



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 18, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the January 18, 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: Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Kathy Harter, Rebecca Call, Warren Fishman (arrived at 6:41 pm)

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) Regular Meeting Minutes of 01-04-2024.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

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

CASE REVIEWS

1. Case 23-105CP, Concept Plan - Ashland Multi-Family

Conceptual review and feedback for the construction of a multi-family development consisting of 330 residential units and retail space. The 18.9-acre site is zoned Office Laboratory and Research District (OLR) and located approximately 2,100 feet west of the intersection of Blazer Parkway and Frantz Road.

Applicant Presentation

Eric Buck, Pizutti Companies, 629 N. High Street, Columbus, stated that tonight is the third time that they will be presenting a conceptual plan for this site. At the previous meeting, the Commission recommended that they reach out to the neighbors. They have been reaching out to other local businesses and property owners in Metro Place and along Blazer Parkway, who have been supportive of their proposal. He stated that Pizutti Companies is family-owned, founded in 1976. Over that 50-year span, they have developed over 100 million square feet of space, including several prominent developments. Although the target site is approximately 19 acres, only 15.2 acres are buildable, due to the Cosgray Corridor floodway. There is an opportunity for a north-south connection through this site connecting Blazer Parkway to Metro Center, opportunity for east-west connections for future development of the adjacent sites, and opportunities for pedestrian trails to connect to the Smiley Park trail. He reviewed slides showing the evolution of their Concept Plan submissions in April 2023 and in August 2023. They have incorporated the Commission's previous feedback, including elimination of the covered parking. The Commission emphasized that there were opportunities to create something special along the Cosgray Corridor, and they have further enhanced that area. At the previous meeting, the Commission expressed an interest for retail to be included. They spoke with a well-known retail broker about the opportunity to do so on this site. Although the broker could not suggest any particular business, he indicated that service retail potentially could work here in a strategic location. They have made a commitment to include a retail opportunity in the Concept Plan. There is a recreational, arboretum trail, which will encourage public engagement in the site. There will be 330 residential units and 480 parking spaces, a parking ratio of 1.45 spaces per unit. To add the retail opportunity to the Concept Plan, they re-located the clubhouse to the west side of the north-south connector to provide on-street parking for the retail use. Until the north connector is completed, they needed to provide circulation for retail clients. The retention ponds were relocated closer to Blazer Parkway and the retail, providing space for potential patios for the retail. He displayed images of projects they have already developed to show their product quality. Pizutti has curated art programs, Living with Art, with their projects, hiring both local and international artists to create the art work.

Michael Chivini, Ex. V. President, Pizutti Companies, Napierville, Ill., stated that they have attempted to add the requested WOW factor, so that this is more than a typical suburban project. In addition to the design and quality of their projects, they incorporate art within the rooms, public spaces and on the exterior of the projects. Throughout the Cosgray Corridor, in addition to the trail, which will accommodate both pedestrian and bicycle traffic, there will be a programmed environment, including small gardens and exterior art sculptures. The environment will engage the residents and the public.

Mr. Buck displayed images of their art program, street views, building elevations and interior spaces within their other projects. They are interested in having the Commission's feedback and support on the proposed site plan before moving forward with a Preliminary Development Plan.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this project would follow a Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. The Concept Plan does not require a determination; this step is intended to receive the Commission's feedback on the development proposal. The next step would be a Preliminary Development Plan and Rezoning. The site is comprised of 18.9 acres, zoned OLR and is located within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, MUR 1 - Metro/Blazer District. The goals of this district are to encourage a variety of uses, amenities, usable open space and supporting residential infill at key locations. Since the previous Informal Review, staff has initiated work on the Metro Center Strategic Framework, a supplemental document intended to guide future development in this area. Completion of the plan is anticipated in September 2024. Its objectives are to:

- Build upon, not duplicate work from past initiatives for Metro Center and the Dublin Corporate Area.
- Refine the vision of a distinct identity and sense of place for the district which replicates the success of Bridge Park but does not duplicate its character.
- Identify public infrastructure improvements that contribute to an urban design framework.
- Identify sites best positioned to establish a development "beach head" and create catalytic change.
- Identify potential strategic implementation partnerships.
- Build consensus in a unified approach to actionable strategies for implementable change from both public and private actions.

In August 2023, the Commission provided non-binding feedback for this application. The development included 6 residential buildings, 330 units, and 480 parking spaces. The Commission offered the following feedback:

- Challenged the applicant to incorporate a mixture of uses throughout the development.
- Expressed concern regarding the use of surface parking.
- Expressed concern that the development mimics the development style of existing development surrounding the site, with development surrounded by surface parking.
- Recommended structured or underground parking to minimize surface parking.
- Was supportive of the proposed street grid framework.

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

- 1) Does the proposal incorporate an appropriate mix of uses, based on previous Commission comments?
- 2) Does the proposed site layout allow for integration with the surrounding properties?
- 3) Does the Commission support the additional open space considerations for the development?
- 4) Additional considerations from the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired if the proposed retail would be visible from Blazer Parkway.

Mr. Buck responded affirmatively. Placing it on the west side will provide better visibility when driving northeast on Blazer Parkway and west from Frantz Road.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the retail would be available to the public as well as the residents.

Mr. Buck responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock noted that providing a patio could be attractive there.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there would be drafts of the area plan to view at some point.

