City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 23, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the January 23, 2025 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, Jason Deschler, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way, Gary Alexander
Staff members present:	Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar, Christopher Will, Tina Wawszkiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 01-09-25 meeting minutes.
Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0.]

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 and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. 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.

CASE REVIEW

Case #24-150CP Pizzuti Blazer

Review and non-binding feedback for the development of approximately 330 residential units, commercial and open space. The 18.9-acre site, located north of Blazer Parkway and south of the Cosgray Ditch, is zoned Office Laboratory and Research District.

Applicant Presentation

Eric Buck, Vice President, Development, Pizzuti Companies, 629 North High Street, Columbus, stated that after the last meeting in January of 2024, they felt good about the direction the project was going. After incorporating comments from this commission and staff, they feel ready to take the next step. Upon working with staff, they realized the project was ahead of the City in regards to community planning for the area so they waited until planning in Metro Center was completed. This is still a concept level plan with details yet to be determined. The entire site is 18.9 acres but there is a four-to-five-acre part of the north side of the site that is in the Cosgray Corridor floodplain requiring development to occur south of that.

Jeff Pongonis, Principal, MKSK, 462 South Ludlow Alley, Columbus, stated that they are here today with the first attempt to fit into the Metro Place Revitalization Plan, specifically the street grid and connections from Metro Place to Blazer Parkway. He referenced key connections, including Blazer Parkway north to Metro Place. Another is the east/west road that runs along Cosgray Run and then connects back up to Metro Place. And finally, there is the connection down to the old Ashland site. This new plan is in reaction to those new streets. Streets create development blocks, into which the applicants are trying to fit. Mr. Pongonis shared that the plan includes a connection to Cosgray Run, east to Smiley Park and an amenity to be defined in future. With the development proposal, they tried to reiterate the Metro Center Revitalization Plan's goal to create a more connected street grid from north to south. Alongside that are the pedestrian routes of travel. The current proposal is in reaction to that connectivity. The north-south connection from Blazer Parkway up to Metro Place is designed as a boulevard with on-street parking and high-quality amenities. That is the primary roadway. The east-west road along Cosgray Run connects to points east and west and fronts the development onto a public street and onto the public open space. The final connection is from this development site down to the Ashland site creating more of a traditional street grid. This plan is a series of four-story buildings with potentially some three-story buildings further to the west. Key amenities include a retail component at the southern entry to the development. A community amenity is the pool and outdoor recreation area as well as the clubhouse. The idea is to provide pulse points along the north-south connector at the ground floor to create activation. Images showing site character were shared. A rendering showing the boulevard/Metro-Blazer connector section was shared.

Tim Donoghue, Sr. Designer, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Columbus, stated that the architecture for this project has had an ongoing design theme throughout its iterations. The intention is to use more natural materials like brick lower on the buildings where people will engage with them. A wood-look siding would provide relief to the building. The rest of the facade would be fiber cement siding. They intend to use large windows. Along primary streets, there will be a townhouse entry feature with a stoop to allow people to interact with the street, sidewalk and pedestrian pathways.

Mr. Buck stated that they will continue to work with staff as standards continue to be developed for the area. There are multiple ways to create a destination such as opening the public realm on the north side of the site, having retail on the south side of the site as well as living with art. Pizzuti

has a curated art program within all their projects. Art is not only inside the building and common spaces but is also outward, public facing with murals and sculptures. Those moments create a unique place that draws people in.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that this is a Concept Plan, which provides the opportunity for the Commission to provide non-binding feedback to the applicant and guidance at the early stages of their proposal. Key considerations at this stage are the land use and densities, the general site layout, streets and circulation, open space framework, and integration with the surrounding areas. No determination is required.

The 19-acre site is located north of Blazer Parkway and contains Cosgray Run to the north in a riparian corridor. The remainder of the site is agricultural use. The Community Plan Future Land Use recommendation for this site is mixed-use center. Mixed-use center is intended to create a vibrant mixed-use district organized around open space with buildings ranging from two to eight stories in height with vertical mixed use and ground floor activations. The principal uses in this district are office, hospitality, multi-family, laboratory, and research and development with commercial retail supporting uses.

Since the Commission last saw this project, the City adopted the Metro Center Revitalization Plan. City Council adopted this plan in December 2024 and established a new vision for Metro Center as a mixed-use walkable district that connects development and nature. Within the plan are the design framework and guidelines, which provide the Commission a tool to review applications and development proposals to ensure they are part of a collective whole. As the City conducted this process, many stakeholders were engaged and the applicants were active members. Their contributions feedback are appreciated.

