



## MEETING MINUTES

### Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 23, 2024

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the May 23, 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: Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way, Kathy Harter, Rebecca Call  
Commission members absent: Warren Fishman, Mark Supelak  
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch Bassem Bitar, Thaddeus Boggs, Tammy Noble, Jeannie Willis, Michael Hendershot

#### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the May 2, 2024 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

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. 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 stated that there was only one item on the meeting agenda and described the case review process for those in attendance.

#### CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #24-019ADMO - Envision Dublin**

Request for review and recommendation to City Council of approval of the Community Plan, a vital policy document that guides development growth and infrastructure expansion based on the City's strategic objectives and the community's shared vision for the future. The Plan

will provide policy direction for the next two decades including land use and development, housing and neighborhoods, community facilities and services, utility and infrastructure, natural resources and environment, fiscal health, transportation and mobility, special area plans, and implementation strategies.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated that Consultant John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne & Associates, would provide the presentation for the Envision Dublin Community Plan Update, and she would provide an overview of the Special Area Plans. The work on updating the City's Community Plan has been an 18-month process, led by a steering committee. The intent with tonight's review is to obtain the Commission's feedback and a recommendation of approval to City Council. The Envision Dublin Community Plan will be the policy document that guides City planning in essentially every decision. The document will be used in Planning's reviews and referenced in Planning documents.

- **Envision Dublin Introduction**

John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne & Associates, 188 W. Randolph Street, Suite 200, Chicago, Illinois stated that their firm was the lead on a team of consultants working closely with Dublin City staff from many departments, other City initiatives and planning endeavors and the steering committee on development of the Community Plan update. As currently drafted, the Community Plan exceeds 200 pages. It contains a significant level of content, including text, recommendations, graphics, maps, infographics, photographs and other visualizations. The purpose of tonight's public hearing is provide an introductory overview of the entire document. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) has been involved throughout the process with presentations and discussion garnering Commission members' input, and the Commission's feedback has been incorporated as the Plan was developed. He noted that the presentation would be followed by a discussion opportunity.

The Community Plan Update has been an 18-month process. A comprehensive planning process involves the following 3 things: determining where the City is, where the City wants to go, and what must be done to get there. That core structure has been accomplished by considering these steps: product initiation, assessment of existing conditions, visioning and goal setting, considering and establishing different land use and growth scenarios, developing special area plans, preliminary framework plans, and a draft and final plan of the document. The Community Plan is a critical document for the City, but it is not regulatory, not zoning, and does not dictate what property owners can do with their property. It is a foundation for decision-making, a policy document and provides the City the footing by which it can evaluate development proposals. It lends credence to approval or denial recommendations; it is a foundation with which to consider recalibrating regulations and new processes, if needed to fit the City's vision. It provides the City the basis for pursuing different grants or funding at the local, state and federal levels. It enables the City to coordinate with regional, state and other local jurisdictions on planning and capital improvement efforts. It allows the City to begin to coordinate budgeting for capital improvements and other efforts and initiatives of the City. Development of the Plan incorporated a very rigorous public engagement process, working with the steering committee and public officials. The foundation for starting and developing the content for this Plan was based on community feedback. The plan represents the core of the community including where we live, how we work and interact with others. The Commission, staff and City Council are vital users of this document. As development proposals are received, this plan should help the Commission make informed decisions. It will

enable the City to remain consistent to a vision over time as it is applied to incremental decisions. If the City is not guided by a vision, within a decade, the direction will not have been maintained.

Mr. Houseal stated that the overall collaboration included Transportation & Mobility, Utility and Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space, Community Facilities. The planning document dovetails into every aspect of what the City does. Reviews of the draft document occurred at the following meetings: the PZC on April 11, the ARB on April 17, a Joint Council and PZC work session on April 29, a final steering committee review on April 30, and City Council review on May 20. Several different groups, organizations, governing bodies, and appointed and elected officials have reviewed this draft document, and as input was received, it was incorporated into subsequent amendments to the draft plan.