Ms. Rauch stated that the process is currently in the fact-finding and development of scenarios stage. There will be a joint work session with City Council at the end of January to obtain feedback from Council. Completion of the final version is anticipated at the end of August/early September.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there would be opportunities to provide public input on the draft.

Ms. Rauch responded that there would be a public meeting on January 30, which will involve a panel discussion and public input session. This process will also be tied into the Community Plan process.

Mr. Supelak inquired if Pizutti is working on this site, there would be interaction opportunities for them.

Ms. Rauch responded affirmatively. As a stakeholder, the consultant working on the Area Plan has engaged them in the discussion.

Ms. Harter inquired if parking, including underground, surface or parking structures, would be part of the public discussion.

Ms. Rauch responded that infrastructure, street connections, pedestrian connections and parking would be part of the discussion for any development happening within this area, not just this site. The intent is that this be a successful, revitalized area, which will require public-private collaboration.

Ms. Harter inquired about the public entrance into the site. Will it be easy for the public to differentiate the public parking from the private parking?

Mr. Buck responded that the width of the street would be similar to Bridge Park. There will be 11-foot drive lanes and on-street, parallel parking. In addition to the on-street parking, there will be designated retail parking.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the future development of the park in the area north of the parking area. Who will be responsible for its development, and is it included in the greenspace calculation for this site?

Mr. Hounshell stated that as proposed, it would be provided by the developer. On the north side of Cosgray Corridor, a future trail is shown, which could be included in future developments to the east and west and of this site.

Mr. Buck stated that development of the trail north of the Cosgray Corridor would require the construction of the connection from Blazer Parkway to the Metro Place roadway. As a private developer, they are not planning to provide that connection. However, once the connection is made and a bridge over the Cosgray Corridor is provided, it will unlock that northern area.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he was inquiring about the commitment. It is important to ensure the greenspace and path shown on the plan will be usable.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the iconic architectural structure on the east side.

Jeffrey Pongonis, Principal Landscape Architect, MKSK, 462 S. Ludlow Alley, Columbus, stated that the architecture is the connection between the two buildings. It will be either a pergola or a covered walkway, which will frame some outdoor space between the buildings at the beginning of the eastern-most lawn area. It is a noncommercial element, a functional focal point. It is unlikely that it will be a bridge.

Public Comments

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she lives in the neighborhood near this proposed development. Based on the acreage, the number of apartments seems high. In previous discussions regarding the Metro Center redevelopment, there was a consensus that we did not want the Bridge Park features here. This proposal reminds her of Bridge Park. Would the applicant be agreeable to making adjustments to make the development appear more traditional to match the adjacent area? Additionally, if she wanted to drive to this area and then walk around, would there be available parking for her to do so?

John Edwards, 345 Monterey Drive, Dublin stated that he is familiar with the quality of the Pizutti projects. However, he is concerned about the traffic impact on the nearby neighborhoods, Waterford Village in particular.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he appreciates that the applicant has incorporated the Commission's previous comments in this plan. However, the Commission would like to see underground parking provided for this project.

Mr. Fishman stated he is concerned about the parking and would prefer to see underground parking for the residential units, as well. The merchants will suffer if there is insufficient parking.

Mr. Supelak stated that he likes the Living with Art program and the project's sensitivity toward future connections within the area. The proposed residential component is more than infill; it is becoming a catalyst to energize the area. The architectural materials are lacking in variation. There is opportunity to vary the buildings and massing much more. He is supportive of the proposed street grid. There is concern whether mixed-use would succeed with the project. In the future developments, mixed use could be included in each site, but it is difficult for the first project. He appreciates that they have added the retail component. Completion of the Metro Center Strategic Framework will facilitate the development energy from both private and public participation.

Mr. Way stated that this project will be pioneering the redevelopment of this area. There is a significant level of planning occurring that could potentially set a different direction than that of existing plans. The Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) and Metro Center Strategic Framework will help guide the applicant's development, but the proposed project is caught in the midst of that. He believes the plan is on the right track. Its framework is strong, and he can see this site being a catalyst for development within the Blazer Parkway-Metro Center area. He believes the north-south connector between Blazer Parkway and Metro Center is a fundamental piece to this project. In an area that is starting to change its character in terms of mix of uses, it is important that it be an active connector. He believes shifting the clubhouse and the pool will enable that. However, he would like to encourage more mixed-use activation of that street. On Blazer Parkway, there is an office-condo development that includes a variety of service businesses. Retail is difficult, but service uses could activate the street, providing services not only for the people who live in the development but for the greater community. There is already a significant level of investment in the Metro Center, so its revitalization will not be a matter of starting over, but a weaving of new uses with the existing uses. This project will weave Blazer Parkway into the Metro Center development. It is important that the uses along the north-south connector encourage an active

pedestrian connection. The attention the project gives to the Cosgray Corridor and park is important. Adding a residential use in this area will enable the activation of that park. Although the project is presently an island in an area that potentially is changing, it has the right ingredients. He is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Ms. Harter stated that it will be important to provide ADA accommodations for the future residents. Landscape mounding also would be critical for providing some privacy for the residents. She encourages the developer to continue to have conversations with the businesses and neighborhood and to pursue something different from the Bridge Park look. She would like to see underground parking, if possible. She appreciates the potential for public engagement here, such as a yoga class or pickleball and encourages them to look into the opportunity to engage local artists with their incorporation of art in the project.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he agrees with Mr. Supelak that more architectural articulation of the buildings is needed. The Cosgray Corridor and the connectivity to Metro Center will be crucial. What occurs with the streetscape along the connection is important. He is concerned about the amount of surface parking. If there is no alternative to that, mounding and landscaping could mitigate the views. The greenspace and the Cosgray Corridor are very nice features of the site, and he would like to see some commitment to that greenspace with this project.

