



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 7, 2023

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the September 7, 2023 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, Kathy Harter, Kim Way, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Jamey Chinnock, Mark Supelak

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar, Zachary Hounshell, Rati Singh, Taylor Mullinax, Heidi Rose

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 08-10-23 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

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

Ms. Call stated the applicant for Case #23-084 Woodspring Suites, Informal Review has withdrawn their application; that application will not be heard tonight.

She stated that one case has been scheduled on the Consent Agenda -- Case 23-065, Topiary Park at PID: 273-012912, Amended Final Development Plan; she inquired if any member wished to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion.

Mr. Way requested that the case be moved to the regular agenda.

The case was moved to the regular agenda.

## **CASE REVIEW**

- **Case 23-065 – Topiary Park, PID: 273-012912, Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP)**

Request for site and landscape improvements on an existing open space parcel. The 0.399-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Residential and is located northeast of the intersection of Dale Drive with Tuller Ridge Drive.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP). The 0.39-acre site is zoned BSD-R, Bridge Street District Residential and is located northeast of the Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive intersection, east of Bridge Park Block H and northeast of Bridge Park Block G. The parcel was created in 2015 with an extension of Tuller Ridge Drive to Riverside Drive as a part of Bridge Street District development. The site is directly south of the main entrance to the Sycamore Ridge apartment complex. The site has a pedestrian walkway along Tuller Ridge Drive and the northeast side connecting to Sycamore Ridge with existing street trees along the sidewalk. Per the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code, the Planning Commission is the final approving body for an AFDP for a site located in the BSD. Upon approval of the AFDP with conditions, the applicant may file for building permits through Building Standards. In 2021, the PZC approved a Final Development Plan (FDP) for Bridge Park, Block G. The 0.39-acre site was approved as a dog park, meeting the open space requirement for Block G, and contributing to the overall provision of various open space amenities throughout Bridge Park. The Commission approved a waiver of the Code requirement for a minimum park size of two acres, to permit the 0.39-acre site to be designated as a park.

The site has numerous underground and above-ground public utilities and has limitations and constraints with development. Above-ground utilities include an electrical switch cabinet, communication pedestal, communication pull boxes, external telephone box, a fire hydrant, and a catch basin located near the center of the site. Underground utilities include electric lines, storm sewer lines, sanitary sewer lines, water mains, gas mains, and cable TV lines. The site has two existing swales, one along Dale Drive and one near the northern part of the site. The proposed Topiary Park will meet some of the public open space requirement of Block G, located diagonally across the site. A total of 0.58 acres of public accessible open space was provided for Block G, 0.39-acre of which would be contributed by this site. Because of the numerous constraints on the site, however, the dog park with artificial turf, outer fencing, hard surface paving, benches, and plantings, proved unbuildable. The topiary park can be constructed with minimal disturbance to the site. The topiaries would be installed and maintained by Franklin Park Conservatory. The applicant proposes to add three distinctive topiaries on the site, each avoiding utilities and other obstacles. The topiaries will be surrounded by plant beds, with lawns throughout the site. The proposed sidewalk along Dale Drive and north of the site will connect to the existing pedestrian network. The applicant proposes to create pockets of brick pavers along Tuller Ridge Drive, Dale Drive, and the sidewalk along Sycamore Ridge, along with seating. A 6-foot wide brick paver path will extend throughout; however, it will be reduced to approximately a 4-foot width in front of the benches. Staff recommends a continuous 6-foot wide brick paver path for a comfortable walking and sitting environment. A compacted gravel walkway along the site's southeast corner and a canopy of trees are proposed. The landscape plan provides creative landscaping to add four seasons of visual interest. In addition to the topiaries and canopy trees, a mix of plant beds will be

included. For building materials, the applicant proposes to use Endicott Clay Pavers in Ironspot Blend, benches around the brick paver path and near the gravel area. Bollard LED path lights will be located along the brick paver path, gravel walkway, and near the edge of canopy trees, and uplighting will be provided for the topiary exhibits. The photometric plan and fixture specifications indicate compliant pedestrian and landscape lighting. The applicant proposes a Meremac gravel walkway at the southeast section of the site and a bike rack along Tuller Ridge Drive. The applicant will work with staff on bike rack recommendations. Staff has reviewed the application against all the applicable criteria and recommends approval with five conditions.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments on the case.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Way stated that the site was approved to be a dog park; however, an amendment is proposed for it to be a topiary park rather than a dog park. He understands that it is due to the site constraints. What are the existing constraints preventing a dog park?

