant to return to creating a walkable feeling. He is very opposed to the proposed drive-thru. With the lack of detail provided, having vehicles cutting in front of buildings when we are talking about pedestrian access does not feel appropriate in this particular location.

Ms. Harter also stated that she is not supportive of the proposed drive-thrus. We talk about walkability in Dublin all the time, and this is a great neighborhood to maintain the opportunity for people to connect in that manner. Emphasizing the neighborhood's walkability would be moving in the right direction. Providing the required setbacks is important. Maintaining a two-story maximum height protects the desired feel of the neighborhood. She likes the similarity to the Ballantrae materials and character.

Mr. Way thanked the Ballantrae community members who attended tonight and shared their thoughts. He complimented the applicant for presenting a strong vision for an Irish Village, which would fit into the community in which it is located. That concept fits very well with the Community Plan update and the designation of this site as Mixed Use Neighborhood. This is a model of what a mixed-use neighborhood should be...a mixture of commercial and residential uses...a little bit of work, but also playing/recreating within a close-knit, walkable area. Someone stated that this is a gateway to Ballantrae. Creating something there that is unique and sets the tone for the whole development is the opportunity. The applicant has varied from the previous plan in the

arrangement of uses on the site. There has been a reduction in the acreage of the site. Orienting the commercial uses to Woerner-Temple and Avery Roads makes sense. He totally supports the idea of some vertical mixed-use, specifically with the building in question. He does not think it makes sense to have that mixed-use on Avery Road, however. It will be important to abide by the setback requirements of 100-200 feet of the new Community Plan. He believes creating a village atmosphere is determined by the scale and character of the design. As the applicant works on the edges of Woerner-Temple and Avery Roads, he is willing to work with them to understand what the environment should be like, the urban design, experience and activation. To articulate the setbacks in a dimension that is less than the plan recommends, they must be fabulous. An Irish Village typically does not have a large parking lot. It tends to be a walkable community, and cars are not dominant. The details of how the internal streets work and how the buildings relate to those streets, creating frontages and activity will be critical to achieving the vision of an Irish Village. He would encourage them to continue to work on the residential buildings, including their front doors and how they address streets, not parking lots, and how they relate to the commercial component. He is supportive of the proposal. He believes they are mostly on the right track. He appreciated some elements of the previous plan that were lost with this plan, but some of those can be recovered. This Commission has really struggled with drive-thrus. We have reviewed a number of projects in which they were proposed. We have also seen existing drive-thrus that have failed because they were not designed properly and could not handle the traffic. He would have to be strongly convinced that a drive-thru would function in this development without causing traffic issues and could be an attractive component in the development.

Mr. Alexander stated that, in general, he supports the plan and the site layout. He believes placing multi-family where they have is the logical place for it and placing the commercial on the busy streets is the correct place to put that. In terms of the setting, he does not believe this development would have any adverse impact on the aesthetics of Ballantrae because of the significant buffer that exists. The layout is logical. Everyone who participated in the Envision Dublin survey identified the need for more alternative housing types compared to single-family residences within the community. That is seen as a national problem. The project has real merit in solving that need. He is supportive of allowing a variation in the setback, as well, but he would need to see the details. The commercial component needs visibility. People have talked about the issues with the Muirfield commercial developments. The buffers, berms and large setbacks established in that community limit the visibility of the commercial uses. How that frontage would be developed is critical and would impact any support he would have for it. If City Engineering staff indicate the drive-thrus and associated traffic issues would work, he would defer to them. He has not been on the Board as long as the Commission members to his right, so he would also defer to their judgment. He perceives a clear change in the site layout. It looks like two developments. The middle north-south road is separating the residential from the commercial. He understands why the applicant might want to do that with the complexity of the building types, but it would be preferable if there were some residential over the buildings that will be out front. It would be a very different housing type on that site. It would also link the community better with more walkability and joint use of the parking lot. Such a huge parking lot could support multiple functions. In the previous proposal, the developer was attempting to articulate every unit. Here, the developer is trying to hide the number of units by camouflaging them with a scale similar to the homes in Ballantrae. He believes that is appropriate here. He likes the detached garages that were on the south property line. They would serve to buffer the largest mass back there. If a third story were within a pitched roof, making the structure essentially 2.5 stories, it could work. If this is an Irish Village, steeper roof pitches are

appropriate with that vernacular in that type of climate. That would be a way to hide a third story. Many homes in Ballantrae have very steep pitches, as well.

