



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 12, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the December 12, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Jason Deschler, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way, Gary Alexander

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 11-07-24 and 11-14-24 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Call, 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. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call explained the hearing process that would be followed.

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

Ms. Call stated that two cases were eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case 24-138CU and Case 24-146AFDP, and asked if any Commission member wished to move one of the cases to the regular agenda for discussion.

No member requested that a Consent Case be moved to the regular agenda.

CONSENT CASES

- **24-138CU – Central Irrigation Supply, 6091 Enterprise Court, Conditional Use**

Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use to allow a wholesale and distribution use in an existing building. The 3.33-acre site is zoned TF, Technology Flex and is located northeast of the intersection of Innovation Drive and Enterprise Court.

- **24-146AFDP – Mount Carmel, 4105 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan**

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to modify previously approved signs and add new chapel building uplighting. The ±34.5-acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located northwest of the 1-270 and Sawmill Road interchange.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Cases:

24-138CU – approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions;

24-146AFDP – approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

CASE REVIEW

- **24-141CP – Bridge Park, Block J – Concept Plan**

Request for review and recommendation of approval of a Concept Plan for the development of an office building, condominiums and parking garage. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, and is located southeast of the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, provided an overview of their Concept Plan proposal for an additional expansion of Bridge Park. Cenovus Energy will be their lead tenant, taking half of the office space in a new office building. Although the office market is not flourishing in the City of Columbus, it remains resilient in Dublin. He believes it's a testament to the work of Crawford Hoying, the City and the Planning and Zoning Commission. They continue to create spaces that people want to be in. The development will also include two condominium buildings, one in Phase 1 and the other in Phase 2 on the existing COTA lot. Phase 2 condominiums will be similar to The Theodore condominiums in G Block; Phase 1 condominiums will be somewhat larger. Crawford Hoying is presently in discussions with COTA regarding a permanent solution for the existing Park and Ride and associated spaces, but also a temporary solution while the site is under construction. Their open spaces in the various block developments have been somewhat similar – urban and dense, but they have the opportunity to do something different on this site. Although there is an existing tree grove, the arborists have determined that few of the trees are worth saving. On the COTA lot, however, there are wonderful tree specimens that could be relocated elsewhere in the development and hopefully, create an urban arboretum. He invited MKSK to provide more details.

Jeffrey Pongonis, MKSK, landscape architect and planner, 462 S. Ludlow Street, Columbus, provided a slide overview of the site and the proposed development. They have the advantage of a larger site area than they had with the earlier blocks in Bridge Park. The framework of this development will be wrapped around an east-west open space. The open space will have less hardscape and be more natural in character. Due to the grade change on the site, their plan is to terrace the landscaping. They will be moving stormwater through the site with a bioswale or similar feature that is integrated into the landscape. The boundaries of the project will be Street B, Banker Drive, Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. The edges will be streetscape, but some existing trees will be relocated in the interior of the open space, supplemented with other natural materials. In regard to streetscape – on the interior of the block, there will be a service drive or alley, which will provide opportunity to access the garage and opportunity for ride share and site circulation. They will attempt to amenitize the streetscape at the center of the block for pedestrians.

Dan Pease, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus stated that their intent is to have a distinctive, simplistic architecture with a lot of rhythm and rich in materials. He showed inspirational images of buildings, which will engage the street with patio space. The north and south elevations of the office building will be quite different. The south elevation will address the natural park. They have chosen an earth-tone, woodgrain color construction panel. In addition to a lot of glass, the primary building material will be a gray brick. There will be screening in front of the parking garage, and a scrim will be used. [Inspirational images of the proposed buildings shown.]

Matthew Lytle, Sullivan Bruck Architects, 8 South Grant Avenue, Columbus, described the condominium structure in Phase 1. He noted that although they have no inspirational images to show for the Concept Plan, there is a new material that they are requesting to use as a primary material. NewBrick is a thin brick alternative, a light-weight, insulated brick made by Dryvit. The condominium building will have 84 units that will be larger than those in The Theodore but smaller than those in The Warren with the same quality of finish. All ground-floor units along Bridge Park Avenue and Street B to the east will have direct access to a sidewalk, and the condominium units on all floors will have direct access to the parking garage.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that the combined ±5.37-acre site is zoned BSD, Bridge Street District – Scioto River Neighborhood, with primary frontages on Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, public streets. There will be accessory frontage on Banker Drive and Dale Thomas Boulevard, both of which are privately owned and are essentially drive aisles. The site consists of 5 properties containing an existing COTA Park and Ride lot, a vacant daycare facility, parking for Wendy's property, and the staging area for The Bailey development to the west. The site features significant grade change from the northwest corner to Dave Thomas Boulevard and the southwest corner. An abandoned stream bed is located centrally on the site, with mature vegetation lining the bed. Block J is the 8th block of Bridge Park East. A Concept Plan, which is the first formal step of the development process, establishes the general outline of the proposed development's scope, character, and nature. All new developments within the Bridge Street District are required to receive approval for a Concept Plan followed by Preliminary (PDP) and Final Development Plan (FDP) approvals. This particular development will be accompanied by a development agreement, which involves a separate process between the applicant and City Council. A development agreement requires City Council to make the final determination on the Concept Plan. Although PZC is not the determining body, it must make a recommendation on the proposal to City Council. The BSD-SRN Neighborhood

District provides a significant opportunity for a well-planned and designed neighborhood with a balanced mix of land uses. Predominant land uses include a residential presence to complement and support a strong mix of uses, including office and supporting service and commercial uses. A comfortable, walkable street network connects these diverse but complementary land uses. With a Concept Plan, specific details are not provided.