Ms. Rati responded that the artificial turf along with the increase of impervious areas within that park were a concern. It was not possible to provide the required level of stormwater management necessary for that amount of impervious surface and artificial turf. The artificial turf would have caused disturbance to the underground utilities.

Mr. Way stated that when this site was approved as a dog park, we recognized a need in this area for that type of facility. Has staff considered replacing the dog park concept in another location within the vicinity?

Ms. Rauch responded that staff has not. She does recall the previous discussion on that issue.

The applicant is present, so she would defer the question regarding an alternate solution for the residents to them.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Don Brogan, Senior Project Manager, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH stated that Crawford Hoying has been working on the dog park design for two years. Although the dog park could be built, it cannot be made accessible due to grading and utility issues. Since approval of the Final Development Plan 2.5 years ago, the development of The Bailey and F Block have occurred. On the southeast corner of F Block, there is small public area, and inside Block G, there is a small pocket park. Along Dale Drive, a pedestrian experience is being developed, potentially a walking art opportunity. The intent is to add the topiary park as a grassy termination point for that pedestrian experience. The greenspace would be a welcome difference to the other pocket parks in Bridge Park, which consist primarily of hardscape with planters.

Mr. Way stated that he has no objection to the proposed topiary park; it is beautiful. However, there is still a need for a dog park in Bridge Park, due to the residential density and number of dogs. He would encourage the developer to identify another site for a dog park.

Mr. Brogan stated that there would be further development occurring, such as J Block, where inclusion of a dog park could be considered. Many of the residents, however, are taking their dogs across Riverside Drive to the River Crossing Park, where a large amount of space is available, even for large dogs.

## Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he agrees that many residents are using Riverside Crossing Park across the street for this purpose. He also believes the proposed use of this small triangular space for a topiary park is a good idea.

Commissioners expressed support for the topiary park but encouraged the applicant to identify another opportunity for a dog park in Bridge Park, which is needed in this area. They appreciate the concept of combining landscaping with art.

Mr. Fishman moved and Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with five (5) conditions:

- 1) Applicant to widen the brick paver path to 6' throughout at building permit.
- 2) Applicant to provide street trees along Dale Drive and Tuller Ridge Drive, subject to approval by Engineering.
- 3) Applicant to work with staff for bike rack recommendations at building permit.
- 4) Applicant to provide trash receptacles along with benches, to be reviewed by staff, at building permit.
- 5) The applicant to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances, if required, at building permit.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

- **Case #22-150 - Shihab Law Office at PID: 273-004511, Final Development Plan**

Request for construction of a one-story, 10,525-square-foot, law office building on a 2.86-acre site zoned Planned Commerce District, Thomas Kohler, Subarea C. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road with Emerald Parkway.

## Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that before the Commission for consideration are two applications for the Shihab Law Office, a Final Development Plan and a Preliminary Plat. The rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan were approved in 1996, which included the creation of the Thomas-Kohler Planned District, which encompasses 120 acres. Any new development in that area requires a Final Development Plan approval and a Preliminary Plat by PZC and City Council.

The 2.86-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road ( $\pm$  374 feet of frontage) and Emerald Parkway ( $\pm$ 265 feet of frontage). The vacant site is comprised of one parcel (PID 273-004511) and is 2.86 acres in size. The existing lot contains a row of mature trees and an existing shared-use path along the west property line. A 75-foot landscape and bike path easement and a 30-foot utility easement are located along the western property line. A City of Dublin 30-foot utility easement runs along the eastern and southern property lines. The applicant is proposing to split an existing single parcel into two parcels for the construction of a single-story, approximately 10,380-square-foot law office and fitness center on the southern proposed parcel. The northern parcel would not be developed at this time. In September 2022, the Planning and Zoning