Ms. Call stated that she also is supportive of the big house concept. It is not difficult to make residential projects work in Dublin. The development text must be sensitive as to how the mixed-use is achieved here. If half of the parcel is commercial and half of the parcel is residential but separated down the middle, it is not "mixed" use anymore. She is juxtaposed to Mr. Alexander's comment concerning commercial in Muirfield. While berming in some areas of Muirfield hides the commercial, in other areas, it does it very well. This current proposal asks the Commission to consider a request to narrow the setback along the two major corridors and then alludes to encroachment within that in some places by 25% with patios under the guise of activation. If we look at the area of Muirfield in which Matt the Miller's is located, what they have done there is allowed the opening but you can still see the activation. This leads to her earlier question of whether the stormwater management pond location could be shifted to the east side of the site. This would allow the wider setback, which is what the Community Plan calls for. It would allow for patios to still be visible over that water feature, and it would allow that activation to pull people into the commercial development but still honor the Code requirements and the Community Plan requirements that the City adopted. She believes this revised plan has gained in pedestrian circulation. The beautiful meandering path that was the belt of the original plan provided almost no pedestrian circulation lower than that path. Although this plan added that, it deleted the meandering path. While there is a lot of open space and greenspace in this plan, there are better ways to utilize that greenspace. That Thoroughfare Plan will be important. A resident referred to this site as a gateway to Ballantrae. She believes it is also one of the gateways to Dublin, so it is a critical area. In deleting the bottom corner, it opened up the view corridor coming north directly into a parking lot. That is something Dublin tries to avoid. The City does not like auto-oriented views from our arterial roadways. To her, a drive-up and a drive-thru are totally different. As the Planning and Zoning Commission, open-endedness is not one of our practices. We expect plans and development details, and we will look at that very critically with the Development Text. We want to be sure that we would be proud and comfortable living right next door, even if we do not. As we look at the Development Text, we will want to look through the lens of ratios/percentages. If all the residential builds out and none of the commercial, that is not mixed-use.

Ms. Call stated this is a non-voting item. She inquired if there is any additional clarification the applicant seeks on this particular item.

Mr. Ingram added that with any redevelopment, there will always be trade-offs and matters of disagreement on some of the subjective components. Nevertheless, he believes the development proposal that is before the Commission will be what they will advance. It is far superior to the existing zoning and the ways the land could be utilized under that existing zoning. They will appreciate this body's support of a rezoning to a planned unit development.

- **24-105AFDP – Fallback Studios, 7007 Discovery Boulevard**

A proposal for an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) to add motion picture, radio, and television production studios as permitted uses within Subarea C-1 of the Perimeter Center Planned Development District. The +/- 24.6-acre subarea is zoned PCD, Planned Commerce District - Perimeter Center, and is located southwest of the intersection of Post Road and Discovery Boulevard.

Applicant Presentation

The applicants introduced themselves: Kevin Kale, 105 Roseview Drive, Granville and Graham Allison, 298 Kelton Avenue, Columbus.

Mr. Kale stated that most of the proposed development is on the interior of the facility. They are working with the design firm, Gensler, based in Los Angeles, on the design of the interior. They expect to close on the building on November 30, 2024. He provided background on Fallback Studios. 90,000 SF of the facility will be sound stage space. They will have the capabilities of full-feature film production TV and virtual production. This type of capability currently does not exist elsewhere within the State of Ohio or in the surrounding region. The closest something similar exists is in Chicago. The 50-60-seat theater will not be open to the public. It is for special event screenings and will be managed by Gateway Film Center. They also have a relationship with Horizons in Upper Arlington to handle the commercial and corporate side of the industry. Their intent is to have an education collaboration. Dr. Marschausen will be touring their site soon to evaluate potential student development in film and art. Educational opportunities exist for area universities, as well. Their team is all Ohio-based.