Mr. Houseal stated that the City's strategic framework of strategies and priorities has been integrated into the Plan. The Plan contains ties to economic strategy and fiscal modeling; it continues forward-thinking land use recommendations and planning principles and creates detailed land use categories with character-defining descriptions. The Community Plan's Land Use Plan is not just a colored map, but a robust land use category layout. Land use categories have been delineated with photographs, text, character descriptions, built form descriptions, parking and open space. Plans for the western growth area contain land use, mobility, transportation and utilities. The previous Community Plan designated much of that area as agriculture or open space. This Plan provides detailed designations for anticipated development. The changing landscape of the market has been incorporated into new economic approaches, including work from home and online retail. Intensified and diversified residential desired in key areas has been incorporated. Much of the community has established beautiful, single-family detached, heavily wooded residential neighborhoods. That is a fundamental part of the City's DNA as is its open space. Those elements are not being changed but secured as a significant part of Dublin's future. In addition, opportunities for different types of residential have been provided, including missing middle, mixed use, townhomes, duplexes and ADUs (accessory dwelling units). The Plan accommodates a wide range of residential uses while being respectful of the character of the City's existing residential neighborhoods. The Plan creates four (4) mixed-use categories. It also outlines a strategic growth approach and shifts in mobility. The City's existing mobility plan prioritized vehicular transportation, while it included other forms. The proposed Plan, however, reflects a paradigm shift that prioritizes individual mobility -- bicycles and walking. It creates a multi-modal Thoroughfare Plan and detailed street typologies. The draft Plan also modifies the City's Special Area Plans. The previous 9 Special Area Plans have been reduced to 6 Special Area Plans. Special Area Plans provide a more detailed and specific look at certain geographic areas of the City. Intensive study was undertaken to ensure that transportation would dovetail with the proposed land use. He provided a brief overview of each of the 12 chapters of the document.

- **Special Area Plans**

Ms. Rauch highlighted the purpose of the 6 Special Area Plans and some of the key factors included in each, as follows:

- Historic District – Incorporates the recommendations of the Historic District Task Force adopted in 2019-2020. It also addresses compatibility of scale and character of development in the Historic District, preserving the existing character. It looks at potential redevelopment opportunities, including the existing school site on the north side of Bridge

Street. Each of the Special Area Plans shows conceptual development. The Historic District (HD) Special Area Plan emphasizes the importance of the Indian Run stream. Any development within the HD or adjacent to it must be sensitive to that key corridor. This ties into the conversation about how the future east-west Signature Corridor could look and where it would be located. A study will be undertaken to help define that City-wide corridor. There is an opportunity for that to happen along the Indian Run corridor. Adoption of the Community Plan update will occur before that study is complete and final answers known.

- Southwest Area - This area is prime for residential development, which is consistent with the previous plan for this area. There is a significant amount of land in this area for development to occur. This will enable implementation of the recommendations in the City's Housing Study. The development will tie into the Amlin area, where there will be some opportunities for mixed-use development. Some of the density in this area has been increased to help meet the housing demand, per the housing study. The character of this area has to be addressed sensitively, particularly along Tuttle Crossing Blvd. and the rail corridor. This Special Area Plan contains many recommendations about landscaping, berming, setbacks and medians. The new development must be integrated and transitioned with the existing development in a sensitive manner, as well. There are some key natural features in this area, and where those exist, particularly the large tree stands, they must be integrated into development as focal points.
- West Innovation Area – The area of this Special Area Plan has been expanded to the south. Previously, the West Innovation (WI) area stopped at Shier Rings Road. As now proposed, it extends further to the south to provide additional opportunity for flex innovation and industrial uses. Consistent with our economic development, the uses are diversified in this area. The Plan proposes mixed-use, particularly adjacent to the Ohio University campus. It highlights the potential future rail site in the northwest corner. A separate study is underway for the future rail extension. The Ballantrae community lies on the edges of this area, so the Plan attempts to scale down the higher intensity uses along US33 and SR161 to the residential development by including buffering, landscaping and setbacks along the western edge of Ballantrae.
- Emerald Corridor – Ms. Rauch noted that this area has been amended slightly from what was shown in the earlier draft. There were some very site-specific graphics in the previous iterations of the Plan. An additional graphic has been provided that looks at the area more holistically with general, illustrative plans for the entire Emerald Corridor. The goal of this Special Area Plan, similar to the West Innovation Area, is an employment focus, particularly along the I-270 Corridor. The Plan prioritizes uses along that corridor that will promote the economic strength and viability of the City. It also looks at opportunities, such as the Parkwood site, where there could be a mix of uses that transition from the larger-scale office along I-270 to smaller-scale office and residential to the east. It looks at similar opportunities for the Bright Road and Coffman Road areas. There are some potential greenway and vehicular connections across I-270 that could be integrated into this area.
- Bridge Street District – This Special Area Plan remains the same. There have not been many new Bridge Street developments since the last look at this Area Plan, and the intent for the

area remains the same. The Plan includes the East Bridge Street corridor and attempts to re-imagine the streetscape along that corridor from the typical suburban road with large setbacks and big campus feel to a more urban corridor, which is supportive of the LinkUs project. Bridge Street has many unique neighborhood character types, which this Special Area Plan attempts to highlight.