Commission reviewed and provided feedback on an informal review application for the Shihab Law Office. The Commission shared the following feedback:

- Support for the proposed uses, architecture, and signs
- Concern about the site layout
- Concern about the viability for future development of the northern parcel
- Concern about the site access and site parking
- Concern over future vehicle-oriented uses occupying the site

The applicant is proposing the construction of a single-story, approximately 10,380-square-foot law office and fitness center. The building is located in the southeast corner of the parcel with parking to the west and north (rear) of the building. There would be 42 parking spaces, two of which would be located within a garage located with the inside L portion of the building. The western portion of the building will contain the law office, with the main rotunda entrance in the middle, and the northern portion of the building will contain the fitness center. A patio is provided in the northwest corner of the building, with the dumpster location directly north of the patio. The applicant has removed all vehicular circulation and parking forward of the building. Access is proposed from Emerald Parkway adjacent to the northern property line (right-in / right-out), and on Woerner Temple Road at the western end of the site (full access in / right out). A detention pond is located in the northwest corner of the site, between the existing shared-use path and proposed development.

Since the Informal Review in September 2022, the applicant has revised the plan to address Commission concerns: vehicular circulation and parking locations; conceptual capacity study of northern parcel; dumpster enclosure location; signs and building materials. The applicant has provided a conceptual site capacity study to demonstrate the ability to develop the northern lot under current zoning regulations. The building is comprised of two wings and a rotunda. The proposed architecture uses primarily red brick and stone, with soldier brick coursing to add visual interest. The roof design accommodates a combination of hip and gable roofs with a bronze standing seam metal. The gables and rear of the building are proposed as beige stucco to complement the earth tones of the stone veneer. The rooftop mechanical units will be hidden via the building architecture and pitched roofs. Other features, including light fixtures, roof coping, window framing, etc., will be bronze to match similar features in surrounding development. Both main entrances into the building are emphasized by bronze metal canopies on the southeast and north facades of the building. The proposed materials are permitted in the development text, and the building design is complementary to existing buildings in the development.

A minor text modification to the development text is necessary due to the lot split to permit the pavement and building setback to be 0 feet from the shared property lines of Lots 1 and 2, as reflected on the preliminary plat. Staff has reviewed the plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Text Modification, the Final Development Plan and the Preliminary Plat.

### **Commission Questions to Staff**

Mr. Way inquired if the FDP approval includes a landscape plan.  
Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the proposal meets all the mounding and landscape requirements.  
Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Call requested clarification of Code requirements concerning garages on commercial property in this zoning district.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Code permits garage spaces to be counted towards the required parking for a commercial site. This text does not provide specific parking requirements, so the standard Code requirements apply to the site, which permits the garage spaces to be counted.

Ms. Call stated that the Code regulates residential garage door entry/height. What are the Code development standards for commercial garages?

Ms. Rauch responded that the Residential Appearance Code for single-family residential and accessory structures addresses garage door height. Code standards do not preclude the applicant meeting the required parking space requirements in this manner.

Ms. Call stated that the Code provides requirements concerning appropriate screening from adjacent property owners. Presumably, there will be a separate property owner/tenant on the adjacent site, which these garage doors will face. However, the Code does not appear to contain standards governing commercial garages.

Ms. Rauch stated that loading areas for commercial properties must be located to the side or rear; however, there is a shared property line here. Typically, the right-of-way view is the primary concern, and this will be screened from both rights-of-way.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if staff confirmed the necessary parking space and greenspace criteria can be met for the northern lot.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the information provided by the applicant confirms the northern lot can meet Code requirements.

Mr. Fishman inquired if what is proposed is a residential garage, and if so, does it meet residential garage door requirements.

Mr. Hounshell confirmed that the garage will be for standard passenger vehicles.

Ms. Call stated that the garage doors appear to have a translucent material, not solid surface doors, so theoretically, the vehicles inside the garage would be visible from the adjacent property.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter asked if the translucent material would be frosted or clear.