Mr. Kale added that they considered potential locations in Hilliard and New Albany, as well, but ultimately chose Dublin due to its proximity to the airport, hotels, restaurants and bars, shopping and safety. These were the key factors in making their decision about location. They were fortunate to be presented with this facility in December by WD Partners, whose headquarters currently is located at 7007 Discovery Boulevard. They found the space perfect for their needs. At the front of the house is 100,000 SF of office and conference space, which would not require significant renovation for their needs. Most of the construction will occur at the back of the house to add technology and soundproofing. Each of the warehouses is connected. Stage A was previously Metatec; that is where their virtual production will be located. Stage B currently is used by an athletic company and Stage 6 is being used by a travel baseball team. The spaces are all connected, but sound must not carry from one to the other or to the outside. Significant sound mitigation will be essential. He asked Mr. Allison to comment on the greening initiative for the facility.

Mr. Graham stated their goal is to be a green, sustainable facility, as well. They will be locating an 800KW solar project on top, the visibility of which will be shielded by the parapet. The solar screens should satisfy all of their power needs going forward. They will be giving the 30-year facility a facelift, but not too much is needed as WD Partners, a design firm, has done a great job. WD Partners will remain as a tenant after Fallback Studios acquires the facility. They are seeking an AFDP to add television production as a permitted use.

Mr. Kale stated that they met recently with the Village of Coffman HOA and answered many of their questions, such as the noise level. The noise level of this use will not be any different than it was when WD Partners was at its full capacity pre-Covid pandemic. There are 450 parking places, which they do not anticipate filling. All trailer traffic will be at the back where the loading docks are located. There will not be a single trailer sitting in front of the facility. He showed visuals of the large LED wall that will be located within the facility, on which the background for scenes will be produced. As far as their construction schedule, Phase 1 will begin in December with a targeted opening date of May. Ruscilli Construction, a neighbor to the site, will be the contractor. Phase 2 will begin in a year after the leases of the two existing tenants expire.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated this is a request for review and approval of an AFDP under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.053. The ± 15.5-acre site is zoned PCD, Planned Commerce District – Perimeter Center. The property, in combination with the site immediately to the south (7001 Discovery Boulevard), constitutes Subarea C-1 (± 24.6 acres) of that planned district. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Post Road and Discovery Boulevard. The applicant is seeking approval of an amendment to the Perimeter Center Development Text to add to the list of permitted uses within Subarea C-1. In the short term, the building will be occupied by Fallback Studios and Horizons Companies (an affiliated business). WD Partners (current occupant of the building) will remain and occupy approximately 35,000 square feet of space on the south side of the building. The two existing indoor recreation operations would remain until their leases expire within the next year. The Perimeter Center Development Text provides a general description of "Subarea C-1 WD Partners: (24.6 acres)" as follows:

Uses within this subarea include office, research and laboratory, packaging and assembly, wholesaling, and light manufacturing. These uses are appropriate to this subarea due to the sizes and nature of existing buildings found therein.

It subsequently establishes specific development standards and a detailed list of permitted and conditional uses for the subarea. These include a more refined breakdown of the uses listed in the description above and reference the permitted and conditional uses listed in Sections 153.026 (Suburban Office and Institutional District) and 153.034 (Office, Laboratory and Research District) of the Dublin City Code. Although the applicant's proposed use is similar to many listed uses, it does not fit under them. As such, the applicant requests that the Development Text for Subarea C-1 be amended to add "motion picture, radio, and television production studios" as permitted uses. A redlined version of the Perimeter Center Development Text and an extract pertaining to Subarea C-1 were provided to reflect the proposed amendment.