Ms. Call stated that the application proposes 1.45 parking spaces per unit. As the project progresses and there is some identification of the retail uses, the amount of parking will be discussed further. In regard to the traffic concerns expressed, a rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) require a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) to be conducted to ensure any potential traffic impacts are mitigated. She appreciates that attention to the view from Blazer Parkway has been addressed by the plan. We want the area to look planned, not appear happenstance. She appreciates that the applicant is involved in the discussion with the Dublin Metro Center Strategic Framework Plan. She agrees that service-oriented, ground level activation along the north-south corridor would truly make this a mixed-use development. She also has concerns about the parking. We do not want to duplicate the sea of parking view. She understands that underground parking is expensive and there is existing infrastructure within the area, but the building blocks could look so much better. We could better embrace the density and intensity of the site with the extra land that is currently being taken up with parking spaces. She appreciates their preservation of the Cosgray Corridor, which is such an asset to this parcel and the community at large. She inquired if the applicant desired any additional input from the Commission.

Mr. Chivini requested clarification of Mr. Way's suggestion that non-residential uses be provided further north on the connector in addition to the retail that is proposed at the south end.

Mr. Way stated that there should be uses that activate the street. The Commission wants mixed-use here, and the street provides an opportunity to add that at the ground level of the buildings.

Mr. Chivini stated that they could study that idea in the next iteration. His concern is the timing element. That area is at the back and not easily marketable at this time. When will that roadway connection be made? If that connection were to happen soon, that could change their perspective on many things. At this point, they are taking a leap of faith on the retail. They may be able to look at programming the area -- perhaps adding an amenity area that can be converted later.

Mr. Way responded that he understands the difficulty, which is the reason he is not referring to it as retail. Once the street connection occurs, it will be a game changer for the site. This is a pioneer project, but it could be set up so it would accommodate those future uses. In the short term, perhaps there is a live-work type of unit that can be leased and converted later. Visitors to the park would be interested in taking advantage of certain services.

Ms. Call stated that the concern is valid. Council is interested in a mixed-use development in this area. As the applicant has pointed out, having the north-south connector is critical to that happening. The Commission will share his comments with Council, and perhaps it can be prioritized in the CIP budget.

Mr. Supelak stated that as Mr. Way suggested, there is opportunity for flex space that would eventually accommodate that future vision.

Mr. Chivini referred to the Commission's comments about parking. He clarified that it is not financially feasible in any way for structured or underground parking to be included in this project without significant public contribution. They have attempted to avoid a sea of parking by creating trays of parking. We are looking at the operational end of the two neighboring buildings. Having those trays of parking will add a buffer. Landscaping is important; they look at the exterior as much as they look at the interior. They build all their projects with the perspective that they may own them forever. Although no vote is taken at this time, they are looking for the Commission's support for moving forward with this proposal. He reiterated that no structured or underground parking would be possible without significant public contribution. They have reviewed the proposed parking with their property management company, and they were satisfied with the proposed parking ratio.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the applicant has achieved a good balance of open space, parking and building. The project would need to have greater density to make a parking structure affordable. However, this is the correct scale for a project located on the Cosgray open space.

Ms. Call thanked the applicant for their presentation and indicated that the Commission looks forward to their future application for a rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan.

2. Case 23-115MSP, Master Sign Plan – The Bailey

Request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan for a new residential building consisting of 6 wall signs and 1 ground sign. The 1.77-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of Dale Drive and Banker Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Adam Kessler, Kessler Sign Company, 1564 Arlington Avenue, Columbus, stated that he is working with Crawford Hoying on this new development in Bridge Park. The Bailey is located at 4351 Mooney Street. He reviewed the 7 proposed signs in the Master Sign Plan. A 26-sq.ft. ground-level, internally illuminated monument sign is located on the northeast corner of the building. On the north façade, there is a canopy sign at the main entrance on Winder Street. There is a flag sign at the entrance of Friendship at Home, a tenant in the Bailey. There are vinyl door signs, a 7.25-sq.ft. sign on the south façade, a 41-sq.ft. internally illuminated-blade sign on the west side, and a cabinet-style, internally illuminated wall sign on the northwest corner.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Schneier inquired if the issue with the cabinet sign is because the wall area is not flat. Mr. Kessler responded affirmatively. Every 6 inches, there are brick headers that extend 1 inch, so whatever sign is placed on that wall would need to extend at least 2 inches.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the ribbon graphic. Is that calculated in the sign's total square footage? Mr. Kessler responded affirmatively.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for a new residential building consisting of 6 wall signs and 1 ground sign on The Bailey building, which is located at 4351 Mooney Street in Bridge Park, Block F. The 1.77-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of Dale Drive with Banker Drive. The site has frontage on Dale Drive, Banker Drive, Mooney Street, and Winder Drive. In March 2022, The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) approved a Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan for the construction of The Bailey, a six-story podium apartment building consisting of 87 units and intended for residents 55 and older. The use is tied with the Friendship Village development located further south along Riverside Drive. MSPs are intended to allow for one-of-a-kind, whimsical, unique signs that employ the highest quality materials and construction while allowing flexibility to deviate from the standards of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Sign Code. MSPs are not intended to allow for a greater number of signs without consideration for unique sign design and display. The BSD Sign Design Guidelines state that signs within the District should contribute to the vibrancy of the area, should be pedestrian focused while simultaneously provide wayfinding for vehicles and cyclists, and should assist with navigation and identification of businesses.