- Dublin Corporate Area Plan - This Special Plan attempts to look at the area more holistically. Similar to the Emerald Corridor and West Innovation areas, there is an employment focus in support of the City's economic development strategy. The area encompasses development along I-270. The City discourages residential development along the freeway. The Metro Center redevelopment implementation project is underway, and this Plan attempts to capture what is known about that redevelopment project. There is a need for sensitive transition between existing and future development. There is adjacent residential development abutting the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The future mobility and transportation connections in the corridor are key elements, as well as the inclusion of mixed-use, both vertical and horizontal.

Ms. Rauch invited Commission members' input.

### **Commission Questions**

Ms. Call stated that the Commissioners would offer comments/suggestions on the proposed Plan, chapter by chapter.

#### Chapter 1 – Introduction

Ms. Call referred to the "Be Distinctly Dublin" comment, under "Land Use Principles". Under the last bullet point, acknowledgement that the City provides for a diversity of uses should be added. In Dublin, there is a place for all uses, including innovation, parks and recreation, high density housing, etc. On page 11, it appears that since the last draft, the addition of park space in the DCAP under the "Improve Active Transportation" section has been deleted. She inquired if that was intentional?

Ms. Rauch stated that staff would check regarding the deletion.

Mr. Chinnock stated that also under Introduction, there is language regarding strategically planning for growth. How do we address Smart Growth? How do we assure that the Community Plan provisions are implemented in a sustainable manner in terms of timeframe and infrastructure?

Ms. Rauch responded that the Community Plan process included transportation, utilities, and fiscal modeling for the land use scenarios to ensure they are feasible. Every development requires sequencing. Some of those elements are related to the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The City is aware of certain areas of improvements that need to be made before development can occur, for example, the utility extension related to the extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd. The Utility Chapter in this proposed Plan points out which areas each sewer shed accommodates, and the improvements that will be needed in those sewer sheds to accommodate growth.

Ms. Call referred to page 6, noting that the Land Use Principles address how the City will handle growth, balance fiscal responsibility and manage infrastructure.

Mr. Chinnock acknowledged that the current Commission and staff are aware of that sequencing and consideration, but he wants to ensure those who follow in these seats and positions also understand that need. He wanted to make sure that it was noted on the record.

Mr. Houseal responded that the principles of smart growth are included throughout the Community Plan. It is included in Land Use Principles and also in the Implementation chapter. Those principles must be incorporated into every facet of the Plan.

#### Chapter 2 – Community Profile

Ms. Call requested the following 2 changes:

- The green colors on page sixteen, which are very close together and not distinguishable, need to be clarified.
- On p. 22, under “Services Provided,” there is a reference to schools, which is not a responsibility of the City of Dublin. This section refers to quality of services and the need to maintain existing service levels. She would recommend using parks and open space or emergency services instead of schools as examples of those services.

#### Chapter 3 – Vision and Goals

Mr. Way stated that he would like to reiterate Mr. Chinnock’s comments concerning Smart Growth. The City’s over-arching Strategic Framework is for the City to be “the most sustainable, most connected, and most resilient community.” He believes that is smart growth, and those themes permeate each chapter of this document. He is confident that intent is well covered.

Ms. Call referred to page 32, pointing out that the language regarding blending with landscaping or complementary landscaping under the “Utility and Infrastructure” item has been omitted. Because this was in previous versions of the draft Plan, she is curious as to the reason for its removal.

Mr. Hendershot inquired if she was referring to one of the objectives in Chapter 9 - Utilities regarding stormwater management and the need to blend that infrastructure with surrounding areas.

Ms. Call responded that in Chapter 3 it is included as a Utilities goal: “to provide high quality utility services in a safe, efficient and fiscally responsible manner.” Under that goal are bulleted objectives. In previous iterations of this Plan, one of the objectives was that when those services are physically implemented, it should be ensured that they blend with adjacent landscaping, buffering, etc. Mr. Hendershot responded that as part of the iterative process, we looked at Chapter 3 and Chapter 9 to ensure they were the same. As Chapter 3 was found to be outdated, some updates were made. In Chapter 9, the last objective is to: “Design stormwater management facilities to blend with surrounding development as an attractive amenity and landscape feature.”

Ms. Call responded that stormwater management also concerns sewer and other utilities. While it should be in the section about stormwater, she also would like it to be included in Chapter 3, where there is a reference to different utilities, as well.