Fallback Studios will generally have 50 employees on site, and filmmakers may have an additional 50-200 on-site employees, depending on the production budget. Three to five tractor-trailers are anticipated to provide production support. They would mostly be stationary for a few weeks during each production and located within the existing loading area at the rear of the building. In addition, there may be a need for occasional recreational vehicle "honey wagons" to support "top line talent" such as actors and directors. Those vehicles would also be parked in the loading area, although the well-screened small parking area north of the building could be used if needed.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Text Modification to add the permitted use category and recommends approval of the AFDP with no conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way requested confirmation that no production activities would be occurring outside the building.

Mr. Kale responded that is not their expectation. Shoots are done on location, but the shoot would have to require what the property offers, such an external shoot of an office building. The probability of that occurring is very low.

Ms. Call inquired if any productions within the City of Dublin would require a permit to conduct such activity.

Ms. Rauch responded that she would assume that would be required in any community.

Mr. Way stated that the definition of a production studio is the use of land, building or structure. Ms. Call stated that there is a difference in the designation of the purpose and the actual function. Whether they own the property or not, the action would require a permit, which is not within this body's purview.

Mr. Way stated that his concern was that the language of the definition would open the door for them to use the land in that manner. Maybe there is no need to be more specific.

Ms. Call stated that is the definition of what the production studio is, which is a PZC determination. Should they actually desire to pursue the activity, that is not a PZC action; it would be a City consideration. She requested the assistant law director to comment.

Mr. Boggs responded that the needed City permits would be a separate manner. From the land use perspective, the land, building or structure, everything on the site, including the employee parking spaces, contribute to the purpose of the facility.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there are limitations to where the actors' trailers can be parked. If the trailer areas are full in the back loading dock, and there are actors' trailers running generators 24-7, should we designate a permitted location for those? Generators running all night long could disturb the nearby residents.

Mr. Kale stated that they would not be opposed to that designation, should that be necessary.

Mr. Bitar responded that with adding it as a permitted use, designating a location for those would not be necessary. Discussions with the applicant indicated that if there were inability to accommodate the trailers in the loading dock area, they could potentially be located in the small parking lot at the north end of the site, which is very heavily screened from Post Road and not visible from the front or other sides of the facility.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if it would be within the purview of the Commission to restrict the type of films that are made on-site, such as adult films.

Mr. Boggs responded that adult-oriented businesses are subject to an entirely different use category and separate processes. The Commission has no purview over other subject matters, such as horror, comedy or drama.

Ms. Harter inquired if there were insufficient room for trailers on the site, a parking place be identified for them elsewhere.

Mr. Kale responded that it would depend on the number of trailers, but they do not expect a significant number. The expectation is that they would remain on the property to the rear of the property.

Ms. Harter noted that there is a greenspace with picnic tables to the side in front of the building. Would they consider updating that area?

Mr. Kale responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if they would consider updating the trash enclosure area.

Ms. Call reminded the Commission members that the AFDP has limited purview. The only item under consideration this evening is the Minor Text Modification to allow the use.

Mr. Bitar noted that the neighbors had mentioned the trash enclosure area, as well, so staff would ensure it is addressed.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Perimeter Center PCD Development Text Amendment as follows:

“Subarea C-1 WD Partners (24.6 acres)
Uses within this subarea include office, research and laboratory, packaging and assembly, wholesaling, and light manufacturing, and motion picture, radio, and television production studios. These uses are appropriate to this subarea due to the sizes and nature of existing buildings found therein.”

and approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch noted that the Development Review Process discussion has been deferred to a later meeting. Related to that subject, PZC members should have received a survey concerning staff reports. She requested that if they have not yet completed and returned the surveys, members do so.

She reminded PZC members of the following:

- A list of the Commission’s remaining meeting dates in 2024 has been emailed to PZC members. Members agreed to confirm availability on the dates at the next meeting.
- The tentative date of the rescheduled Joint Work Session with CC, PZC, ARB and BZA is October 16, 2024.
- A printed/bound copy of the Ohio APA Planning reference book was provided to members at the meeting, and a copy of the August 2024 City Manager Update has been provided in OneDrive for the Commission's reference.
- Commissioners were reminded to complete the online mandated training regarding Fraud.
- The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 19, 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council