Mr. Hounshell reviewed the signs proposed in the Master Sign Plan.

South Fascia Sign: The south fascia sign is the primary identification sign, and located on the southeast portion of the building. The sign is 72.25 square feet in size and approximately 56 feet in height to the top of the sign. The sign features 3-inch deep channel letters with white acrylic faces, and a 3-inch deep multicolored logo above the white copy. The sign will be internally illuminated. It is positioned on the south elevation for primary vehicular identification from W. Dublin-Granville Road.

Monument Sign: This ground sign is located in the northeast corner of the site approximately 9 feet from Dale Drive to the east and 12 feet from Winder Drive to the north. The sign sits diagonally on the site to provide visual interest from both Dale Drive and Winder Drive. However, some of the provided plans vary in the final location of the sign. The applicant should update the plans to represent accurately the location of the ground sign, prior to sign permit submittal. This ground sign is 26 square feet in size and approximately 2.50 feet in height. The sign features many components, starting with a 14-inch deep monument base clad in Hazelnut Brown Alumaboard. The copy of the sign is 0.50-inch push-thru white acrylic letters. Above the cabinet of the sign are 3 separate clear glass panels alternating in a wave motion. On the two outer glass panels, transparent vinyl logos will be applied in identical locations. Both the glass and the copy

will be internally illuminated. The applicant will need to finalize the landscape plan around the base of the sign.

Placemaking Sign: This blade sign is located along the west elevation above the parking entrance on Mooney Street. The sign is approximately 41 square feet in size and approximately 32 feet in height to the top of the sign. The base of the sign starts at the second story of the building, which is consistent with similar placemaking art signs in the Bridge Park development. The sign is constructed of a 22.50-inch deep metal cabinet clad with routed Alumaboard in a Hazelnut Brown finish, and .75-inch white push-thru acrylic for the sign copy. The sign features a printed translucent vinyl on the western face of the sign that mimics the colors of the logo in lieu of the logo on the sign. The wave of the logo is mimicked along the outward edge of the sign. Both the white copy and translucent colored vinyl will be internally illuminated.

Cabinet Sign: This sign on the west elevation is intended to provide identification for the second tenant of the building, Friendship at Home, and is located in the northwest corner of the building. The sign is 21 square feet in size and approximately 5.50 feet in height to the top of the sign. The sign is constructed of a 4-inch deep aluminum cabinet with 0.50-inch push-thru white acrylic copy and logo. The sign cabinet is intended to match the color of the brick the sign would be mounted to, which is Driftwood Gray. It is proposed to be placed on a screening wall for a transformer enclosure, and the façade of the enclosure was approved with a unique brick design that provides varying dimension to the face of the structure. The wall features brick headers that are pulled forward 1 inch from the face of the brick veneer at 16-inch intervals. Installing a cabinet sign on this façade would detract from the architectural features approved for the screening wall. Although Friendship at Home is a secondary tenant for the building, this sign is not located adjacent to the tenant's primary entrance on the north elevation and does not provide wayfinding. Due to its location, staff recommends this sign be removed.

Projecting and Door Signs: Both the projecting and door signs are located in close proximity to each other on the north elevation of the building. These signs are intended to identify the primary building entrance for Friendship at Home. The tenant's entrance is immediately adjacent to The Bailey main entrance on the north elevation of the building. The projecting sign is approximately 4 square feet in size; the height has not been provided. The applicant should install the projecting sign with a minimum height of 8 feet from the bottom of the sign to the sidewalk. The sign consists of 0.50-inch push-thru white acrylic graphic and lettering with a translucent vinyl applied to the graphic. Like the blade sign, the copy and logo are on a Hazelnut Brown Alumaboard routed aluminum sign face. The sign will be non-illuminated.

Canopy Sign: This canopy edge sign is proposed over the primary entrance into the building on Winder Drive. The sign is approximately 67 square feet in size and approximately 16 feet in height to the top of the logo. The copy of the sign features 3-inch deep channel letters with white acrylic faces and is mounted directly to the face of the approved canopy. The logo is located above the edge of the canopy and is mounted to 2 vertical steel posts.

Staff has reviewed this application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with 4 conditions.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Chinnock inquired the reason for the number of signs proposed; 7 signs seems excessive.

Mr. Hounshell responded staff is recommending that one of the signs for Friendship at Home be removed. However, the number of signs proposed for two separate tenants is consistent with previous such applications.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the monument sign was necessary or if it could be replaced with landscaping.

Mr. Hounshell responded that monument signs are infrequent in Bridge Park. There is one in Block A within the plaza area; however, other sites typically do not have enough greenspace to accommodate a monument sign. There is sufficient space for a monument sign on this site, and it will be integrated with the approved landscaping and lighting. The sign is creative and accommodates the design of the logo and the branding of the business. Staff believes it is appropriate in this location.