Some fundamental pieces of the framework are mobility, open space and development. The intent of Metro Center is to reprioritize mobility and focus on pedestrians and cyclists and creating connectivity within the district and to other areas of the City. Specific recommendations for this site include the new Metro-Blazer connector connecting Blazer Parkway with Metro Place South, the creation of a network of new streets designed to be contact sensitive, a metro bike loop through Cosgray Run connecting to the rest of Metro Center, and a mobility hub near Cosgray Run.

Mr. Will shared a conceptual view of the Metro-Blazer connector. The intent is to make this more bike friendly, pedestrian friendly, and add green into the streetscape. The Revitalization Plan recommends taking an open space first approach to design. The larger Metro Center is designed around five landscape rooms. Cosgray Run is one of those rooms present on this site. Its intent is to create a more naturalized experience.

The development framework builds upon the Future Land Use recommendations of the Community Plan. One of core tenets of the Revitalization Plan is to reimagine the mix of uses, which are currently primarily office and commercial. Residential is one of the recommended future uses for the district. Mixed-use is also one of the recommendations. The plan prioritizes where to put commercial and ground floor activation. Over the next 5, 10, 20 years, there is only so much demand for commercial in Dublin and in Metro Center. The desire is to ensure commercial uses are being used in a smart way that is prioritized toward the waterway or inner loop area. This site does have strategic activation at the south gateway near Blazer Parkway and closer to Cosgray Run. The Metro Revitalization Plan makes recommendations on appropriate uses in those areas, including shared lobbies/clubhouses.

Image shown comparing previous site plan to current proposal.

Mr. Will stated that the previous plan included six residential buildings, a clubhouse, the north-south Metro-Blazer connection and the Cosgray Run. Architectural imagery and character representations are unchanged from last time.

Mr. Will provided the following questions for discussion by the Commission.

1) Does the Commission support the proposed mobility framework?
2) Does the Commission support the proposed open space framework?
3) Does the Commission support the proposed development framework?
4) Additional considerations from the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock stated that he feels the site has lost some of the organic nature. He asked the applicant to talk through site layout. Mr. Pongonis stated that the street grid came directly out of the Metro Place Revitalization Plan. The plan from 2024 has organically shaped retention ponds at the entry and more greenspace at the core than the current plan. In some ways, that is a reaction to connecting the street grid in the way that the City's framework suggested. Mr. Chinnock stated that the site is very grid-like. Mr. Pongonis stated that the spirit of the buildings is generally unchanged.
Mr. Buck stated that the change is really in reaction to the Metro Center Revitalization Plan.
Mr. Chinnock stated that this appears to be primarily residential. He asked what is mixed-use about the site. Mr. Buck stated that his understanding was that the mixed-use district was not for each site but the whole district (Metro Center) is a mix of uses. They see their retail being more specialty retail. Restaurants may not succeed this far into Metro Center. He can see it being something to activate that corner like a yoga or Pilates studio.
Mr. Chinnock asked for more information about structured versus surface parking. Less surface parking could be construed as more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Buck stated that the rents in this area do not support parking structures. Without some type of subsidy from City, the rents would not support it.

Ms. Harter asked how long it would take someone to walk over to Metro Center. Mr. Pongonis stated that it would probably be between one-third and one-half mile from Blazer Parkway up to Metro Place South. That is a five-to-ten-minute walk.
Ms. Harter asked if there is an anticipated speed change in that area. Mr. Will stated that the intent of the future streets is to be more pedestrian-oriented. These neighborhood streets would be marked as 25 miles per hour and reinforced by the built environment.
Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that she would anticipate new routes would be posted at 25 miles per hour, have narrow lanes and the environment to support speed compliance.
Ms. Harter asked how the buildings could be updated in the future. Mr. Donoghue stated that the intent for most of the elevation would be to have the brick and wood-look siding and those would remain the same. The only thing that would possibly change would be the fiber cement siding.
Mr. Buck stated that brick could be painted and other materials could be removed.
Ms. Harter asked if there is a bus stop in the area. Mr. Will stated that there are bus stops along Blazer Parkway and Frantz Road and COTA service through the Metro Place Loop and Dublin would like to continue to promote transit and walkability.
Ms. Harter stated that this is 800 feet from I-270 and she asked if there is noise anticipated. Mr. Will stated there was no noise study. Part of the Revitalization Plan recommends office along that I-270 frontage. This property is 900 feet from I-270. The Community Plan Future Land Use

recommends office along the I-270 frontage and open space around Cosgray Run with the intent to maximize the benefit and view for those uses while the mixed and residential uses are more interior to the site.
Ms. Harter asked if the proposed development would cause any problems for the special flood hazard area. Mr. Will stated that any future development would need to occur outside of the floodplain. It is the intent of the plan to preserve that riparian corridor along Cosgray Run. Appropriate transitions would be encouraged with future development.