Mr. Hounshell reviewed the proposed street network. The development is expected to have frontage on five streets: Dale Drive (Public/Principal Frontage Street), Bridge Park Avenue (Public/Principal Frontage Street), Banker Drive (currently Private/to be Public), Street A (to be Private), and Street B (to be Public). Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue are currently not built to Bridge Street streetscape standards but will be updated with the development of this site. Banker Drive is presently a private street owned by Cadillac to the south. The proposal currently shows the portion of the Banker Drive streetscape on the proposed site to be updated to meet the streetscape standards. However, additional discussions between the City and the applicant are necessary to determine the future of the street with the development of this site. Street B (Dave Thomas Boulevard) is also a private access drive expected to provide public access to the proposed garage on the site's east side. Additional discussions between the City, the applicant, and Wendy's are necessary to determine how the street should be approached to accommodate the new development and the needs of Wendy's operations to the east.

The primary public open space is centrally located between the office building and the Phase 2 condominium building. The intention for the design of this public open space is a greener and more natural environment, including a proposed revitalization of an existing stream bed to assist in the site's stormwater management strategy. It would be supplemented by benches, decking/boardwalk and additional greenspace with pedestrian facilities throughout the center of the site. The applicant has not identified the open space type at this time but will be required to provide an analysis of the open space requirements with the PDP. Open space requirements within the Bridge Street District are dictated by the uses in the development. One square foot of open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial development, and 200 square feet of open space is required for each dwelling unit. For a mixed-use scenario, the requirements for open spaces are individually calculated. Based on the conceptual square footage of the development, ± 1.10 acres of open space are required. This acreage includes the anticipated Phase 2 development of the condominium building. The applicant has not indicated the proposed amount of open space for the development. Should the open space be less than the required acreage, the Commission would need to consider whether a waiver would be supported based on the design and quality of the open space.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that the condominium building is proposed to be an Apartment building type. This building is five stories tall and will include ± 89 residential units at approximately 145,000 square feet. The building will have frontage on one principal frontage street (Bridge Park Avenue), which will serve as the primary street frontage. An amenity deck with a swimming pool is proposed at the center of the building, which will open up to Street A and the public open space. The south side of the building connects to the garage, allowing residents to have direct access. Renderings of the building have not yet been provided, but the applicant is requesting feedback on a potential building material called NewBrick. This brick-clay veneer is anticipated to be used on upper stories only. Approval of a waiver to use this material would be required at the PDP stage.

Apartment building types with a maximum height of 4.5 stories are permitted in the Bridge Street District. A waiver would be needed to allow the building to exceed this height. The Commission should consider whether this future waiver request would be appropriate to allow a habitable 5th

story. Alternatively, the applicant may pursue a different building type that allows five stories but has different transparency, siting, and façade requirements.

The garage is proposed to be a Parking Structure building type, which is compatible as an accessory to the Apartment building type. The garage is five stories in height with 534 parking spaces within a total of 200,000 square feet. The garage is expected to have rooftop parking, which would require the addition of an enclosed stairway and elevator in the northwest corner of the garage. This enclosed space will be six stories in height, which also would require a waiver. Parking structures are permitted to include parking on the roof, consistent with other parking garages in Bridge Park. Parking structures that are completely lined by space available for occupancy along a public or private street frontage and parking structures located on the interior of blocks with other building types situated between the parking structure and the street are considered Permitted Uses. However, all other parking structures are considered Conditional Uses. The applicant must submit a Conditional Use application for the standalone garage with the PDP.

Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against the applicable criteria and recommends the Commission's recommendation of approval to City Council with two conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin stated that the staff report indicated that Planning staff did not believe that shopping was an appropriate use. Is that because of the Sycamore Ridge apartments on the other side, or is it due to the grade of the land?

Mr. Hounshell responded the Code requires at least one shopping corridor in the District, and that is provided along Longshore Drive, a north-south street. Staff believes that is adequate for the neighborhood, and that the City would not extend the shopping corridor along Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Garvin inquired if negotiations were to be successful with Wendy's and the daycare but failed with COTA if the applicant would still anticipate moving forward with Phase 1.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. They and the City already have a signed agreement with Cynovus Energy, so they are anxious to complete the process. They are already negotiating with Wendy's for a number of items, not the least of which is a 70-foot section of their property that is an existing unused parking lot; Crawford Hoying will be purchasing that property. There also have been many discussions regarding how best to address the public street. It will make a significant change to Wendy's property. Wendy's does not object, but there is a timing issue based on how long it will take to get through the process and ensure we can deliver to Cynovus, while we continue to work with Wendy's and with Cadillac, the other property owner.

Mr. Garvin stated that the Phase 2 units appear to be denser; how do they compare to the size of The Warren units?

Mr. Hunter responded that the Phase 2 units are identical to The Theodore (G Block). The Phase 1 units are larger. The Warren units are larger, 1,800–1,900 SF; however, the intent is that the Phase 1 units will be 1,300-1,400 SF. The Theodore units are smaller than that.

Mr. Garvin stated that if both phases advance, the proposed parking garage does not appear to meet the parking space requirements. Is there any parking plan to meet the anticipated parking space needs?

Mr. Hunter responded that they are working on ways to achieve more parking spaces from the parking garage. It might mean that the anticipated building size is increased by two feet, which

would provide an additional 12 spaces per floor. The parking will be addressed as part of their PDP proposal. He noted that they anticipate meeting the open space requirements.

Mr. Garvin stated that as he understands the LinkUs project, there needs to be a significant COTA location there. Do they anticipate that solution being achieved from additional land or property currently under their control?