Mr. Chinnock stated that on the edge of the blade sign, there is an LED-colored band, which is close to being neon. What is staff's perspective on that detail?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff has worked with the applicant to modify this sign. Previously, the banding was on both the top and bottom edges, which potentially could impact any residents living there. The look is achieved by film over the white light, which is not neon. Staff is not concerned, particularly since there is a parking garage on the other side. Once installed, it will be inspected. The amount of lumens projected in the lighting can be adjusted, if need be.

Mr. Fishman stated that there are only a small number of non-conforming signs in the District, which is fine. However, as we consider more signs, it will be important to take the total number of non-conforming signs into consideration to avoid changing the look of the District.

Ms. Harter inquired if the Commission did not approve a sign, the applicant could return with a revised proposal.

Mr. Hounshell responded that if the Commission were to approve all but one sign, the applicant would need to come back with an amended Master Sign Plan for approval of the revised sign.

Mr. Way requested the reason for the differentiation between The Bailey and Friendship at Home. Isn't the intent to provide signage for this project, which is The Bailey?

Rita Doherty, Ex. Director, Friendship Village of Dublin, 6000 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that Friendship at Home is a component of the Friendship Village family. Friendship Village has a partnership with Crawford Hoying to develop The Bailey, a 55+ community facility, but Friendship at Home is a completely separate company. The Friendship at Home concept is essentially life care without borders. They provide life care to residents out in the community, who live in their homes or elsewhere. Previously, they had a Friendship at Home location on High Street in Old Dublin, understanding that space would be built within The Bailey to have a more cohesive partnership. They closed their office on High Street and moved it temporarily to the Friendship Village facility with the understanding that it would be permanently located within The Bailey. While they are separate entities, they are intended to work together. Currently, they have approximately 200 Friendship at Home residents with an anticipated growth of 500 in the next 3-5 years. There will be 7 offices in the building. Visitors parking across the street must be able to identify where Friendship at Home is. The Bailey consists of 87 residential units. The first floor of The Bailey is occupied by a commercial tenant, Friendship at Home.

Public Comment

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, stated that his home is located on the Martin Road corridor, not far from Bridge Park. This building fills one City block, and many City blocks are approximately 400 feet in length on all four sides, 1,600 linear feet – more than a ¼ mile. He does not believe 7 signs is excessive for a building the size of a City block.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he understands the argument about the size of the building, but he believes 7 signs is excessive. There is much occurring within Bridge Park, and adding more sign is not the best idea. He agrees with staff's recommended removal of the sign on the west fascia. He does not see the need for the monument sign, which seems to be over designed, especially if the landscaping will cover most of it. Other than that, he has no objections to the proposed plan.

Ms. Harter stated that she would be supportive of the sign proposal with staff's recommendation, including the removal of the sign on the west fascia.

Mr. Way stated that he likes the signage package; it is very attractive. He understands the need for separate identification for the tenant. Visitors for Friendship at Home will not be parking near the building but in the parking garage across the street. He does not understand the need for the west fascia sign on the corner, as there is a blade sign and a door sign. He is supportive of staff's recommendation to eliminate that sign, but he has no concerns with the remainder of the package.

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes this is a nice signage package, including the monument sign. He does not believe the location on the corner is incorrect, but agrees that 3 signs for one tenant seems excessive. He finds the proposed west fascia cabinet sign lackluster. What is proposed is literally the brand in several locations. He believes the sign that is located high on the south fascia of the building could be much more than is proposed. The City is looking for creativity and uniqueness in the signs for this District, and there is a great opportunity to do something marvelous with the sign on that wall. The canopy sign could be much more, as well. Friendship is a great word; take advantage of that. Turn it vertically; perhaps place it in the garden – a unique sculptural sign at a height greater than one story. They could replace a forgettable cabinet sign with a very memorable sign, and that sign could be an asset for the City and the tenant. He would encourage the applicant to think more creatively about two of the signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has no objection to the proposed Master Sign Plan package with staff's recommendation for removal of the one sign. He agrees there is opportunity to make a couple of the signs more exciting.

Mr. Schneier stated that he does not believe the proposed number of signs is too much. Bridge Park is in the area where signage is part of the energy created in the District. There is a vast difference between the brown signage in Muirfield and Times Square; he believes the signage in Bridge District should lean more toward Times Square. Rather than removing the one Friendship at Home sign, he would recommend staff and the applicant work together on revising the sign for that area.

Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of staff's condition for the removal of one of the three signs. Typically, the Commission would not approve 3 signs for one tenant, which are in close proximity to each other. The applicant has received a variety of feedback from the Commission, including

Mr. Schneier's support for 7 signs, with the one sign being revised. Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to staff's recommendation to remove the one sign, or if he would prefer it to be included.

Justin Metzler, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that they were seeking the Commission's feedback, particularly regarding the cabinet sign for the transformer screen wall. They realize that the design of the building makes it difficult to place a sign on that fascia for the Friendship at Home tenant, but there are only two potential locations. They would have no objection to moving forward with the other signs, with the exception of this one. They could work with staff and create a different sign design, such as Mr. Supelak was suggesting.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the applicant would be willing to consider reassessing the large wall sign on the south fascia, as well.

Mr. Metzler responded affirmatively.