Ms. Call indicated that the question would be deferred to the applicant to respond.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Gene McHugh, Design Collective, 51 East Nationwide Boulevard, Columbus, OH indicated that he had no additional presentation but is available for questions.

### **Commission Questions for Applicant**

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the fitness center was intended for employee use only or if it would be open to the public, as well.

Mr. McHugh responded that the fitness center would be open to the public. It is envisioned as a boutique hotel type of amenity in terms of services and equipment, open normal daytime hours.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there would be designated parking spaces for the facility.

Mr. McHugh responded that due to the orientation of the building's L design, the parking spaces on each side of the building would be primarily for the respective use on that side, fitness or law firm.

Mr. Schneier inquired the reason the garage doors are intended to be glass.

Mr. McHugh responded that the intent was for them to be similar to the storefront windows.

Mr. Way stated that the landscaping on the Emerald Parkway side of the building includes a straight walkway; on the Woerner Temple side, there is a curvilinear landscaping experience. Are there constraints on the Emerald Parkway side that necessitated a straight walkway?

Mr. McHugh responded that there were no constraints. The difference in the two sides is due to the landscape beds provided on the law firm side.

Mr. Way stated that the grading plan shows the grade dropping to a catch basin of some sort on the Emerald Parkway side. The landscape on the law firm side relates to the curvilinear walk; on the Emerald Parkway side, the walkway is rigid. A more attractive edge has been created on one side than the other, but both are very visible from major roadways. It would be more cohesive to treat each side in a similar manner. Would the applicant be willing to work with staff on the landscape plan to achieve that?

Mr. McHugh responded that the straight path was envisioned to be a lesser used path, because the entrance to the fitness center is in the far corner; however, they would be willing to work with staff on that detail.

Mr. Way stated that in addition to the function element, there is the aesthetic element.

Mr. Fishman indicated that Mr. Way makes a good point. He would suggest that be added to the conditions for approval.

Mr. Supelak inquired the reason the handicapped parking spaces are clustered on the north side of the lot.

Mr. McHugh responded that he believes it was due to the access ramps from the parking lot leading up to the raised area.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the rotunda on the corner, which, due to how it wraps the corner, has an awkward shape. Was there any effort to separate the rotunda from the two flanking walls, not be coplanar?

Mr. McHugh stated that the previous plan contained a more defined rotunda, but as they worked through the interior programming, an L-shaped building with a curved corner was the result. Roofing studies indicated that the conical shape would be the way to tie together the curved corner, given there would not be symmetrical legs on each side of the building.

Mr. Supelak inquired if it would be a double height space for a single floor.

Mr. McHugh responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired the reason the lighting on the side with the garage is different than on the rest of the building. For instance, the door has two sidelights; however, on the side with the garage, there is only one light and no lights around the garage.

Mr. McHugh responded that the intent was to downplay the presence of the garage. There was also an asymmetrical lighting solution for the secondary egress on the back of the building.

Ms. Harter inquired if the stucco had a yellow tint.

Mr. McHugh responded that it is an off-white color, which might include a hint of tan.

Ms. Harter inquired what colors are included in the roof; there seems to be a starkness about it.

Mr. McHugh responded that the color of the printed renderings are a little different from the actual material samples that were submitted. The primary roof is a medium bronze, and to distinguish the roof on the conical corner element, black was used. The colors are intended to be close, yet somewhat different.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant contemplated any other material on the garage door other than a transparent material.

Mr. McHugh responded that a translucent film could make it less transparent, but the intent was to make the garage doors similar to the windows on the rest of the building.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Chinnock stated that they have done a nice job with the building design. He has no objection to the lot split and the 0-foot front setback. He agrees with the request for the applicant to work with staff to address the landscaping and the sidewalk on the Emerald Parkway side of the site. He agrees with Mr. Supelak that the architecture of the rotunda is lacking. He would not deny approval because of it, but if there is an opportunity to reconsider the design of that rotunda, particularly the roof, he would encourage that.

Mr. Schneier stated that he likes the building design. The plan revisions made are positive and enhancing. He believes the use of glass as the garage door material is not optimal, but it is probably the appropriate solution. The rotunda does not look quite right, but he recognizes the applicant has attempted to accommodate the existing elements, so he is supportive of the application.