Mr. Hunter stated that they have been discussing LinkUs with COTA for many years. Their intention is that Bridge Park will be the temporary most northwestern location until the route is extended further west. Crawford Hoying is attempting to hold some space for them on the ground floor that would accommodate restrooms, driver break rooms and waiting space in the event that transit route would end at this parking garage. They do not know how many parking spaces that will require, which is one of the reasons they have not yet determined how many parking spaces will be needed. There currently are 86 spaces on that lot right now, but how many are utilized today or will be utilized in the future is undetermined.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the permitted condominium building height.

Mr. Hounshell responded that every building developed in Bridge Park must align with a specific building type. The condominium building is the Apartment building type, which has a maximum height of 4.5 stories. The applicant is proposing 5 stories, so a waiver approval would be necessary to allow the additional .5 story. However, if the applicant should choose to pursue a Mixed-Use or Loft building type, the 5 stories would be permitted. However, the requirements, such as transparency and where the residential use may be located, may change with a different building type.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the Garage building type transparency requirements.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Parking Structure is a permitted building type that is permitted if there is a liner building fronting the street and separating the garage from the public street. That is a condition that exists with a few other garages in Bridge Park. However, when a garage fronts a public street, it is considered a Conditional Use, and there is specific criteria that must be met. The Conditional Use is a separate application, but it accompanies the PDP process.

Mr. Deschler inquired if that is because the proposed garage fronts the private streets.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Deschler inquired if Street A is proposed to be a public street.

Mr. Hounshell responded that Street A would be a private street. The intent is that Banker Drive and Street B will have public access and must meet public street standards.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there currently are any other private streets in Bridge Park.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. Longshore Loop, which is behind the AC Hotel in Block A, and Winder Drive, between The Baily and the Spring Hill Hotel, are private streets.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the owner of the private streets is responsible for the street maintenance.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Commission could discuss the proposed brick material at the Concept Plan stage.

Ms. Call responded that building material is a Final Development Plan (FDP) discussion item. She asked staff if the consultant had reviewed the proposed material.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he had shared the material with the consultant, who indicated that they are familiar with the material, but would be visiting the projects to evaluate how the material has held up. He has not yet received that follow-up information from the consultant. He anticipates providing that material with the PDP rather than the FDP, because it would potentially require a waiver. The applicant has provided a material sample tonight to place it before the Commission early in the process. Providing it early gives them the ability to revise their material proposal, if necessary.

Ms. Call stated that preliminary feedback on the proposed building material would be acceptable tonight, but it will be discussed in a later development review stage. She requested the Law Director's feedback regarding the discussion not being germane to the Concept Plan decision.

Mr. Boggs responded that is correct. Material specifications are not part of the criteria for a Concept Plan review and determination.

Ms. Call stated that initial feedback on the material is permitted, however.

Mr. Alexander stated that the office and condominium buildings and adjacent sidewalks are not aligned in the site plan. Is there collaboration to create some uniformity between the two buildings?

Mr. Lytle responded affirmatively. The color of the materials used on the building facades is complementary. He proposes use of a dark gray brick at the base of the condominium building; the architect for the office building is using a dark gray brick, as well. There are some other tones that they are attempting to make complementary.

Mr. Way stated that he has some structural questions. Street A is not a required street. How does Street A serve the development?

Mr. Hunter stated that there has been significant debate regarding that street. There are a couple of purposes for the street; one is to provide a secondary vehicular egress from the garage. The grade of the site changes east-to-west but not north-to-south. It will be difficult to achieve an egress from the garage on the south elevation. The second purpose is that in an urban environment, service is needed, such as trash rooms. They do not want the trash room for the office building to be located on the Bridge Park Avenue elevation, and the garage is too far away. Initially, they considered making Street A a pedestrianway; however, that would not align with the needed operations.

Mr. Way stated that it would be possible to service just the end elevations of the office and condominium buildings instead of having a through road.

Mr. Hunter responded that they studied that option, as well; however, it would not have matched what has been done in the rest of Bridge Park, i.e. a street actually takes you somewhere. The intent is to utilize materials that change the feel of the street, so that the connection from the urban arboretum on the west to the condominium amenity space feels the same. The space should feel like cars "can" be there, but probably "shouldn't" be. A car on Bridge Park Avenue heading toward the garage but misses Dave Thomas Boulevard would still have an opportunity to access it. Essentially, this street design feels more correct.

Mr. Way stated that he is enthusiastic about the proposed open space because it is different than everything else in Bridge Park. There is an opportunity here to do something unique. That is the reason that he has questioned having a road cut through that space. If it isn't necessary, eliminating it would provide more open space and more pedestrian access, which is consistent with the street goals of the newly adopted Community Plan. He is supportive of the wider sidewalks, which include seating opportunities. It would be better if either the road wasn't there or it was a road that had some type of operational aspect that permitted it to be closed down for day or evening events, making it a pedestrianway. If the concrete were extended across the area

in a plaza-like manner, it would appear more like cars really shouldn't be there. Mr. Way referred to the "blue line," denoting a historical drainage line that runs through the open space. Are they exploring opportunities to engage water with the space?

Mr. Hunter responded that they are considering potential opportunities, such as aesthetic, stormwater and educational features.

Mr. Way inquired about the east-west walkway that runs south of the office building. It is both wide and is located on a slope. Is there a purpose other than connection?

Mr. Pease responded that there is a transition in the site north-to-south between the formal landscaping adjacent to the office building, incorporating a plaza-like entry area, and the less public entry for the condominium building to the south.

Mr. Way stated that the east elevation of the garage was not shown in the site plan. Will it be the same as the south elevation and have another scrim?

Mr. Pease responded that the east elevation will be very similar to the west elevation.

Mr. Way inquired if the scrim would be only on the south side.

Mr. Pease responded affirmatively, noting that it faces SR161.