Ms. Call stated that the applicant has two options: approve the proposed sign package with staff's recommendation, and in the future, the applicant could return with a request for approval of an Amended Master Sign package for the one revised sign, or table the proposal and return with one or two amended sign designs.

Mr. Boggs pointed out that the submission of an Amended Master Sign Package would be a new application with a new fee.

Mr. Metzler requested that the application be tabled to permit them to make modifications to the two signs and return with a revised sign package.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded that the Master Sign Package be tabled.

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

[Motion approved 7-0]

3. Case 23-121CP – Concept Plan - Upper Metro Place Mixed-Use Building

Applicant Presentation

Mark Costandi, Costandi Studio, Sinton Avenue, Cincinnati, stated that in July 2022, the Commission approved a Concept Plan for this project. In moving to the Preliminary Development Plan, they were faced with some issues, including financial. The plan has been revised to make the project more feasible, some of which – size and parking -- will be to Dublin's advantage. He presented slides comparing the previous plan and the revised plan. There is an underground stormwater utility that bisects the site, which they had previously intended to relocate. Because it was cost prohibitive, the footprint of the building has been revised from 175 units to 159 units with five stories instead of four. There are 227 parking spaces, including parking for a 3,500-sq.ft. restaurant on the corner facing Frantz Road. Commercial space remains on the ground level facing Frantz Road; moving west on Metro Place, all levels are residential. There is a look of two separate buildings connected with a link. The total project would be completed in two phases. Phase 1 is the primary use, the residential building and the commercial space facing Frantz Road, and the associated open space. In a future Phase 2, they are considering a 2-level boutique office building

located west of the stormwater utility line. Staff indicated that would continue a consistent line of building along Metro Place, maintaining the same vision from over 1.5 years ago. The plan retains the same concept of an art walk along Upper Metro Place. With this proposal, they will be creating a screen wall for the surface parking that is adjacent to the public park. That screen wall could be used as an additional art piece. There will be multiple art structures throughout this zone. Another revision made in this proposal is to lower the platform on which this building sits. Previously, it sat on a 3-foot plinth in the public space. On the corner, there were steps leading up to that platform, which could be intimidating to the public. They have lowered the platform to 1.5 feet at the corner. That also increases the height of the commercial spaces along Frantz Road. The height increases back up to 3 feet in the residential-use section. Previously, the Commission had raised concerns about the availability of the open space to the public. With this revised plan, all the open space is very clearly available to the public. In pushing back the footprint of the building, they are maintaining the same number of underground parking spaces by expanding the garage. There will be 133 spaces below grade. They have increased the number of 2-bedroom units in the upper levels.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that the 2.55-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road in the Bridge Street District. Development in the BSD is a 3-step process. Concept Plans within the BSD do require a determination by the Commission. There are pedestrian facilities on both Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. The site does not have any significant change of grade throughout. There are existing trees along the south and east perimeters of the site. A stone wall erected in 1998 with the construction of Upper Metro Place is present along the east perimeter of the site. The site includes a 22-space surface lot providing additional parking for the adjacent Towne Place Suites. Within a developed area, the site has access to existing utility services through the City of Dublin. This site is in an area where the BSD Code and Dublin Corporate Area Plan both apply, so it is necessary to look at both in reviewing a site plan. In July 2021 and February 22, the Commission provided Informal Reviews and in July 2022, the Commission approved a Concept Plan for a four-story, mixed-use building with 175 residential units and 8,400 square feet of commercial space. The Commission approved the Concept Plan with two conditions: that the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure the open space and on-street parking meets BSD requirements. He displayed slides comparing the Concept Plan approved in July 2022 and the plan shown tonight. The Code indicates both the quantity and characteristics of the open space. The required open space for the plan is 3,200 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing a little more than required and has been mindful about creating meaningful and purposeful open space and activating the street. Along Frantz Road, those spaces are considered private amenity spaces for the restaurant. The applicant is proposing 209 off-street parking spaces, 227 in total, including the off-street parking spaces along Upper Metro. Currently, Upper Metro does not align with BSD streetscape guidelines. This proposed retro fit of Upper Metro will bring that more in line with the BSD vision. Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with the 2 conditions.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Supelak inquired if it would be possible to consider angled parking along Upper Metro Place.
Mr. Will responded that BSD streetscape design guidelines call for parallel parking.
Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant had any objections to the conditions for approval.
Mr. Costandi indicated he did not.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the underground parking would be entirely subgrade. Is there any visibility of the underground parking?

Mr. Costandi responded that the parking is entirely concealed, but there is a 3-foot elevated condition within the residential area.

Mr. Way that the corner plaza has been lowered to accommodate the revised parking garage condition, which is different than it is in the residential unit section.

Mr. Costandi stated that the vehicles are ramped internally within the garage to account for the drop that occurs with the plaza. The initial ramp from the surface parking area extends downward 7 feet, and the residential is 3 feet above that, which achieves a 10-foot floor-to-floor condition for the garage. They continue to ramp down further to allow sufficient area at the top for the landscape, plaza and beneath the pool, which is 5 feet deep.

Mr. Way inquired if the applicant wanted to keep the corner at the same level as the other terrace, could they do so.

Mr. Costandi responded that they could; however, the advantage of doing so is that it adds height to the internal ceiling heights of the commercial space.

