



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 6, 2023 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2/3. Towns on the Parkway, Section 2 at PID: 273-013211
23-023PP, Preliminary Plat and 23-024FP, Final Plat**

Proposal: A plat to create a residential development on a 3.41-acre site consisting of 49, single-family attached units included within five to seven buildings.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of Tuller Road with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat and Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicants: Adam Pychewicz and Joe Lamparyk, Pulte Group; and Joshua Cummings and Kyle T. Kungle, EMH&T

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-023 and www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-024

MOTION: Mr. Way moved, Mr. Superlak seconded approval of the Consent Agenda cases to recommend City Council approval of the the Preliminary and Final Plats with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plats, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council; and
- 2) The applicant dedicates necessary easements on the Tuller Flats PL 1, LLC property to the west of the Towns on the Parkway development to the City, no later than conditional acceptance of the Section 2 public improvements, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary and Final Plats were forwarded to City Council for approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Absent
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



~~“Thank you for the opportunity to share concerns with the Planning and Zoning Commission. I appreciate the time and energy you put into your roles on the Commission. Thank you for hearing citizen concerns and fostering positive engagement. Everywhere you look in the Bridge Street District, there is new development in process. It seems these developments are happening at a rapid pace with several projects in-flight concurrently. I understand that development proposals to the Planning and Zoning Commission must be evaluated solely on the contents of that given proposal. However, the changes that new developments specifically involving increased density bring do not live in a vacuum in real life. There are real impacts to residents and despite best planning efforts by developers and City staff, not every outcome can be predicted. I am concerned that too many projects are happening all at once and in doing so, visibility of future impacts is blurred with nearby residents to deal with the fallout.”~~

~~Ms. Call asked if any Commission member wished to move the cases to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested the cases be moved.~~

- ~~• **Towns on the Parkway, Section 2 at PID: 273-013211, 23-023PP, Preliminary Plat**~~

~~A Preliminary Plat to create a 49-unit, single-family, attached residential development on a 3.41-acre site located southwest of the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.~~

- ~~• **Towns on the Parkway, Section 2 at PID: 273-013211 , 23-024FP, Final Plat**~~

~~A Final Plat to create a 49-unit, single-family, attached residential development on a 3.41-acre site located southwest of the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.~~

~~Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Consent Agenda cases to recommend City Council approval of the Preliminary and Final Plats with the following conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plats prior to submission for acceptance to City Council; and~~
- ~~2) The applicant dedicates necessary easements on the Tuller Flats PL 1, LLC property to the west of the Towns on the Parkway development to the City no later than conditional acceptance of the Section 2 public improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0.]~~

~~Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees intending to provide testimony on the cases on the agenda.~~

~~**NEW CASE**~~

- ~~• **Ashland Multi-Family Development, PIDs: 273-012284 & 273-002453, 23-016INF, Informal Review**~~

~~A multi-family development consisting of 300 residential units and a freestanding residential clubhouse on a ±19-acre site located north of the intersection of Blazer Parkway with the Ashland Service Road and zoned Office Laboratory and Research District.~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 6, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211 22-075PP **Preliminary Plat**

3. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211 22-076FP **Final Plat**

Proposal: Subdivision of a 2.19-acre site to create a 39-unit residential development zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Location: Northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.
Request: Review and approval of a Preliminary Plat and review and recommendation to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.
Applicant: Adam Pychewicz and Matt Callahan, Pulte Group; and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC
Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director
Contact Information: 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-075 and www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-076

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve the Preliminary Plat and recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plats including any discrepancies in open space square footage, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council; and
- 2) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering to dedicate necessary easements via warranty deed or another acceptable conveyance mechanism on the Tuller Flats PL1 LLC property, prior to commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat and Final Plat were approved by consent and the Final Plat was forwarded to City Council for approval.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier Yes
Rebecca Call Yes
Mark Supelak Yes
Kim Way Absent
Warren Fishman Yes
Jamey Chinnock Yes
Kathy Harter Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Director





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 6, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**4. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-013211
22-119AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