Mr. Way stated that some of the plans show a connection to the east across the property that breaks up a larger block. He asked if that something the City would like to preserve. Mr. Will stated that these are fairly large sites and the Plan does recommend extending that connection when future development occurs.
Mr. Way asked for the applicant's intent regarding the connection to the east. Mr. Pongonis stated that they are trying to be true to the intent of creating a street grid and developing in blocks. That connection would provide the opportunity to connect both east and west should the City find that valuable as those properties develop.
Mr. Way stated that this project has been before the Commission multiple times and the unit count has not changed. Density remains unchanged from before the City's planning efforts occurred. The Community Plan and Metro Place Revitalization Plan call for a certain type of mixed-use development and densities. If the density could be increased, it changes the whole development perspective. He asked if more units were added, could the development support structured parking and still fit within the market. Mr. Buck answered that no, rents do not support structured parking. They have remained at 330 units because it is what can fit on the site with parking. More density would require the removal of open space.
Mr. Way stated that previous plans showed the buildings wrapping an open space and creating a private amenity. There was feedback about that not being closed off but being more open to the public. Now half of that area has been made surface parking. He asked if that was simply to add parking. Mr. Pongonis stated that the location of the streets and the multi-modal paths took up ground causing a loss of parking. They have a goal to have as few multi-depth parking areas as possible. The applicant's intent is to have the Cosgray corridor remain a four-acre public park. Mr. Pongonis stated that they designed within the lots and blocks provided. Given the market, the location and public open space, this plan feels responsive to the desire for lots and blocks and streets and parks.
Mr. Way asked if the buildings on the western edge have different unit types. Mr. Buck stated that those have a town-home feel with parking tucked under a flat on top.

Mr. Alexander stated that the north-south connection has been made much more of a feature than the Community Plan suggests. He asked how those buildings will be treated compared to those facing Cosgray. Mr. Pongonis stated those are set back with more landscape and scaled appropriately to the street. That includes the front door of the clubhouse and the front door of the retail site. All the units along that stretch are ground-floor front-door units. Mr. Alexander stated that edge seems like a more urban condition than what is facing Cosgray.
Mr. Alexander stated that the structured public space at the south is appropriately sited. He asked if there was any thought given to public structured space at the northern part of site. Mr. Pongonis stated that it is undesigned right now.

Mr. Deschler asked staff what conversations were had with the applicant relative to the proposed density and majority apartment proposal. Mr. Will stated that the Community Plan Future Land

Use Plan for the mixed-use center prescribes uses and mixes and the density is influenced by building height and form. There is no specific unit or density count, so there was discussion on that matter. The Metro Center Revitalization Plan works on strategic activation and does recommend mixed residential for this. There was a market study done by the consultant for the Metro Center Revitalization Plan considering market conditions for 5-20 years. One of the findings from that study was that there was limited demand for commercial uses in greater Dublin and Metro Center so it should be used wisely and spread around Metro Center to areas where the most activation is intended. That would be where the waterway park and the inner loop is.
Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that staff is supportive of this area being generally residential. Mr. Will stated that the Metro Center Revitalization Plan does recommend mixed residential for this within the larger Metro Center area. This proposal area is a contributing piece of the neighborhood while using those active edges to make sure it is still a walkable neighborhood and not an apartment complex.
Mr. Deschler stated that the expectation is that the pool, clubhouse, etc. will be private for the use of those residents. He asked for the applicant's thoughts regarding the one retail piece. Mr. Buck stated that they have been speaking to one of retail brokers leasing properties to the east of this location and they agree that restaurants and those uses are better in the core area of Metro Center and along Frantz Road. The retail space on this plan could be a coffee shop or more of a specialty use.
Mr. Deschler stated the building next to the retention pond feels like it could be problematic based on parking. Mr. Buck stated that they did a parking count per unit by building and can provide that. Mr. Pongonis stated that this may evolve but they feel like they have good parking distribution throughout the site.
Mr. Deschler asked if there could be delivery trucks driving down this boulevard. Mr. Will stated that there are not a lot of industrial uses in the area. Mr. Deschler stated that the lane distances feel tight. Mr. Will stated that part of the paradigm shift is to prioritize pedestrians and bicyclists in other modes of travel. Reducing lane width is one of the strategies to change the built environment to slow traffic. That is recommended in Metro Center.
Mr. Pongonis stated that typically things like delivery rooms and clubhouse visits are planned for by practice in every project like this. In future steps, there will be engineering drawings that show that a roadway truck could make its way through the site.
Mr. Deschler asked if the thought is that every building will have the same colors/materials. Mr. Buck stated that the buildings will relate to each other but will not be the same. This is not a cookie cutter development.
Mr. Deschler asked if they know what type of wood-look material will be used. Mr. Pongonis stated that they are still evaluating that and will work with staff to make sure it is part of the approved materials list.