Mr. Way noted that he preferred the previous concept of 3 feet, providing greater separation between the street and the sidewalk and making it a special place related to the business within.

Mr. Chinnock requested clarification of the pedestrian bridge connector between the two buildings.

Mr. Costandi responded that it is a single-loaded corridor between the two buildings.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the streetscape regulations per the BSD Code.

Mr. Will responded that this is a Neighborhood Street and would abide by guidelines for that street type concerning on-street parking, sidewalks, street trees and amenities.

Ms. Call inquired about the vertical mixed-use permitted by the BSD.

Ms. Rauch responded that the vertical mixed use was included in the Code to provide that opportunity where it felt appropriate; it is not a requirement. There are a number of BSD commercial buildings that do not have a vertical mixed use component. It was intended to allow maximum flexibility to allow for a variety of uses within the building and a greater height.

Public Comment

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she lives near the developments proposed tonight. Was a market study performed that confirmed a desire to live in a residential development surrounded by hotels? She does not find that appealing. She sees that the greenspace is public greenspace, but would a resident living there want to share their small greenspace with the public? She does not believe the look of the buildings fit with the surrounding area. There are many hotels here. This is a very large development within a small space. It is also in an awkward location. Entering/existing the site is limited to right turns only. With the Ashland proposal considered earlier on the agenda and this Concept Plan, a total of 489 residential units are proposed. She is concerned about there being a more serious traffic issue here, which will have a significant impact on their neighborhood.

Wendy Edwards, 345 Monterey Drive, Dublin stated that she and her husband have lived in Waterford Village for 30 years, and she does not want to live anywhere else. She would like the Commission to consider that they will be bringing in a large amount of additional traffic congestion

with these two developments and the one proposed at the other end of their street. In peak hours, she cannot exit her neighborhood. Because none of the Commission members live in Waterford Village, they have no idea how much this will impact their neighborhood.

James Clarence Borders, 306 Monterey Drive, Dublin stated that developers typically present proposals that begin as overkill, so they can act as if they are negotiating to settle on something less that still is preposterous to people living in the neighborhood. He has all the same concerns as his neighbors. Coming down Frantz Road and looking at this 5-story monolith structure so close to Frantz Road will be daunting. Public spaces are parks and thoroughfares; they are not cutouts of hotel property. No one would take their family to go sit in the lawn of Holiday Inn. The Commission is obsessed about parking, and that is good, but the residents are more concerned about traffic. The way this is structured, the parties make it seem like they have all negotiated, and we should accept it because it could have been worse. In view of the Ashland Development discussed earlier on the agenda and the parking concerns, it would seem incumbent on Dublin to attempt to reduce the reliance on cars. Make the area from Bridge Street to Metro Place a showpiece for e-bike traffic, including charging stations. Perhaps the retail component could be a business that sells and repairs e-bikes. The developers currently are forced to provide the expense of parking.

Public Comments received via email:

Frank Kownacki, 4229 Haymaker Lane, Dublin:

"Would these units feed into Thomas Elementary? I remember that Thomas Elementary was already at maximum capacity. Wouldn't this development exacerbate the already over-crowded school?" [Ms. Rauch noted that this site is actually in the Indian Run Elementary school district.]

Kathryn Lecklider, 275 Monterey Drive, Dublin:

"As a resident of Waterford Village, a mid-thirties professional and a parent of two young children, I'd like to request the following be taken into consideration regarding this development:

- This should not mirror development in Bridge Park.
- The Metro area is adjacent (across Franz Rd.) to existing residential/subdivisions, which flow naturally from Historic Dublin. Both the physical development (height, style, density) and the type of development (commercial, office space, multi-family, single family, GREEN SPACE) should fit with the area.
- I'm not enormously opposed to some apartments in this area, but apartments should not be the bulk of development in the Metro area.
- There are serious infrastructure concerns - namely traffic/safety - with adding more development (of any kind) to this already dense and congested area.
- There currently is a right turn only onto Franz Road from this proposed development. Where will traffic that wants to get to 161/270 be routed?
- This is one of a number of development projects on the horizon and cannot be considered in isolation; the whole will be more problematic than any of the parts on their own.
- Dublin prides itself on green space. What is the intentional plan to ensure (usable) green space is incorporated into overall development plans?

Market considerations:

- Bridge Park seems to be focused on a young professional and senior demographic - what is the focus of the Metro area development? Dublin seems to bill itself as a family community and we have many great amenities, but I think there is opportunity for the Metro area to be more family friendly than Bridge Park - at the very least, incorporate

some play areas and some metro-park-esque use of some of the space? As a parent of young kids, I am much more likely to frequent businesses or development areas where I feel my kids are safe AND entertained.

- For this specific development, aside from one hotel, surrounding building heights are less than 5 stories. Dublin has a wonderful history of thoughtful, intentional, aesthetically pleasing development. I hope this will be no different. The exterior/facade of an apartment building will likely include porches - I'm not loving the thought of 5 stories of personal patio items being visible from Franz Road. Please think hard about this one. Thanks for your time, effort and consideration."