Mr. Way pointed out that it actually is included, as the last bullet item.

Ms. Call acknowledged that since it is included in both chapters, no change was needed.

#### Chapter 4 – Land Use and Development

Ms. Call referred to page 42 and 43, where Alternative Land Use Scenarios are addressed. She is concerned that there may be future misunderstandings in assessing future development applications that any/all these scenarios are options for future development.

Mr. Way responded that all future applications should be referred to the Preferred Land Use Scenario. Ms. Call agreed but if it is listed as an alternative in the adopted Envision Dublin Plan, that could be confusing to future PZC members.

Ms. Rauch indicated that some context could be added. In working on this section, we had 3 land use scenarios, which then resulted in a Preferred Land Use. The 3 scenarios are no longer an alternative that a developer could choose. That needs to be clarified.

Mr. Houseal stated that there is a labeling issue. The language should state that 3 previously adopted land use plans were examined for research purposes in order to prepare the future land use plan. That use was identified, and at this point, it is not just preferred; it is the future land use plan. He noted that the titling issue would be clarified.

Mr. Way noted that the graphics depict different categories, and "Low Residential" is not a correct label. Charts in previous versions depicted the area as "Residential Low Density" and "Residential Medium Density". Because low residential could mean various things, the label should be either "Low Density Residential" or "Residential Low Density." This should be noted in all the similar residential categories.

Ms. Call referenced the 4th bullet under Recommendations on page 56. With the statement that, "when considering new subdivisions only within a quarter-mile buffer of existing infrastructure, if they connect to existing infrastructure and serve..." should there be an exception stated for developers who would be building infrastructure needed by the City?

Ms. Rauch responded that it is a recommendation, so if a developer submits a proposal that is different, staff could consider it.

Ms. Call stated that as it reads now, it states "consider only."

Ms. Rauch responded that clarity would be added.

#### Chapter 5 – Housing and Neighborhoods

Mr. Way acknowledged that placemaking was mentioned several times and thanked the consultants for including it in the document.

Ms. Call stated that while we like placemaking, and we have discussed connected neighborhoods, there is no emphasis on Council's "connected City" goal.

Mr. Houseal responded that there are various ways to do this – in the body of the text, or on the landing page, where it states "most connected", add sense of place or placemaking.

Ms. Call responded that placing it under Placemaking is fine. The first statement is that placemaking focuses on strengthening the connections between people and where they live. Placemaking is a component of becoming the "Most Connected City." Language should be added to tie it to that goal. Ms. Call noted that where you live can include recreation, such as the adjacent trails in neighborhoods.

#### Chapter 6 – Economic Development

Commissioners had no comments.

#### Chapter 7 – Mobility and Transportation

Commissioners had no comments.

#### Chapter 8 – Community Facilities and Services

Ms. Call stated that earlier, there were requests for images or visuals of the envisioned Signature Trails.

Mr. Way reminded staff that, on the map, the newly constructed OSU Hospital needs to be identified.

Ms. Rauch responded that those items would be added.

#### Chapter 9 - Utilities

Commissioners offered no comments.

#### Chapter 10 – Natural Resources and Environment

Ms. Call stated that the Signature Trail was not mentioned in this chapter.

Mr. Way responded that it may be because it is not well defined at this point. It may not be a natural corridor; it could be something different.

Ms. Willis stated that the Signature Trail will offer a variety of experiences, some of them will be in the natural setting; some in a more mixed-use, urban environment. The natural elements may not necessarily be the main elements of the Signature Trail. She noted that in the Transportation and Mobility Chapter, there is more defined geography for the Signature Trail. There also are some inspirational images in that chapter.

#### Chapter 11 – Special Area Plans

Mr. Way stated that Special Area Plans are tools. Most of the keys in the Special Area Plans are related to Land Use, but there are also many other symbols, such as arrows. If those provide important clarifications for the Area Plan, they should be described in a key. For example, view corridors are addressed in the text, but not on the graphics.

Ms. Call stated that it appears the Heritage Trail and the Signature Trail have been deleted from the Southwest Area Plan, specifically the area recommendations. The Heritage Trail is mentioned in the greenways connections section, but in previous iterations, they were listed in separate sections. She requested clarity.

Ms. Rauch responded that the intent was to make that a larger point. The Plan looks at the greenways more holistically and ensures that those corridors are connected. A couple of elements have been consolidated under the larger point. She inquired if the Commission believes it should be identified differently.

Ms. Call responded that she likes the way it has been captured under “Greenway Connections.” At this point, the Signature Trail is in early development stages.