Mr. Garvin asked if the Community Plan Future Land Use recommendations separated retail versus office when referencing more intense uses in the center of Metro Center. Mr. Will stated the plan does contemplate a base type of land use. Within mixed use, certain sites need to be reserved because of visibility or location for commercial office or hospitality. The ground floor is another area where those recommendations are made. Those are primarily made around the waterway park. Office is suggested along I-270 and neighborhood office along Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway. Mr. Garvin sought confirmation that the thought is that the land uses would be office along the outside of Metro Place, retail inside the core and this would be expected to be mostly residential. Mr. Will stated that is what is recommended in the Metro Center Revitalization Plan.

Ms. Call stated that that this is proposed at an average of 21 units per acre. She asked what that translates to in floor area ratio (FAR). Mr. Will stated that there is a mathematical equation for building footprint that staff does not have at this level of review. Mr. Donoghue stated that the FAR for the development is around .9.
Ms. Call asked to have that called out in future staff reports. Mr. Will stated that one of the recommendations of the Metro Center Revitalization Plan is to look into development and design standards and guidelines. Staff will make sure the applicants provide everything necessary for both staff and the Commission to review at future stages.
Ms. Call stated supporting materials show the bike loop as a straight line. She asked if it is the vision for the Mobility Street Network/Bike Path Network to be straight lines on the corridor areas. Mr. Will stated that the plan calls for different types of bike and pedestrian facilities. The Metro Center bike loop is intended to be a circuit through Metro Center. The intent is that as it moves through different spaces, that it has a different experience. In the Cosgray Run, it is part of the more naturalized nature play experience. In the inner loop, it has a more active experience. As development occurs, specific alignments would be reviewed with each proposal.
Ms. Call stated that the way the plan is drawn, there is a dog park and specialty retail along Blazer Parkway. She asked what the plan is for four-season activation. Mr. Pongonis stated that putting a dog park on Blazer Parkway requires creative design. The intent for the retail space would be to create an attractive transparent retail space.
Ms. Call asked if Blocks One and Two would have backside garages. Mr. Buck answered affirmatively.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is generally in favor of this development. This area needs to have more activation and a more organic nature to the buildings. He suggested the applicant consider how to accomplish their intent while making the development more special, activated and connected to Metro Center. Parking remains a concern.

Mr. Harter is supportive of the idea of underground parking or blending it in more. This is the perfect location to promote walkability and cycling. She suggested the applicant continue talking about the art and connecting that through all of Metro Center. There are ways to make the open spaces engaging and purposeful. Landscaping and screening are important.

Mr. Way stated that as previously stated, the Metro Plan and Community Plan support that this should be denser than this plan. His expectation was that there would be podium buildings with parking below. A plan like that would be addressing the area plans. He could also see an alternative but it would have to be very good. The important edges to this development are the north-south connector and frontage onto Cosgray Park. The buildings along those areas could be taller and look denser. The buildings could be brought closer together to create a more urban dense feel. Instead of a dog park, he would make that a bigger building. If there was a bigger building fronting Blazer Parkway and greenspace, potentially a plaza, across the street from that, this could be a dramatic gateway. The architecture and streetscape needs to be spectacular. The

parking needs to be screened as much as possible to give the illusion of a denser development without coming up with a different parking solution.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is generally supportive of what was presented this evening. The introduction of the boulevard creates a hierarchy to the plan, of which he is supportive. There is a hierarchy to the street network. The Blazer Parkway connection to the west, as well as the connection to the south presents an opportunity to carve out another block at a future time and develop that in a similar way. He is supportive of the established framework. He is supportive of the open space but would like to see more public open space on the north end. The current proposal is an improvement over the previous one. There is a hierarchy to the open space as well with the private open spaces in front of the units and the semi-public open space of the pool. He suggested the edges be differentiated more. The line of buildings along Cosgray could be like Central Park where the buildings are tall and create a wall and take advantage of that amenity. The buildings along the boulevard could have different character. That would support the idea of greater density but also differentiate those two routes in the community. He is supportive of the way mixed-use has been defined with more of the office use part of adjacent parcels.

Mr. Deschler stated that what has been presented seems to be a better proposal than the previous one. He shares the concerns of his fellow commissioners. The dog park should not be in front of the activation area. It is unclear what the retail piece will be and how it will be interplayed on that frontage. While he has concerns regarding the boulevard, he likes how it is set up. There could be additional work relative to open space. He would like to see more details on the architecture.

Mr. Garvin stated that the applicant did a good job reacting to previous comments and trying to accomplish the City's and Commission's goals. He is generally supportive of the proposal. The mobility framework aligns well with the Metro Center Revitalization Plan. Materials referenced exercise nodes or mini gardens. Anything like that can add interest to the boulevard into the tertiary spaces. He wants to see the potential walkway through the Cosgray area activated. That is important as it supports the green space requirements. He is supportive of the artwork and the development framework. He shares the concern that residents in the southwestern building may have a long walk to parking.