Mr. Way inquired about the proposed parking spaces.

Mr. Hunter responded that there are 534 parking spaces right now. This information is not typically required with the Concept Plan. The difficulty they are having with working out this item is the COTA need.

Ms. Harter stated that she recalls an earlier meeting about this area and the need for COTA in this area. Could the City pull that earlier meeting discussion so we can assess how that discussion evolved?

Ms. Rauch inquired if she is interested in pulling the background discussion concerning having a COTA site in this area. Ms. Harter responded affirmatively. Ms. Rauch stated that the records would be searched for that discussion.

Ms. Harter requested clarification of the intent with the proposed balconies on the office building.

Mr. Hunter responded that the current office users really appreciate the balcony spaces, so they are interested in incorporating them where possible. The northwest corner of the building adjacent to the open space that will be created would be one obvious choice. There may be additional balconies on the building, as the design advances.

Ms. Harter inquired if they would be usable spaces, with the intent of enhancing the open space opportunity.

Mr. Hunter responded affirmatively. Additionally, there will be patio spaces at the ground level of the building, which will overlook the open space. There is almost a full story of elevation change from the intersection up to those patios; another full story of elevation change at the end of the office building; and yet another full story at the end of the condominium building.

Ms. Harter stated that the garage seems to be located far from the restaurant. Are the restaurant users anticipated to park in the garage or along the street?

Mr. Hunter responded that it is difficult to predict, but in previous blocks, the parking was over-built. This block is more removed. The placement of the garage honors Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive as the primary streets. The patrons of any restaurants that develop on the western elevation of the building likely will park within the Bridge Park area. The new garage in this block

will likely be used by the office and condominium users. The distance from the garage exit to the office building entrance is only approximately 100 feet.

Ms. Harter inquired about plans to enhance the walkability from this area to the shopping area across SR161, including the Wendy's restaurant.

Ms. Call stated that the walkability of that area falls more within the City's responsibility than the applicant's. She invited Ms. Rauch to share any comments.

Ms. Rauch stated that this issue was raised during discussions concerning a different block in Bridge Park. The City has been studying how to transform the streetscape of SR161/Dublin-Granville Road. Pedestrian activity is desired on the street, not over the street. The desire is to improve the walkability, particularly at the roundabout. The City is studying potential design solutions. A potential over-the-street feature was discussed with the earlier Y block consideration. Because of the grade, that option would be difficult to achieve and extremely costly.

Mr. Chinnock referred to Banker Drive and Street B, which will need to be widened consistent with public street standards. What is the reason that the additional widening space would be taken from adjacent sites, not this site?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the goal is for the centerline of Street B to be the same as the current centerline of Dave Thomas Boulevard. The site plan provides half of the space needed to widen the streetscape for Street B. The applicant will build Street B and Banker Drive to meet the necessary streetscape standards. The issue is what to do about the other side of Street B so that a cohesive street design is achieved.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the needed street improvement space would come from the properties on both sides of the street.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the graphics of the proposed garage scrim would not be considered signage.

Mr. Hounshell responded that in the past, it has been considered art.

Mr. Hunter noted that they worked with the Dublin Arts Council on the existing scrim on the garage in Block G.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the anticipated timeframe for the future condominium development. What would occur on that site, while the buildings in this phase are in use?

Mr. Hunter responded that they should be constructed at approximately the same time. Although they will not open simultaneously, construction will be seen on both sites.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the green space opportunity on this site is unique. How will it connect to the adjacent F Block to the west?

Mr. Hunter responded that Banker Drive and Bridge Park Avenue align. Winder Drive will continue to evolve. A crosswalk is not possible due to its proximity to the intersection. There will be continued landscape and design development to ensure connectivity.

Mr. Deschler inquired if there would be no onstreet parking on Dale Drive. Would onstreet parking be present only on Banker Drive and Bridge Park Avenue?

Mr. Hounshell responded that discussion would continue with the City Street and Mobility Division to determine if onstreet parking would be desired on Dale Drive, as well.

Mr. Deschler inquired the size of the restaurant space on the first floor of the office building.
Mr. Hunter responded that it would be approximately 10,000 SF.

Mr. Alexander referred to the 6-story building in Bridge Park west of this site. Is that reflective of the building type that was selected for that site?

Mr. Hounshell inquired if he was referring to the Spring Hill Hotel or The Bailey.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be the Spring Hill extended-stay building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes it is either a loft or mixed-use building type, but he is unsure if a height waiver was approved for the building. He could provide that information in the next development step.

Ms. Call inquired what is the vision for separating the public open space from the private, condominium open space.

Mr. Hunter responded that the grade of the site is in their favor, particularly in Phase 1. The site would incorporate a gentle staircase as well as landscaping that would separate the public from the private realm. He anticipates something similar in Phase 2. This is effectively achieved in D block, where a fountain is included.

Mr. Way stated that earlier in the discussion, the applicant mentioned that if a couple of feet were added to the parking garage, they could achieve a certain number of additional parking spaces per level. He is concerned that it will require a bigger parking garage to achieve the needed parking spaces. Is that anticipated?

Mr. Hunter responded that he would hope not as if the garage extends further north, it would sacrifice private space in this phase; if it extends further to the west, it sacrifices Phase 2 private space. They do need more parking spaces, but they anticipate submitting a shared parking plan for consideration. Currently, the parking is overbuilt in some blocks.

Mr. Way stated that the staff report indicates 662 parking spaces are needed; they have 534 parking spaces. Therefore, 128 spaces are needed. This could have a significant impact on the proposed plan.

Ms. Call stated that there currently are 5 separate parking areas that are equidistant to the existing parking garage. When submitted, the proposed shared parking plan should clarify the totality of the parking arrangement.