Rosemary Hill, 333 Stonewall Court, Dublin:

"5055 Upper Metro Pl. represents an aesthetic improvement over the initial submission from November 2023 by moving the structures back slightly from Frantz Road. We understand that revitalization of Metro Place is a worthwhile goal, not to mention inevitable. I speak for many Waterford Village neighbors who are nevertheless still opposed to the proposed building height of five stories. We prefer a maximum of four stories bordering Frantz Road. We are also concerned about the impact that 159 additional "residential units" in that location will have upon traffic congestion, school enrollment and demand for emergency services. Finally, we urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to keep in mind when reviewing this and other proposals, that although we may enjoy the amenities of Bridge Park and the Scioto River Park, we definitely do not want the density, intensity, or congestion of Bridge Park a just few blocks from our peaceful neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration."

Wendy Edwards, 345 Monterey Drive, Dublin:

"Does Dublin really feel there is a need for 159 more residential units so close to all the units across the way. The street off Frantz, up Corbin's Mill, and now proposed at the end of Monterey Drive at SR161 – the congestion for the people in Waterford Village is going to increase exponentially....not happy about it!"

Commission Question for Staff (continued)

Mr. Fishman stated that when this potential project came up a year ago, Councilmember Reiner stated that a comprehensive study should be done of the Metro Center area before allowing any more apartment developments. Has that study been done?

Mr. Will responded that the study to which he refers is the Metro Center Strategic Framework Plan, a revitalization plan. This area technically is just outside that planning area. It is within the Bridge Street District and in an area where there is a community vision for redevelopment change over time, and a Code in place to support that. The study of the Metro Center that is underway at this time is for the area just south of this site.

Mr. Fishman stated that what he understood is that no more apartments should be approved until that had occurred.

Mr. Boggs stated that the BSD zoning on this parcel remains as it is in terms of the uses permitted and the development processes of which property owners may avail themselves. There has been no action by Council to prevent the typical application and development process from proceeding for a Bridge Street District project, including on this particular parcel. Metro Center is a different situation because there is the ongoing planning process, and any applications at Metro Center are asking for a PUD/rezoning, which Council has discretion to accept/reject.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that this Concept Plan was approved previously, and for the reasons that have been stated, the applicant has requested that a revised version be approved. He was supportive of the Concept Plan before, and he believes it has been improved. He continues to be supportive.

Ms. Fishman stated that the plan has been approved, but it could be improved further. This will be a huge project next to single-family homes, and the ingress/egress from this street to Frantz Road is already very difficult. This development will add significantly more traffic. The situation for the neighbors, the density and other elements need to be looked at critically in the next development stage.

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes the Concept Plan has been improved. The height barrier adds something; the paths are generous; the reduction of the plinth removes some concern; adding space into the commercial elements is a nice byproduct. The model of the architecture leaves much to be desired. He is supportive of the greenspace. The parapet appears to be all the same height; some variation of that would improve the architecture. There appears to be a massive blank façade on the west side near the Phase 2 building; that visual needs attention. Because this is in the BSD, there is a great opportunity to include some very nice signs. The restaurant is small; it could be "blossomed", perhaps, by conceding a unit above it. The presence of the glass mass at the corner could be raised. Adding more glass and architectural interest would help that restaurant to succeed based on the visibility. The art walk is a great concept. If it is located on the west end, there are loops, which could be missed. The screen wall could be more than a wall; public art should not be a flat element. There are times and places for moralized canvas, but art in public spaces can involve installations. Phase 2 has the potential of never being built, but he encourages them not to give up on considering it.

Mr. Chinnock stated the Commission appreciates the public's comments, but a Concept Plan has already been approved for this site. The revised plan is great. He would challenge the applicant when they come back with the next step, that they recognize that this particular location is south of the larger Metro Place development and will be a transitional piece with the residential. Consider how to better transition this first piece. He is looking forward to the next step when the architecture and overall look and feel of the space is addressed.

Ms. Harter stated this is a family-oriented space, so the walkability needs to be considered. She believes the ingress/egress from this site needs to be reconfigured, and the traffic issue will need to be addressed. The landscaping on the site will be important to providing a sense of privacy to the residents.

Mr. Way stated that this project is not new. It has been through previous Commission reviews. It started as an L-shaped building fronting onto Frantz Road and Upper Metro Place. Since then, the developer has broken up the massing, creating great open space on the corner. He believes the revised plan continues to head in the right direction. The building along Upper Metro Place is now shorter. He understands the economic reasons for certain development decisions. Scaling down the building length has made it more attractive. If the additional infill building does occur in Phase 2, that would complete the story. He does not mind the interim surface parking surrounded by an attractive wall integrated into the art walk. He is not opposed to 5 stories; there is sufficient open space to support that.

Ms. Call stated that previously she worked in Metro Place; now her office is on Frantz Road. The traffic in the area is concerning. SR161 is a state route, so the City does not have much input with that; however, with the demand for reprogramming that area, there is the impetus for considering alternative traffic patterns in the surrounding area. In regard to open space, she does not think that just because a space is not built upon that it qualifies as open space. Open space can be a multiuse trail. She applauds the creativity that goes into making an open space a destination, such as the art walkway.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Concept Plan with 2 conditions:

1. The applicant continue to work with staff for proposed on-street parking and other improvements within the public rights-of-way;
2. The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure site open spaces meet the quantity, accessibility, and type requirements of the Code.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch stated that due to a meeting conflict, the previously scheduled April 4, 2024 PZC meeting date has been re-scheduled to April 11, 2024.

PZC members had no concerns with the revised meeting date.

The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council