Ms. Call stated that the PZC looks at applications with objectivity and subjectivity. Objective tools include the Community Plan, Metro Center Revitalization Plan, and the Neighborhood Design Guidelines. If the plan recommends FAR of 1.5 to 3, that is an objective metric. Currently, there are many objective metrics that are not met by this particular plan. Part of the reason Metro Center is being revitalized is because of seas of parking. This plan shows seas of parking. This site could be a catalyst for development in Metro Place, which benefits this development and all of Metro Place. When considering projects, the Commission needs good reasons for violating any of the objective metrics that took years of planning time. The parking and the Blazer Parkway entrance (dog park and retail) are challenges. The Commission needs to make sure proportions of mixed use are being weighed fairly across the entire district. She appreciates the different residential types offered by this plan. It still has a way to go. The Cosgray corridor has been incorporated very well.

Ms. Call asked if the applicant sought any additional clarification from the Commission.

Mr. Buck stated that he was under the impression that the FAR was not determined for this area. Ms. Call clarified that is from the Neighborhood Design Guidelines. Mr. Buck stated that they are reacting to the Metro Revitalization Plan. The parking lot locations in that plan are almost identical to this current plan. They want to make sure the Commission is supportive before moving on to the next step. Rents do not support podium parking. They understand and agree with having taller buildings on the boulevard. Ms. Call stated PZC does not consider economics.

Mr. Way stated that structured parking may be required to achieve the densities thought of in the Community Plan. Another direction could be showing how to achieve the look and feel of density without actually doing structured parking.

Ms. Call clarified that the referenced Neighborhood Design Guidelines are embedded in the Community Plan.

Mr. Way recused himself from the next case and exited the room.

Case #24-160CP Cosgray Commons
Review and non-binding feedback of a mixed-use development comprised of office, residential, commercial and open space. The 43.3-acre site, located southwest of the intersection of Post Road/State Route 161 and University Boulevard, is zoned ID-2: Research Flex District.

Applicant Presentation

Tony Murray, NBBJ Design, 250 S. High Street, Columbus, stated that they are looking for feedback as they move forward to Preliminary Development Plan. This plan addresses feedback from their previous meeting with the Commission in 2024. Changes to the plan have accurend mostly to the west and south of this site. This site has the potential of being the heart of the West Innovation Distict. The new interchange, proximity to neighboring communities and plans for the surrounding area make this an exciting opportunity. They previously received feedback regarding sustainability. They are beginning to think about stormwater harvesting as a central feature of the central open space running from north to south, funneling it to the middle. The plan shows One Earth as a green street. This plan is trying to get as much efficiency as posssible out of the buildings by orienting them north to south; however, orienting them north-south is not always the best for solar energy. The north side of the site will be more polished and innovative to align with the West Innovation District. The uses there will be commercial, hospitality, and mixed-use urban. Material typologies navigate to more natural features as the programming moves south on the site. At the Commission's suggestion, a significant amout of development was put into the open space. The intent is for the open spaces at the center of the project and around the site to be meaningful and not residual. The northern parcels would likely be developed first. The goal is for impact at the northeast corner. This will be the gateway into the project. The central space could have a hill much like Bridge Park has a bridge. It also relates to the founding of Dublin and why it is named Dublin. The historic house will remain and have some relationship to structures along Post Road. Visitors coming from the west will see the hotel on that corner. There is demand for more than one hotel. The shared use paths along Cosgray and Post Road are important for connectivity to the community within and beyond the site. The south edge of the site will be quieter and calmer, relating to Indian Run, with 31 townhomes. The main arrival points are off of University Drive and Cosgray. They open to large landscape open spaces. The heart of this development is the central