Mr. Way stated that in the Emerald Corridor Plan, the beige color seems to identify mixed use, but no key has been provided. He was attempting to relate that item to the Parkwood Place plan, as the beige color extends into the Parkwood site. The area plan does not include that. This is the one area plan where there is the intent for infill development of parking lots, but it appears to stop halfway through it. Is that deliberate? He asks as there appears to be a conflict with the overall Emerald Corridor Area Plan in that respect. In summary, he has 2 related questions:

1. Is it intentional that the area north of Parkwood Place Road continue to be surface parking lots to support the existing office buildings, or if a developer were to propose infill development there, would that be consistent with the Area Plan?

Ms. Rauch responded that staff was focusing on the redevelopment of the vacant parcel. Something more holistic would be possible there, but the existing users may not want that.



Mr. Way continued:

2. On the Emerald Corridor Plan, 2 areas are indicated in a rust-red color that are different than multi-family, and they also are not described in the key. One is the Parkwood Place area; the other is an area on Hard Road. Additionally, in the Bridge Street Area Plan, there is a color code in the key for West Bridge Street, which is a gateway into Dublin, but there is no verbiage or graphic that describes the intent for that area. This is not part of the Metro Place area; it is the area further to the north that includes Embassy Suites and the car dealerships. Could a description be added for this area?

Ms. Rauch responded that more description is provided under the subarea recommendations for the West Bridge Street area on page 45.

Mr. Way stated that there are no specific Area Plan graphics. It is simply a land use designation.

Ms. Rauch responded that additional recommendations could be included for that area.

Ms. Call noted that on p. 53, the language with bullet 14 seems very pointed, "Integrate entertainment uses into design and identity of future redevelopment." Although in this specific area, there is an existing entertainment facility, we have not placed that type of emphasis in other areas, other than for park and recreation.

Ms. Rauch responded that the entertainment use is in the current Plan, and the intent was to remain consistent with the current Community Plan.

Ms. Call responded that the City would not discourage entertainment as an accepted use in any other area, so calling it out specifically in one area seems inconsistent.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff would look into that.

Mr. Way stated that in the LinkUs graphic, the LinkUs connection appears to end before Riverside Drive, which he believes is its current scope. Would it be helpful to add a note that the future intent is that it would not end there but will extend all the way to Ohio University (OU)?

Ms. Willis responded that the Special Area Plan is attempting to depict the area where the dedicated lane is meant to be within Dublin and where there is a dedicated guideway for bus rapid transit. Mr. Way inquired if the lane extended further it would involve different technology.

Ms. Willis responded that it would involve a mixed stream, which is what we were attempting to designate.

Mr. Way suggested that clarity be provided that the transit would continue westward, but differently. The West Bridge Street gateway is as important as East Bridge Street gateway, and it would be helpful to understand how transit will interface.

#### Appendices

Commissioners offered no comments.

#### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

#### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Way stated that he appreciated being a part of the process and having the opportunity to provide input representing PZC. He believes the outcome is a complete and solid document. He is very supportive of the proposed Envision Dublin Community Plan Update, which he believes will take Dublin in the right direction for the future in terms of being a smart, sustainable community.

Ms. Harter stated that the Envision Dublin was an incredible undertaking. She believes this document will not sit on the shelf but will be a working document for the City. She believes future PZC members will find the document easy to use. The document reflects a significant level of community input. She appreciates Ms. Call and Mr. Way's service on the Steering Committee.

Mr. Chinnock stated that much time and expertise has gone into this document. Although he found the document overwhelming to review due to the amount of content; however, he appreciates the opportunity to review it and provide input. He appreciates not only the effort and expertise that has gone into this document but also the effort to make it clear, visual and easy to use.

Ms. Call stated that she and Mr. Way enjoyed serving on the Steering Committee, but the amount of time they contributed was a pittance compared to some of the other stakeholders. She is impressed with the level of collaboration from many stakeholders that occurred to advance the document to this stage. The Commission extends a sincere appreciation to everyone for their investment in the development script that the City of Dublin will use for the next decade or longer.

Mr. Way moved, Ms. Harter seconded a recommendation for approval of the Envision Dublin Community Plan Update to City Council with the minor changes as requested.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion carried 4-0.]


## COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reminded members of the following:

- A Board and Commission recognition for outgoing members and a swearing-in ceremony for newly appointed members is scheduled for Monday, June 3, 2024 at 5:30 pm in Council Chamber. All members are encouraged to attend.
- The 06-13-24 PZC meeting is canceled due to lack of a quorum.
- The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 20, 2024.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

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

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