Mr. Fishman stated that he likes the garage doors. He has seen clear garage doors on multi-million dollar homes. He likes the changes made to the plan and is supportive.

Ms. Harter stated that she has concerns about the glass garage door, but is supportive of the plan with the requested landscaping modifications.

Mr. Way stated that the handicapped parking spaces should be positioned in proximity to both entrances. He is supportive of the use of glass for the garage doors consistent with the appearance of the windows; they blend in better. The rotunda has morphed more to a corner condition. Personally, he believes that is a better solution than creating a rotunda.

Mr. Supelak stated that many positive changes have been made to the previous plan. He has no objection to the use of glass for the garage doors. However, he remains concerned about the rotunda element. Architecturally, a near miss is jarring. This is a corner condition trying to be a rotunda. He believes there is an easy solution, which would consist of an adjustment where the curved glass recesses 18 inches. Where the two side walls recess 18 inches, and the curved glass



steps back, it is possible to create a break. By doing so, the curved wall will not be coplanar with the adjacent brick walls. That will allow the rooflines to be treated differently. There would be the structural roof and some light gauge framing above it to create the rotunda element. This would free the geometries to be what they should be. That type of separation would permit the rotunda to be as such.

Ms. Call stated that she likes the revised plan. With the addition of four-sided architecture, the building is now beautiful. The parking is now behind the building, which is preferable. She appreciates the applicant's willingness to address the walking paths as suggested by Mr. Way, who is a landscape architect. She also appreciates that the applicant has provided a concept use design for the residual parcel, which confirms that the lot is programmable. In the Informal Review, the applicant indicated that the garage also would be used for storage. She would have no objection to the use of glass as the garage door material, if the contents of the garage were not in the direct view of the adjacent parcel. Due to that visibility, she is not comfortable with the use of glass. Concerns were expressed about the accessibility of the handicapped parking spaces. Could that issue be addressed here?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff would work with the applicant and Building Standards to identify the best locations for the handicapped parking spaces.

Ms. Call suggested that a condition be added to reflect that and that Condition #1 be revised to include the requested landscape modification.

Mr. Fishman stated that he was not aware of the intent to include storage in the garage. If that is the case, he would not be supportive of the use of glass for the garage doors. He inquired if it would be possible to include a condition that the garage would be used only for the parking of the two vehicles, no storage.

Ms. Call inquired if there is an avenue for the Commission to prohibit storage in a garage in addition to vehicular storage.

Mr. Boggs stated that he believes that the correct direction would be to state that any storage other than vehicular storage not be visible to the exterior.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would be agreeable to that condition.

Mr. McHugh stated that the garage would be used for vehicle storage. Large file boxes and furniture would not be stored there; however, tools such as snow shovels might also be stored there, as necessary.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the entire building contains very nice, large windows. Are we requiring that no storage be placed in front of any of the windows? The glazing condition is essentially the same for both the windows and the garage. Making the restriction for one, not the other, does not seem correct.

Mr. McHugh clarified that under the Ohio Building Code, the use group of that particular area is classified as storage. Although it would be automobile storage in a garage type setting, the official Ohio Building Code of that area is storage.

Ms. Call inquired how Dublin's Code addresses storage in commercial buildings.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the only commercial storage addressed by the Code are storage units. A condition could be added to require that storage other than vehicular storage not be visible from adjacent properties.

Commission members were agreeable to the addition of the condition.

Mr. McHugh indicated that he had no objection to the condition.

Mr. Supelak inquired if a condition could be added to require that the applicant work with staff to refine the geometry of the rotunda, if the internal space permits.

Ms. Call clarified that if no changes are possible, the condition is not binding. She asked the applicant to review the revised conditions and inquired if he had any objection the conditions as listed.

Mr. McHugh responded that he had no objection.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modification to the Development Text:

Under the Thomas Kohler PCD: Section C3.06, Setback Requirements, to Permit:

- 1) A pavement and building setback of 0 feet along the shared property line of Lots 1 and 2, as indicated on the preliminary plat for PID:273-004511 (Case #23-020PP).