Public Comment

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, stated that there is no rezoning involved, so the project will be built to the established standards. He is hopeful that the proposed height and size of the buildings will comply with those rules. In the discussion tonight, there was reference to another project in Bridge Park that may have been granted a height waiver, and there may be consideration of a parking waiver. The Concept Plan proposal is for a 5-story garage. There was a statement that the rules allow a 4.5-story condominium. He recalls an application for a residential garage expansion in his neighborhood that was denied a few years ago. The denial was based on the assessment that the garage would look massive relative to the house. His question now is if a 5-story parking garage next to a 4.5-story condominium would look out of place. Additionally, many times in the past, the Commission has said that it did not want to consider projects in phases, but instead, see the overall plan. That makes this application seem peculiar, especially at this point, where the City has not yet acquired all the parcels intended for the project, i.e. the COTA site. He

recalls the review several years ago of the location of COTA to this site. An alternative prospect was to move COTA all the way out to a Bright Road/Emerald Parkway site. There was a large attendance and much testimony for that earlier COTA project. Is the intent now to kick COTA out of this location?

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes the proposal is headed in a good direction. He has some concerns about the east elevation – a mass next to a parking lot. The architecture is currently lacking; more articulation and interest is needed. It will be important to identify what we really want with the private Street A connection. It is difficult to provide full support due to the level of unknowns at this point.

Ms. Harter stated that it will be essential to identify another COTA location. She is concerned about proposed waivers; the parking garage size; the trees that would be removed; and the proposed color of the materials for the office building. She believes the open space plan is moving in the right direction. She appreciates the plans to enhance the appearance of the parking garage. The parking plan details will be important to this proposal.

Mr. Way stated that the proposal is a very good use of this block. He likes the mix of uses – office and condominiums. The organization of the site is appropriate and responsive to the Bridge Street Corridor plan. The open space will make this block unique. He is very supportive of the application.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is supportive, as well. From an urban perspective, the application makes sense. He likes the way the plan reinforces the street wall and feels like the fabric of Bridge Park is being moved back. However, the fabric changes to the north. In the future, when we see the proposed facades, how will the applicant address the dramatically different scale across the street? There was some articulation of the office building façade, breaking it up into smaller volumes. With condominiums, there is a 4-story layer and a taller building behind that layer. This site is in a unique location, where it needs to address Bridge Park but still address the fabric of the sites in the other directions. He has no objection to the proposed building heights, due to the grade and important connections.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the stand-alone garage, which appears to be attached to the condominium building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it is stand-alone in the sense that it is its own building type, attached to a different building type. That building type is conditionally permitted based on the fact that it does not have a liner building.

Mr. Deschler inquired if every floor of the parking garage is attached to the condominium building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the parking garage is a separate building, but it is connected on all floors.

Mr. Deschler referred to proposed Street A and stated that he is not supportive of the proposed cut-through. He inquired Mr. Way's alternative suggestion.

Ms. Call noted that subject would be PDP discussion item. However, early discussion of items can be valuable to the applicant. She inquired if the applicant would like to have additional discussion from the Commission on that particular plan element at this earlier phase.

Mr. Hunter stated that if there are additional comments, they would like to hear them. At this point, they are not entirely sure that they know what the correct design is; there is further design to be done. However, it is possible that if the cut-through street there is not included, additional waivers would be required due to the block length.

Mr. Way stated that the discussion has opened up some ideas that could be explored, and the Commission would like to see more exploration. The applicant has been made aware that a cut-through road is not well supported by the Commission. Perhaps there could be a street that is paved in a different manner and that provides opportunity for closure for different purposes or different times of the day.

Mr. Deschler stated that if the proposal comes back and the street remains unchanged, the plan will not have his approval. He is hopeful that the Commission's feedback tonight will encourage a new idea regarding the street.

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Deschler would like to explain his objection.

Mr. Deschler indicated that his intent was for the Commission to enter into a discussion about that item during the prescribed time for deliberations. The applicant is supposed to gather their ideas from the Commission's discussion and reactions to various elements of the proposal. At this point, he does not know what he wants to see, but he does know that he does not like what he sees. He does not believe there should be a cut-through street, because it creates the impression of two blocks. It is non-sequitur, not connected. Vehicles will use that street and travel through that area, exactly as Mr. Way has pointed out. He is generally supportive of the rest of the application. He is hopeful that the applicant can reach a resolution with Wendy's and COTA. He likes the ideas for the office building and the parking garage. He believes there needs to be on-street parking on Dale Drive.

Mr. Garvin stated that he believes the trees will be an important element of the open space area. The height is difficult to visualize due to the grade of the site. At the next stage of the development process, it would be helpful if the applicant provided some visual references to enable the Commission to envision the proposed heights against the skyline. Meeting the required parking spaces will be a challenge; we do not want the parking garage to become too large, nor to have a deficiency in needed parking spaces. The parking garage on the other end of Winder Drive may be the solution for achieving the needed spaces. Although some other Commission members may not agree, he likes the cut-through street. He believes additional issues could be created on either side by incorporating a dead-end street. Generally, he is supportive of the plan. He agrees that the greenspace will contribute to giving this block an interesting and viable block design.

Ms. Call stated that at the Concept Plan stage, the application meets the vision of Bridge Park. The building types are acceptable. The use and layout are generally acceptable. She likes the additional ingress/egress public safety service street, although she does wish that it did not come at the cost of the greenspace. Perhaps there are ways to address that, such as changing the material type through the belt, so that it evolves from concrete or asphalt to brick or another material to give the feel that it is not a preferred vehicle route. The Commission would appreciate it being addressed in a manner other than a public street. A parking proposal with a shared-use agreement is anticipated at the next step. The architectural materials of the office building and the condominium do not need to match but be complementary. The parking garage in the drawing looks too plain, but at this point, we did not see the scrim. At the next step of the development process, visual images of the proposed scrim would be helpful.