commons area/hill. The thought is that some of the retail buildings will be under this. Programming is very important. The development should be walkable and in order to be so, it needs a market or grocer. There is a civic opportunity with a nature center envisioned along Indian Run. The landscape space is bookended on the north with the historic house and on the south with the nature center. Streets would be ended and designed to prevent high rates of speed.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that this is a Concept Plan giving the Commission the opportunity to provide non-binding feedback and guidance on development proposals to an applicant before they submit a formal application. Key considerations at this stage are land use and density, general site layout, streets and circulation, open space framework and integration into the surrounding areas. No determination is required.
The 43-acre site is located southwest of Post Road and University Boulevard and is currently zoned ID-2, Research Flex District. There is a tributary to the Indian Run South Fork at the south of the site, Cosgray Road bounds the site to the west, and Ohio University (OU) campus is to the east. Dublin Green and Costo shopping center are to the north of the site. AEP-owned land and SportsOhio are located to the south and the Fishel Industrial Park is to the west. The site is in portions of both Union and Franklin counties. Photos showing existing conditions were shared. The Community Plan Future Land Use recommendation is mixed-use center. The intent of this is to create a vibrant, walkable mixed-use district. Principal uses are office, hospitality, multi-family residential, laboratory, research and development and supporting commercial, civic and retail spaces. Development is intended to be two to eight stories tall. The site is within the West Innovation District Special Area Plan. Economic Development is a principle focus of this district. While residential and commercial uses serve as amenities to support employees and employers, the creation of a distinct walkable, mixed-use node in the West Innovation District is a recommendation of the Community Plan. In 2016, OU and the City of Dublin collaborated to create a framework plan, which illustrates a vision for their campus. Though this site is not within that framework boundary, it can be referenced for view corridors, street level experiences, green space and open space network. Feedback regarding the previous plan (2024) was generally positive with a good response to the creativity and open space framework. Some concern was provided for density. Key changes between the two plans include moving the hotel along Post Road and the elimination of residential directly fronting Post Road. An office retail building has been replaced with a retail grocery building and the standalone retail/commercial buildings within the open space have been incorporated in the hill. The Wunerf that connected to Post Road and the southern street has been disconnected. The open space framework is generally consistent with 9 acres of open space. Additional renderings have been provided showing massing, scale and character.

Mr. Will provided the following questions for discussion by the Commission.

1) Is the Commission supportive of the updated proposed organization of the mix of uses?
2) Is the Commission supportive of the updates to the proposed open space framework?
3) Is the Commission supportive of the access and circulation?
4) Is the Commission supportive of the character and scale of the proposed development?
5) Other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin asked if, given guidelines of two to eight stories, the applicant expects to seek an exception for the hotel on the SR161 side of the development. Mr. Murray stated that it is currently shown at 12 stories, so yes, that would be an exception. Everything else will fit within the recommended two to eight stories.
Mr. Garvin sought clarification regarding parking. Mr. Murray stated that they will be podium-style parking garages. Mr. Garvin suggested the applicant give thought to traffic entering and exiting those garages with the mass of buildings here. He is supportive of that solution but it does bring up concerns.
Mr. Garvin asked if there is any anticipation of OU needing space for dorms. Mr. Will stated the framework does identify future development that is educational, residential and commercial to create a campus experience but City staff is unaware of any potential development for that site. Ms. Call noted that Mayor Amorose Groomes is engaged in those conversations.
Mr. Garvin asked if Cosgray is anticipated as the main point of entry. Mr. Murray answered that it will be secondary, but not by much. They anticipate doing additional traffic analysis. Mr. Will noted that as part of the rezoning and preliminary development plan process (PDP), a traffic impact study would be required of the applicant. The multimodal plan does recommend improvements around the site. Cosgray is recommended to be four lanes from the two-lane section and University Boulevard is proposed to extend to the south to connect closer to the Ohio State University Wexner medical facility.

Mr. Deschler stated that the previous proposal included two million square feet for development. He asked what the numbers are with the updated proposal. Mr. Murray answered that they are roughly the same.
Mr. Deschler asked for more information on the garages. Mr. Murray stated that typically with the podium garages, they will be topped with an amenity (garden, green roof, pool, etc.) that relates to the program to which they are adjacent. Mr. Deschler asked if the apartments would have a pool-topped garage. Mr. Murray answered in the affirmative.
Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that the intent is to have an elevated green walkway with retail underneath. Mr. Murray answered affirmatively.

Mr. Garvin stated that he supports the elevated walkway. He asked if the applicant has seen trees used successfully in this treatment. Mr. Muray stated it has been done. One of the precedents he referenced is Titletown, a development in Green Bay, Wisconsin. This is all subject to economics. Even if the walkway does not go over the top of buildings, there are ways to create this type of landscape architecture feature to make this a unique space.

Mr. Deschler asked how many apartments are being considered. Mr. Murray answered that they were planning for approximately 1,000 one-to-three-bedroom apartments and 31 condominiums.
Mr. Deschler asked if consideration was given to adding condominiums instead of apartments on the south part of the site. Mr. Murray stated that it will be largely market driven. They are envisioning the residential units in the center of the development could be apartments and the larger buildings further south could be condominiums.

Mr. Alexander asked if there is any intent to link the open space with OU and their campus. Mr. Murray stated along University Boulevard, there is a significant swath of green space that works east to west. They have tried to be mindful of that, but the challenge is understanding long-term what will happen on the OU campus. They have designed the open space to still be viewed as an entry point if the OU plan does not materialize.