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff to finalize the landscape plan, and update the walkway along Emerald Parkway to mimic the design along Woerner-Temple Road;
- 2) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 3) The applicant work with Building Standards to identify best locations for handicap accessibility spaces on the site;
- 4) The proposed garage not have storage, other than vehicular storage, visible from adjacent properties;
- 5) The applicant work with staff to identify opportunities to modify the 2-story architectural feature in the southeast corner of the building, consistent with the direction of the Commission.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

- **Case #23-020 - Shihab Law Office at PID: 273-004511, Preliminary Plat**

A Preliminary Plat for a one-story, multi-tenant building on a 2.86-acre site zoned Planned Commerce District, Thomas Kohler, Subarea C. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Woerner Temple Road with Emerald Parkway.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant to work with staff to update any minor technical changes prior to submitting to City Council.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

- **Case #23 – 057 - Ohio Health Rehabilitation Hospital – Dublin, 3805 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan**

Request for construction of a one story, 10,936-square-foot addition and associated site improvements to an existing rehabilitation hospital. The 5.76-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Northeast (NE) Quad and is located northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Summer Drive.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) for the Ohio Health Rehabilitation Hospital. Upon approval of the AFDP, the applicant may file for building permits through Building Standards. The 5.76-acre site is located directly northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Summer Drive. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District (PUD), NE Quad, is located in Subarea 5B and includes approximately 11 acres north of Summer Drive, west of Sawmill Road, and south/east of Emerald Parkway.

In 2019, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) approved a Final Development Plan (FDP) for the construction of the 46,400-square-foot rehabilitation hospital serving 40 in-patient beds. The existing hospital building is centrally located on the site with a U-shaped footprint comprised of two 20-bed wings. The main entrance faces Summer Drive, and a large lawn designed as a rehabilitation amenity is oriented to the north. A stormwater management pond is located west of the building along Emerald Parkway. Vehicular access to the site is provided from Summer Drive to an internal private drive east of the site. Parking is located on the north, west, and south sides of the existing building. Along the east façade, an internal drive aisle parallel to the existing private drive provides access to the refuse and delivery area. Pedestrian sidewalk access is provided along the northwest and south property lines.

The request is for an AFDP to construct a 10,936-square-foot building addition west of the existing hospital building to accommodate 20 additional beds for post-acute physical rehabilitation services. Minor site modifications include relocating patio amenity areas, trees, and pole lights to accommodate the addition and adding additional parking. The development text permits a density of 10,000 square feet/acre, including outparcels in Subarea 5B. The maximum total permitted density for the 5.76 acre site is 57,600 square feet. With the FDP, the PZC approved a Minor Text Modification to reduce the parking to two parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of building. With this modification, 114 parking spaces and 5 ADA accessible parking spaces are required. There are 103 parking spaces, which includes 11 ADA spaces. The applicant is proposing 22 additional spaces, which include 2 additional ADA spaces. Due to the Commission's previous direction for the reduction of parking, staff is requesting Commission's feedback regarding the parking request. Since the FDP was approved in 2019, several of the original materials are no longer available or the manufacturer changed. Proposed building addition materials are either an approved FDP material for the main building or are a like-for-like match using a different manufacturer. The west elevation of the addition's façade is finished with full depth brick with bays inset from the primary plane accented by stone veneer columns. The north and south elevations each contain a glass entry covered by an extruded aluminum canopy. The addition is connected to the main building via a glass pedestrian walkway. Similar to the main building, the addition contains a flat roof with appropriately screened utility units. There are no open space requirements in the development text; however, the site is subject to density requirements, which determine the amount of open space provided. The two existing amenity patio spaces would be relocated north and south of the addition, reusing all

existing materials. The applicant has proposed a third patio amenity space near the pond surrounding an existing bench and sidewalk. Staff is not supportive of the third amenity space, because it encroaches into the front building line setback, and there is limited space to locate the patio fully behind the setback line while avoiding grading conflicts with the pond. A condition of approval is recommended for the removal of this proposed patio amenity. The proposed addition and additional parking triggers landscape modifications, including relocating 21 tree and 2 new trees to meet ground coverage requirement. A new hedge will be added to screen the proposed northern vehicular use area. Building foundation plantings and landscape beds around patio amenity spaces are provided with matching plantings approved at FDP. The application has been reviewed against the applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval of the AFDP with 2 conditions.