There was no additional discussion.

Mr. Way requested that a third condition be added, which is that the applicant will explore some alternatives with Street A in terms of making it more pedestrian-friendly, based on the discussion. Mr. Hunter indicated that he had no objection to the additional condition.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded a recommendation of Council approval of the Concept Plan with 3 conditions:

- 1) The applicant continues to work with staff on the conversion of Banker Drive and Street B (Dave Thomas Boulevard) to public streets;
- 2) The applicant submits a Conditional Use Permit with the submission of the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP); and
- 3) The applicant continue to work with staff to explore alternative designs for Street A, based on the comments provided by the Commission.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

- **24-136INF - MAG – Volvo, 6335 Perimeter Loop**

Informal review and feedback on proposed building modifications and new signs. The 15.52-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), Midwestern Auto Group and is located southeast of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road.

Applicant Presentation

Brad Parish, Archall Architects, 49 E. 3rd Avenue, Columbus, stated that this application is related to the Volvo portion of the primary MAG building. The proposal is to update the exterior façade with brand elements. The Volvo brand imaging division recently updated its brand, which includes the following key items: replacing the showroom storefront with a frosted glass; introduction of a blue metal panel with the Volvo signage; display windows into the showroom; a metal entry portal with a wood texture; updating the uplighting for the vehicle display areas. The request also included 3 new signs -- 2 wall signs and one service sign. They are seeking the Commission's feedback before filing a formal application.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review in a Planned Unit Development (PUD). An Informal Review provides the applicant with non-binding feedback from the PZC on a development concept. Following an INF, the applicant may submit an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) application for formal review by PZC, which is required when any changes to a previously approved FDP are requested. The 15.5-acre site is located southeast of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road, with a shared access drive off Perimeter Loop Road and two additional access drives off Venture Drive. It includes the Ferrari, Porsche, and main MAG dealership (including Volvo) buildings, outdoor display areas along the front of the buildings, associated parking, and pedestrian facilities along Venture Drive, Perimeter Loop Road, and Perimeter Drive. In March 2018, City Council approved an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for a MAG campus comprehensive sign plan, including an inventory of all existing and proposed signs. This

portion of the MAG site is located in Subarea A. Subarea A buildings are permitted a total of 3 wall signs. There are 3 wall signs, currently; so any additional wall signs would require an amendment to the development text, which would need to be approved by City Council. Because the site is located on a larger, more global dealership campus, there are multiple dealerships with the MAG campus. Each tenant is permitted to have a brand monument sign. Volvo currently has a brand sign between the front façade of the showroom and the parking lot. The various individual dealerships within the main MAG building also have respective brand signs. In addition to a wall sign in the main MAG building, two other wall signs exist, one each at the Porsche and Ferrari stand-alone buildings on the north side of the property.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the etched glass and the wood-detailed ACM paneling at the entry points are not consistent with the development text. The development text requires clear, transparent buildings, which is the existing character. This proposal would alter that character. The proposed exterior modifications would include replacing the existing transparent glazing with various types of Kawneer glass: etched frosted glass for the Volvo showroom, blue glass which is also one of the proposed sign's backgrounds, and clear glazing in the viewing portals. The showroom entryway and vehicles would be accentuated with portals clad with wood-looking ACM panels, and the Volvo service area walls would be replaced with silver ACM paneling. Doors within the service area would be replaced with like-for-like materials. The design intent of Subarea A buildings includes modern architecture with extensive glass and metal for sleek, transparent facades with sharp edges and angles. Any modifications must align with the PDP's established design and character which emphasizes a campus-like setting with design features present in the architecture of the various dealership buildings. Permitted materials include glass, metal, EIFS, stone/stone veneer, and concrete masonry units (CMU). The etched frosted and blue glass do not meet the development text requirements for transparent facades. While ACM panels are permitted, the wood-like finish is not consistent with the rest of the MAG campus. The proposed cladding of the CMU façade at the service area with silver ACM panels would also alter the architecture and material consistency on the south façade. The development text would need to be modified to allow these improvements to occur.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that three wall signs currently exist. The proposal includes two new wall signs on the east (northwest) elevation: "Volvo" in white lettering on a blue glass background, and "Dublin" in white lettering on etched frosted glass. Additionally, a new "service" directional sign is proposed on the south (northeast) elevation, wall-mounted between the overhead service doors. According to the AFDP approved by City Council, Subarea A is permitted a maximum of three wall signs. Directional signs, including ones for service entrances, are allowed if they are ground signs no taller than 3 feet, among other requirements. The two proposed wall signs exceed the maximum number allowed for Subarea A, which includes the existing wall signs for the Ferrari, Porsche and main MAG buildings.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the proposal also includes recessed uplighting for the exterior circular vehicle display area in front of the Volvo showroom. According to the development text, lighting for the MAG campus must be consistent and utilize cut-off type fixtures, except for building uplighting. Uplighting exterior vehicle display areas is not permitted per the development text, nor is it permitted by the Zoning Code. He indicated that the following discussion questions have been provided for the Commission's consideration:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed building modifications?
- 2) Does the Commission support the additional number of wall signs?

- 3) Does the Commission support the illumination of vehicle display areas?
- 4) Additional considerations from the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock inquired if staff was provided examples of existing use of the Kawneer glass material within the Dublin area.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he is not aware of any existing use.

Ms. Harter inquired about the drawing that indicates "Dublin" in white over the entrance feature.