Mr. Alexander asked if conversations have been had regarding the viability of retail internal to the site.
Gilli Zofan, First Vice President, Colliers, Two Miranova Place, Suite 900, Columbus, stated there is market demand, and that market demand drove the adjustment to add the market grocery. They wanted to make this a dense, urban destination.
Mr. Alexander asked if parking is intended to be underground. Mr. Murray stated that no parking will be underground.
Mr. Alexander asked if the signature trail connects with City trails. Mr. Will stated that the east-west signature trail is currently under study by the City. The alignment of that has not been determined. The South Fork Indian Run is a potential corridor but this site is not directly on the South Fork, it is on a tributary to it.

Ms. Harter asked if there has been communication with nearby property owners. Mr. Murray answered in the affirmative.
Ms. Harter asked if any speed changes would be anticipated. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated the site would have a lower speed limit, probably 25 miles per hour with a narrower feel and pedestrian amenities on both sides. The existing routes on the perimeter of the site will stay the same as those are set by State statute.
Ms. Harter asked if there is a plan for solar panels on top of the market. Mr. Murray stated that there is not.
Ms. Harter asked about anticipated uses for the historic home. Mr. Murray stated that they have a lot of ideas, such as a museum, historic home, coffee shop, or venue.
Ms. Harter asked if people walking on the hill can be seen as a person drives into the site. Mr. Murray answered in the affirmative.
Ms. Harter asked if cars drive under the hill. Mr. Murray answered in the affirmative.
Ms. Harter asked about the nature center. Mr. Murray stated that the idea is that it would be a node along the trail and is still open to design.

Mr. Chinnock stated that they did an exceptional job presenting their vision. He is concerned about pedestrians coming from Dublin Green to access the site. He asked how crossing SR161 would be handled. Mr. Murray stated that it is an important consideration. They must consider people who may live in the development that may want to cross the street as well. Mr. Will stated that there are existing pedestrian facilities at the Post Road and Cosgray Road roundabout. As it is a state route, there are other considerations. Dublin Green and the Costco shopping center are all within Jerome Township so planning there would occur outside Dublin's jurisdiction. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that the Ohio Department of Transportation has jurisdiction over Post Road. Union County has jurisdiction over parts of the routes. Dublin would be coordinating with those outside agencies particularly as this moves to next steps and considering how to accommodate all modes of transportation.

Ms. Call asked for the FAR calculation. Mr. Murray stated that it is 1.0 for the whole site and 2.0 for the developable area.
Ms. Call asked the applicant to identify employment centers. Mr. Murray stated that the retail in the center would qualify as an employment center. The northern two blocks are commercial hospitality. By square footage, the site is 50/50 employment/residential. Ms. Call asked if there are any calculations regarding office uses. Mr. Murray stated that the plan calls for 400,000 square feet of office space.

Ms. Call asked if they are looking at the nature center as a collaborative project with the City. Mr. Murray answered in the affirmative.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were provided.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that he is supportive of the proposal. The plan has improved in terms of open space network. Removing buildings in the middle and dedicating that middle space to public use is a big improvement. He is supportive of the variety of events occurring throughout the space - the nature center at one end, the bridge, the historic building and two public spaces on a cross axis. He would like to see the two public spaces as organizers for retail at the perimeter. He expressed interest in space for active play in the plan. He is supportive of the access, character and scale. He suggested the applicant explore a deeper approach to sustainability.

Mr. Deschler stated that he appreciates the updated site plan and feels the activation of the middle corridor is significantly improved. He offered support for the open space, access and circulation. There was concern about internal traffic pieces that he feels have been addressed. He agrees with Mr. Chinnock's concern regarding a pedestrian safety mechanism to cross to Dublin Green. Mr. Deschler is supportive of the placement and sustainability of the garages. He likes the building structures and how they are placed.

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the project in general and he appreciates the transition of the site. He has concerns about the massing and intensity of the main hotel. He is most supportive of the updates to the open space. People will be drawn into a feature like that. Concerns regarding traffic will be addressed at later steps with traffic studies.

Ms. Harter stated that she is excited about this project and agrees with her fellow commissioners.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the connections are important at SR161 and to SportsOhio at some point. This is such a unique, exciting place, people will want to get there. He suggested the garage not be so restricted that there is not enough parking for more public access. He is supportive of the scale though he would like the building heights varied. He is very supportive of the project.

Ms. Call stated that the project is on target with the FAR as called out in the Future Land Use Plan. The recommendation for this site is that it be principally focused on economic development with commercial, retail and housing supportive of that. 22% is significant but possibly not principal. She understands this is a terrible time to build office buildings but she challenged the applicant to find opportunities to leverage economic development drivers – especially laboratory-focused. This plan responds appropriately to the Community Plan at its current phase. She stated that it would be helpful if there could be a model or some sort of visual aid to help the Commission understand the scale of the massing of the hotel on the corner.

Ms. Call asked the applicant if they sought any further clarification. They did not.

With no objection from the Commission, Ms. Call called for a brief recess. All members returned to the dais and the meeting reconvened at 9:18 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

Bridge Street District Overview
A presentation explaining the origins of the Bridge Street District, the Bridge Street District Code, and additional initiatives within the district.