### **Commission Questions for Staff**

Mr. Way stated that staff's recommendation is to disapprove the requested third amenity space. The existing site includes a pond and fountain. He would assume an existing patient would appreciate being able to sit a distance away from the building in a green area with water. He inquired the reason the third amenity space is not recommended.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the Code permits only a 5-foot encroachment into a front building line setback. If the spaces were reconfigured, there could be grading conflicts with the pond. The existing patio spaces would be re-located; the third patio would be an additional space.

Mr. Way stated that he does landscape design work for health care environments and is aware of the elements that are helpful in a healing environment. An amenity space that is not tucked in a courtyard and is away from the building is very desirable. What is proposed would an environment that encourages mobility and circulation.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if all landscaping and mounding requirements would be met with the proposed addition.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Nick Belfer, Select Medical, 4714 Gettysburg Road, Mechanicsburg, PA stated that in regard to the third patio -- due to its distance from the building, the hospital staff would rarely take a patient there. Although it would be a good space for visitors, it would not be used by the patients. They have no objection to keeping the space or removing it from the plan, but he wanted to be clear that it would not be used by the patients.

Mr. Way inquired the reason the third space is included in the plan.

Mr. Belfer responded that he believes that where the empty lot exists, there is a garden that was placed there to avoid the look of an empty grass lot next to the building. The building addition will be placed over it.

Ms. Harter inquired if the existing mounding along the perimeter of the site would remain.

Todd Faris, Faris Planning and Design, 4876 Cemetery Road, Hilliard, OH stated that all of the perimeter landscaping would remain as it exists today. On the southeast corner of the site, another hedge will be added for the purpose of vehicular screening.

Ms. Harter inquired if the applicant has considered the addition of more landscaping there to further screen the vehicles.

Mr. Faris responded that all of the existing mounding and landscaping meets Code requirements for screening, so there is no additional need.

Ms. Harter inquired if they had considered any additional landscaping on the east side, consistent with the Kroger site landscaping.

Mr. Faris responded that most of that landscaping was included with the first site development. They did incorporate many of the same type of landscape materials as are part of the Kroger site. They actually did the landscape for the Kroger site expansion.

Ms. Harter inquired if the site landscaping includes pine trees.

Mr. Faris responded that it does not because most of the trees on the site are replacement trees. Pine trees do not count as replacement trees.

Mr. Chinnock inquired the reason there is a break depicted in the building architecture on the north elevation where there is mechanical screening.

David Collins, Architect, Perkins & Will, 6730 Avalon Avenue, Dallas, TX, stated that the break is the entry door into the actual screening. It would be painted the same color as the surrounding architecture, so it will appear as a solid screen.

Mr. Chinnock stated that there is not much architectural articulation on the east elevation. Is there a reason?

Mr. Collins responded that there is not much stone on several elevations. The proposed addition matches the existing architecture of the entire building.

Ms. Call stated that there is a lack of articulation on the east elevation. Although there are windows, there is a high percentage of primary and secondary building materials. Does it meet all of the Code requirements for four-sided architecture?

Ms. Mullinax responded that that the development text does not require a percentage of primary or secondary materials. It requires only that the typical primary building materials be carried throughout the majority of the facades, matching any existing buildings and surrounding development. The proposal meets all the development text requirements concerning building materials and architecture.

Mr. Supelak referred to same long elevation and inquired if they considered making that publicly accessible.

Mr. Collins responded that the original building is U-shaped. The large gym for the entire facility is within the space to which he refers. The outdoor area next to the gym is a controlled area; it is only for the patients and staff.

Mr. Belfer pointed out that due to the distance between the two buildings, adding a walkway there and bringing patients through the space would result in people walking close to the windows of the patient rooms. It is important to preserve their privacy.

## **Public Comments**

No public comments were offered on the case.