Mr. Hounshell responded that is one of the new wall signs proposed.

Ms. Harter requested clarification of the vehicle entrance.

Mr. Parish responded that below the Volvo sign is the vehicle entrance to the showroom. The other entrance uses clear transparent glass where a vehicle will be displayed.

Ms. Harter inquired if it would be possible to see the outlines of the car through the frosted glass at night.

Mr. Parish responded that it would not be possible; it would be a glowing box.

Ms. Harter inquired about the display uplighting.

Mr. Parish responded that it is located around the perimeter of the building. There are locations for two vehicles and four lights that shine upward from the ground onto the cars – inground lights.

Ms. Harter inquired if those streams of light would be visible from I-270.

Mr. Parish responded that he does not anticipate that would be a possible, due to the footcandles of the light fixtures.

Mr. Way inquired if Volvo is redoing its brand and implementing that at all of their showrooms.

Mr. Parish responded affirmatively. They update their brand standards every ten years and extend those to all their existing showrooms. The Volvo Dublin showroom deviated from those due to the MAG development text for the MAG campus. The question is how to apply the new brand standards to an existing design.

Mr. Way inquired if their intention is to make their signs stand out within the glass façade.

Mr. Parish responded that the exterior façades of other Volvo showrooms within the U.S. consist of an accent panel highlighting the Volvo signage.

Mr. Way inquired if it encompasses the entire façade, not just a couple of etched glass panels.

Mr. Parish responded that the prototypical design is the front façade consists of etched frosted glass, and there are portals that provide display of the interior showroom, showcasing a vehicle. The blue feature provides background for the signage. That is the brand concept.

Mr. Way stated that it seems counter intuitive to replace the beautiful, existing glass façade that displays their vehicles to the highway; at night, the showrooms are lit up and glowing. To restrict the views of the MAG vehicles to traffic seems counter intuitive for a vehicle showroom environment. The existing MAG campus is an attractive vehicle showcase campus. MAG has invested in the architecture and profiling of the different brands. This proposal goes against the whole grain.

Mr. Alexander that he is aware that some manufacturers have been extremely prescriptive on what should be visible on the elevations. What exactly did Volvo prescribe?

Mr. Parish responded that the image that is displayed tonight is the rendering he received from Volvo, which they have attempted to implement on the existing Volvo building. They are aware of how sensitive the MAG campus is to Dublin, so are seeking the Commission's feedback.

Mr. Alexander inquired if they had considered using the glass in the existing fenestration pattern. Mr. Parish responded that the existing fenestration does not align with the very clear-cut panels of the Volvo brand.

Mr. Alexander stated that this building is unique because it houses multiple product lines. What would prevent the Volkswagon (VW) dealership next door from also asking for a brand sign on the front façade of their space, similar to Volvo's?

Mr. Parish responded that a few years ago, VW required signage, and they implemented an interior pylon.

Ms. Call noted that MAG also implemented a feature in red for the Audi dealership.

Mr. Parish responded that the red branding was added inside the glass. The solution was to add the branding inside the building, leaving the building itself nondescript to a brand, because it was part of the overall campus solution. The interior provides the brand identification, and that has been the consistent direction they have received from every Commission to whom they have presented such requests.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the applicant should be sworn in, since he was not present at the beginning of the meeting when the swearing-in was conducted.

Ms. Call inquired if that would be necessary for an Informal Review, since it is a non-action item.

Mr. Boggs responded that it would not, since the case requests only informal non-binding discussion. Where the lack of that could become problematic is if a case were to be appealed to court. If a party were to raise that issue during an appeal, however, the party could be asked to complete an affidavit for their testimony.

Mr. Deschler inquired if approval would require an amendment of the development text.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the existing exterior wall signs on the campus.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the two stand-alone buildings have wall signs. Although this main building has a wall sign, it has no specific dealership wall signs.

Mr. Garvin stated that he looked up some other more modern Volvo showroom locations. The woodlike finish on the ACM seems to be a Volvo standard. If MAG had plans to incorporate that update on all the MAG dealerships, it would provide consistency. Might that be anticipated, or is it only a Volvo brand characteristic?

Mr. Parish responded that they do not anticipate introducing it at the other showrooms, which incorporate different brands.

Mr. Garvin inquired if there is any potential of removing an existing wall sign to be more compliant with the required number of wall signs.

Mr. Parish responded that potentially, the Welcome MAG sign could be removed. However, he would be concerned about the calculation of that area (either 15 or 20 feet) being in compliance with the signage requirements for Subarea A.

Mr. Hounshell noted that the entire sign face, including the blue area, would be counted as part of the sign.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were provided.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that she does not believe any of the other members of the Commission were members at the time the MAG Audi sign was approved. For context, she explained that when the Commission reviewed the Audi sign case, there were significant concerns about the red block of the brand that was requested. The solution was that a red block was added within the interior showroom of the dealership. It is not a sign. The red feature is internal to the site and has no branding. That was acceptable to the Commission. What was not acceptable to the Commission was additional, large format signage, especially since the MAG campus is so prescriptive in colors. It was a subject of significant Commission discussion, due to the campus feel of the MAG. The Commission was not supportive of a piecemeal approach throughout.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the Audi sign was for a new building.

Mr. Parish responded that the Audi case was for a new building. It was the expansion of the campus into Subarea B. A new development text with different standards was created and approved, and Subarea B does permit wall signs. The Jaguar/Land Rover site is located in Subarea C, and it has its own signage provisions. In totality, the campus has many wall signs, because it was parceled out into different subareas, as the campus expanded through the years.