Ms. Rauch introduced an overview of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code. This Code was a complete change in the City's approach to development ten to twelve years ago. It provided the opportunity to capitalize on the success of the Historic District and use the Scioto River as the grounding point for the larger Bridge Street development. It allowed focus on the economic vitality of this new type of development and how to attract workers that want the opportunity to live and work in different environments than a typical suburban neighborhood. One of the key principles was walkability and the natural environment. The District provides opportunities for residential, retail, recreation and transportation. These ideas translated into the Vision Plan that was created in 2010, which started to lay out very different style of development for the City with street connections and blocks that are very comfortable and walkable. A mix of uses was a key component of the Plan that has been carried through today. The Special Area Plan that was adopted as part of Envision Dublin still adheres to the same connectivity and neighborhoods and character. The Code is purposely focused on building types, form, and types of design. The Bridge Street District Code retains some traditional conventional zoning code and form-based code to make a hybrid. The BSD Code includes the uses and intent statements found in a traditional code and then focuses on how a site gets developed, the building types, neighborhood standards, etc. The BSD Code permits a mix of uses in all the districts and focuses on the character and land use. There are specific standards within each of the zoning districts. The goal is to break lots and blocks down into areas that feel walkable. There are different building types with specific requirements and all include a required building zone. The point is to move buildings up to the street. There are neighborhood standards that address the extra level of detail for character. That helps provide placemaking elements by enhancing the desired character of a neighborhood. The Code includes open space regulations with an intent to provide meaningful areas. The Code allows for the opportunity to bring creative design to make for a more creative district through the use of waivers.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission will have these types of informational conversations more regularly to become more familiar with all of their review tools. Opportunities exist to introduce a request for additional training/education at a regular meeting or at the yearly joint meeting between the Commission, boards and City Council.

Ms. Wawskiewicz stated that Transportation and Mobility and Planning are very closely tied. In the context of the Bridge Street District, transportation has been woven into this process along the way. Beginning in 2010, the BSD Vision Plan contemplated gridded streets. There was a transportation report compiled the next two years that was folded into the rezoning. All of those pieces went into the Thoroughfare Plan and Community Plan update in 2013. Another transportation planning study was conducted in 2013 and 2014. The first study done by Nelson/Nygaard showed that the grid network did work. Two-lane streets generally work on the interior of the District, and multiple grid connections alleviate congestion. Multi-modal options such as walking, biking and transit, all support lower infrastructure needs. Transportation and Mobility worked with Planning and determined that individual traffic impact studies within the District were not necessary. Walkability is a crucial element for this District to be successful. Factors influencing

walkability include the quality of sidewalks and connections, avoiding gaps in the system, traffic and street patterns (keeping speeds and volume low), building accessibility and safety. Another finding of the initial study was the importance of the grid. The BSD vision created 32 lanes. The capacity adds up but in small pieces so that it stays comfortable for all users. Many times an applicant will ask if they are required to build small pieces of roadway and they are able to see why it matters with this plan. The big picture needs all the connections for the traffic to distribute across the grid. Dublin has not outgrown the projections at this point and staff is comfortable with how the District is developing from a transportation perspective. The City continues to build on its multimodal network to support lower infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chinnock asked if projections are down across the City or just this area. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that there was a dip in volumes nationwide during the Covid19 pandemic. Numbers are rising and have caught up across the network. There is still some reduction in peak times because employers have implemented more flexible work options.

Mr. Deschler asked about the John Shields Parkway bridge. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that staff has investigated alignments and looked at structure type. It has been programmed in future years in the City's Capital Improvement Program but the construction year has not yet fallen into the five-year window. Mr. Deschler asked if the bridge over I-270 would be completed before the John Shields Parkway bridge. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that there is still no complete funding for the Emerald Parkway connector.

Mr. Alexander stated the Code allows different types of buildings adjacent to one another, whereas some traditional communities establish the street first and then the building type, emphasizing public realm rather than private realm. Ms. Rauch stated that the Code does talk about compatible building types and the goal was to allow flexibility. There is intended to be synergy among types.

Ms. Harter asked how safety is considered. Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that staff is always thinking about safety, particularly when considering walkability. Narrowing streets is one of the main tools to get drivers to comply with lower speed limits. They follow the minimum fire code and lane width. The Fire Department is involved in the reviews to make sure they can serve a land use.

Mr. Way stated that the Thoroughfare Plan has a timeline of when projects might be implemented depending on funding and priorities. It gives a sense of when infrastructure is coming on board and could help when reviewing proposals.

OTHER

Ms. Call stated that she will miss one meeting in February and one in March and asked staff to bring back dates for the Commission to review at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 pm.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council