## **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Chinnock stated that the applicant has done a good matching the proposed addition to the existing building. He is supportive of retaining the proposed patio in the plan. It is a nice amenity to have, even if it is not used that much. He believes that the empty area along the long façade would benefit from landscaping.

Ms. Harter stated that she believes there are some missed opportunities for landscaping that would improve the public's view of the site. She believe it also should accomplish a better connection to the surrounding area. She has no objection to the proposed patio spaces.

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the project. He understands that when adding the patio spaces, there is also a need to preserve patients' privacy. The landscaping that has been proposed is fine. He is supportive of keeping the third patio space in the plan, to be designed to meet whatever challenges exist for the area. He believes that on a nice day, it would be a good opportunity for a visiting family member to push their loved one undergoing care in the hospital to a nice outdoor space.

Ms. Call clarified that the third patio space is not a Code requirement. Because of that and its placement, staff has recommended its removal.

Ms. Rauch stated that the issue is not the proposed third patio space; it is the fact that what is proposed would not meet the setback requirements for that area. If the Commission believes it is appropriate to include the patio space and has no objection to the patio encroaching into the setback, then the patio location would be fine.

Mr. Supelak stated that the architect has designed a lovely building, both the first construction and the proposed building addition. He is supportive of the project, including the third patio.

Mr. Fishman stated that he also is supportive of the proposed building addition and the inclusion of the third patio.

Mr. Schneier stated that he visited the site and found it to be a beautiful place. The site is not obvious until you are actually there. The fact that there is a Kroger across the street is not apparent. He believes the applicant should be congratulated on their efforts; the proposed building addition will be complementary to the existing building. He is supportive of the proposed project.

Ms. Call stated that she also believes this is a beautiful building, and the proposed building addition will further enhance it. The Commission is happy that the facility has experienced a need to grow in Dublin. She thanked them for being a good City partner. She is supportive of the applicant working with staff on the placement of the third patio, so that perhaps it does not encroach so much. It will be a lovely amenity for the site, even if it would not be used primarily by patients. She would suggest the condition for removal of the third patio be revised to state that the applicant work with staff on the proposed patio space west of the existing sidewalk. It provides staff and the applicant a desired flexibility.

Mr. Boggs pointed out that if after working with staff, the patio space remains as currently proposed, that also would be an acceptable outcome.

Commission members indicated that would be acceptable.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there is a need to include a condition to address the break in the rooftop screening on the north elevation.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant has clarified that it will be solid screening.  
The applicant confirmed it would be.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions as displayed.  
The applicant indicated they had no objection.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff on the design of the third patio amenity space west of the existing sidewalk and bench at the pond; and
- 2) The applicant continue to work with Engineering at permitting to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Bitar provided the following information concerning the upcoming Commission tours.

- PZC tour #1, a vehicular tour of approved and developed project sites within the City, is scheduled for Thursday, September 14. PZC members should meet at City Hall at 6:00 pm. A shuttle bus that accommodates 14 passengers will be used for the tour. The public is invited to participate; therefore, if needed, an additional van with 11-passenger capacity also will be available. Background information regarding the tour sites will be forwarded to Commission members.
- Discussion of tour #1 is scheduled for the Commission's next regular meeting on September 21, 2023.
- PZC tour #2, a walking tour of Bridge Street District project sites, is scheduled for Thursday, October 5. Members will meet at an identified Bridge Park location at 5:30 pm.
- Discussion of tour #2 is scheduled for the Commission's next regular meeting on October 12, 2023.

Ms. Rauch reminded Commission members of the following dates:

- The 2023 APA Ohio Planning Conference will be held September 27-29 in Columbus, Ohio. Members wishing to attend should contact the Clerk to be registered.

Ms. Call reminded Commissioners of the required City Cornerstone online training. She noted that when opening the portal, the site could indicate the member has completed all required training. That may not be accurate, however; so it is important to verify your training has been completed.

Ms. Rauch stated that she would check to see if any members have outstanding training, and if so, will provide an email reminder. Staff is available to provide assistance, if needed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

---

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Assistant Clerk of Council