Mr. Alexander stated he is somewhat sympathetic with the applicant, as he is aware of the pressure that can be imposed on individual dealerships. The manufacturer/distributor can limit the number of cars and models allowed to the dealership, if the dealership does not make certain modifications. He is not comfortable with the proposal, however, due to the unique nature of this particular building. The fenestration designs one system. Where this change would be located is where that fenestration system and the concrete mass come together. Changing it to this extent would make it impossible to make that connection with the rest of the building. He inquired if it would be possible to keep that pattern but use the glazed glass and move the blue Volvo sign to the other side of the system? Could a compromise achieve what is needed? He cannot support what is currently proposed, but he can be flexible, as he understands the situation with which the applicant is dealing. If the Commission permits the additional wall signage, he is concerned about setting a precedent and the other MAG dealerships requesting the same.

Mr. Deschler inquired if any other vehicle dealerships have the vehicle display uplighting.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he is not aware of any other vehicle display uplighting within the City.

Ms. Call stated that she believes it may have been allowed with the Germain dealership.

Mr. Deschler stated that he is generally supportive of the proposed vehicle display uplighting.

However, he is not supportive of approving the additional wall sign. It could set a precedent so that every time there is a request for a change from a manufacturer, there is pressure to comply. He would prefer to find a solution that does not require a modification to the development text.

Mr. Garvin stated that despite it being one building, he is a little more open to the dealerships themselves being unique. The issue is that most of what was established was consistent, and approving changes individually when attempts are pursued to refresh individual dealerships is not consistent. While he believes the existing fenestration on this building is dated, and he would love to see it replaced, that, however, is not the request. The question is if the building looks strange with the proposed modifications made just to Volvo. Generally, he would be supportive of making building modifications, but not in view of the other dealerships in the connected building. In terms

of the additional number of wall signs – every dealership wants to have their sign in as many places as possible. Could we remove an existing sign and re-assess what three locations make the most sense for the signs? He has no objection to the vehicle display uplighting.

Mr. Way stated that when he looked at the other Volvo dealerships, there is no single stance. The new look is being implemented in different ways. There is a Byer Volvo in Columbus that has a glass curtain wall with a blue square on it that is not frosted. He does not support removal of the transparent glass, which is so much a part of the MAG campus. Its removal would not be pursuing the right direction. He also objects to the size of the sign in the context of how the other brand signs are presented in the MAG campus. In summary, he is not supportive of the sign or the glass. He does not object to the vehicle display uplighting.

Ms. Harter stated that she does have an issue with the frosted glass. The upper windows would remain the same, and the open areas do not appear to be cohesive. The building has a patchwork feel that is not good for the area. We do not have examples of the wood product being used successfully in this area, so that product is still questionable. She has no concerns with the vehicle display illumination.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he appreciates the fact that this proposal was rendered by Volvo, not Archall, because it is clear that they based it on the image shown. There is much more to this building, however, than that view. If they understood what the MAG building was about, the rendering makes no sense. The MAG building is unique to the area, and the rendering was done in a vacuum. He personally does a significant level of branding work across the country. It is not a "one size fits all," especially here. This proposal cannot happen on this building. The City makes great efforts to combat lighting pollution. He is not in favor of adding more lights just for the sake of adding more light. If we cannot light up our streets, why light up cars unnecessarily.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of the building design.

Mr. Parish responded that the original building was designed in 1997 by Karlsberger. It was a very unique design for automotive showcases. Their design intent is to determine how to enhance the original building and create a stunning showpiece of the chain of beautiful showroom galleries on this campus. The development text allowed them to think creatively outside the box to bring the Volvo brand to the MAG campus. The Volvo site was originally located in Linworth.

Ms. Call stated that she is not in favor of removing the transparency nor of the additional wall signs. Dublin is not generous with wall signs; we already have quite a few. She echoes Mr. Chinnock's comments regarding the vehicle display uplighting. The MAG campus is adjacent to some residential communities, so she would be very cautious about permitting any additional lighting. Additional night lighting would be intrusive to the neighbors.

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Parish sought any additional clarification.

Mr. Parish inquired if the uplighting would require a development text modification, and if so, if it would need to go to City Council for approval.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it would not require City Council approval. Only the signs would require a development text modification that would need City Council approval.

Mr. Parish responded that he would report the Commission's feedback to Volvo and learn what their next steps will be.

DISCUSSION ITEM

• PROPOSED 2025 PZC MEETING DATES

Ms. Call recommended that the remaining 2025 meeting dates be re-confirmed at the April 17 and the August 7 Commission meetings.

Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the 2025 and beginning 2026 Commission meeting dates.

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

[Vote: Motion carried 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that:

- There will be a change to the digital meeting packet delivery via use of the OnBoard software. This change will be implemented with the second January PZC meeting on January 23, 2025. Upcoming virtual training on use of the software for Commission members will be offered.
The digital packet delivery system will be implemented for the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), as well.
- The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 9, 2025.
- Mr. Chinnock inquired how the Commission would address the new thin brick building material proposed in the first case tonight.

Ms. Call stated that currently, thin brick is not a primary or secondary permitted building material. If any application were to be submitted for this material, it would be a request for use of a non-approved building material. Staff would provide a recommendation to the Commission after having obtained the consultant's review of the material. The Commission then would deliberate on its use and make recommendations based on the material, its use, scale and scope.

Ms. Rauch stated that the architectural consultant would provide an assessment and recommendation on the requested material.

Mr. Boggs stated that because that the case in question lies within the Bridge Street Code area, the Commission would not be asked to make a final decision on the material until the Final Development Plan (FDP) review. If it were a PUD, the decision would be made with approval of the PDP.

Ms. Rauch stated that if it is subject to the Bridge Street Code, there are criteria that must be considered, such as if it is being used in the recommended climate.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council