Proposal: Amendment of the street tree requirements, residential building locations, and construction of two booster houses for the approved residential development on an 11-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Adam Pychewicz and Matt Callahan, Pulte Group; and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director

Contact Information: 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-119

MOTION 1: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve four (4) Waivers:

1. §153.064 (G)(4)(e)(2) – Fully Enclosed Structures and Table 153.064-A.
Required: Enclosed accessory structures are not permitted within open spaces.
Requested: Permit an enclosed structure within an open space - pocket park.
2. §153.062 (B)(3)(e) – Accessory Structures.
Required: Accessory Structures are permitted within the buildable area of a lot not occupied by principal buildings, located to the side or the rear of the principal building and outside of the Required Building Zone (RBZ).
Requested: Permit an accessory structure within the front Required Build Zone (RBZ).
3. §153.074 (6)(a) – Required Location in Residential Zoning Districts.
Required: Accessory Structures are required to be located to the side or rear of the principal structure.
Requested: Permit an accessory structure forward of the principal structures in Block B.
4. §153.065 (D)(3)(a) – Street Trees.
Required: One street tree per 40 linear feet of frontage. McCune Avenue – 23 street trees (per north/south side of the street); Holcomb Street – 14 street trees (pereast/west side of the street).
Requested: To permit 11 street trees on the north side of McCune Avenue and 9 street trees on the west side of Holcomb Street.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The four (4) Waivers were approved by consent.



**4. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-013211
22-119AFDP Amended Final Development Plan**

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant dimension the building separation between buildings in Block D: 28 and 29; and 26 and 27; to confirm the separation requirement is met, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant submits revised plans to Building Standards for any applicable building permits related to the modifications in the AFDP.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Amended Final Development Plan was approved by consent.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Director





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 6, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 6, 2022 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, Lance Schneier, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Jamey Chinnock
Commission members excused: Kim Way
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Chris Will, Thaddeus Boggs, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawzkiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 09-01-22 meeting.

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

[Motion approved 5-0 with one abstention.]

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

Ms. Call noted that the applicant for the first case scheduled on the agenda, Cardinal South Development at 6775 Dublin Road, 22-135INF, Informal Case Review, requested that the case be postponed, so that case will not be heard tonight.

Ms. Call stated that there are three cases eligible for the Consent Agenda, Towns on the Parkway, Section 1, 22-075PP, Preliminary Plat; 22-076FP, Final Plat; and 22-119AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan, and inquired if any Commission member wished to move the cases to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested that the cases be moved.

CONSENT CASES

2. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211, 22-075PP, Preliminary Plat

Subdivision of a 2.19-acre site to create a 39-unit residential development zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

3. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211, 22-076FP, Final Plat

Subdivision of a 2.19-acre site to create a 39-unit residential development zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request to recommend Council approval of the Preliminary Plat and approval of the Final Plat with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plats including any discrepancies in open space square footage, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to dedicate necessary easements via warranty deed or another acceptable conveyance mechanism on the Tuller Flats PL1 LLC property, prior to commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Request for approval of the following four (4) Code Waivers:

1. §153.064 (G)(4)(e)(2) – Fully Enclosed Structures and Table 153.064-A.
Required: Enclosed accessory structures are not permitted within open spaces.
Requested: Permit an enclosed structure within an open space - pocket park.
2. §153.062 (B)(3)(e) – Accessory Structures.
Required: Accessory Structures are permitted within the buildable area of a lot not occupied by principal buildings, located to the side or the rear of the principal building and outside of the Required Building Zone (RBZ).
Requested: Permit an accessory structure within the front Required Build Zone (RBZ).
3. §153.074 (6)(a) – Required Location in Residential Zoning Districts.
Required: Accessory Structures are required to be located to the side or rear of the principal structure.
Requested: Permit an accessory structure forward of the principal structures in Block B.
4. §153.065 (D)(3)(a) – Street Trees.
Required: One street tree per 40 linear feet of frontage. McCune Avenue – 23 street trees (per north/south side of the street); Holcomb Street – 14 street trees (per east/west side of the street).

Requested: To permit 11 street trees on the north side of McCune Avenue and 9 street trees on the west side of Holcomb Street.

4. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-013211 22-119AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Amendment of the street tree requirements, residential building locations, and construction of two booster houses for the approved residential development on an 11-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request for approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant dimension the building separations between buildings 28 and 29 and between 26 and 27 in Block D to confirm the separation requirement is met, subject to staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant submit revised plans to Building Standards for any applicable building permits related to the modifications in the AFDP.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Consent Case actions as requested.

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

[Motion approved 6-0]

~~NEW CASES~~

~~5. Mount Carmel Hospital - Northwest at 3865 Bright Road, 22-134AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan~~

~~Request for approval of the development of a 150,000-square-foot, 30-bed, inpatient hospital on a 35-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital – Northwest. The site is located southeast of the roundabout of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Mr. Will stated that this 35.0-acre site located at 4105 Emerald Parkway is 750 feet southeast of the intersection of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway and northwest of the I270 interchange at Sawmill Road. This is an application for an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP), which provides opportunity for the applicant to propose changes to the Final Development Plan (FDP) approved on August 4, 2022. Tonight's presentation will highlight the proposed changes and how the prior Conditions of Approval were addressed.~~

~~The following changes have been made to the FDP in the proposed AFDP:~~

- ~~(1) Of the total 728 parking spaces, only 424 will be provided in Phase 1 of the project, the remainder in future phases.~~
- ~~(2) One of the four (4) accesses -- the restricted access from Sawmill Road has been removed from Phase 1 to be provided in a future phase.~~
- ~~(3) Only 3.0 acres of the total amount of 6.9 acres of open space will be in the first phase of the project, which now has a modified west entry green and a reduced east staff green.~~
- ~~(4) The attached Medical Office Building (MOB) will be provided in a future phase.~~
- ~~(5) Changes in the green ribbon are proposed, including moving the oncology garden and respite areas to a future phase.~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Tuesday, November 16, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. Towns on the Parkway at PID: 273-008811 **Amended Final Development Plan**
21-160AFDP

Proposal: Amendment to permit terraces on select front-facing, end units for a recently approved attached, single-family development. The 11.61-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.055(B).

Applicant: Adam Pychewicz, Pulte Homes

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-160

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan without conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Absent
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Taylor Mullinax
D0CF1A1C484140E
Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 16, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November 16, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman

Commissioners excused: Leo Grimes, Jane Fox

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Heidi Rose

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

APPROVAL 2022-2023 MEETING DATES

Ms. Call noted that the proposed July meeting date is July 7, 2022 and inquired if Commission members were aware of any schedule conflicts they might have with the proposed meeting dates. The Commission can periodically modify meeting dates, if necessary.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the proposed 2022-2023 Commission meeting dates.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

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. There are two cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. Case 2 – Towns on the Parkway

Terraces, and Case 3 – Jerome High School Classroom. She inquired if any Commission member requests to have one of the cases moved to the regular agenda for discussion purposes. [No member requested that a Consent Case be moved to the regular agenda.]

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Towns on the Parkway at PID: 273-008811, Amended Final Development Plan, 21-160AFDP

Amendment to permit terraces on select front-facing, end units for a recently approved attached, single-family development. The 11.61-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

3. Jerome High School at 8320 Hyland-Croy Road, Amended Final Development Plan, 21-162AFDP

Allowance for a ±11,550-square-foot modular classroom building. The 88.17-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District and is located northeast of the roundabout of Hyland-Croy Road and Brand Road.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Agenda cases.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Ms. Call swore in those individuals intending to give testimony at the meeting.

NEW CASES

1. Three Metro Center at PID: 273-010449, Informal Review, 21-156INF

Informal review and feedback for construction of two, four-story, multi-family buildings that are cumulatively 258,000 square feet in size consisting of 265 units, amenity spaces, and associated site improvements. The 12.75-acre site is zoned Office, Laboratory and Research District and Planned Unit Development District. The site is southwest of Metro Place South ±2,400 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an Informal Review and nonbinding feedback on a proposal to construct two, four-story, multi-family buildings on a 12.5-acre site located on Metro Place South. The northern portion of the site is heavily wooded and sparse vegetation exists on the southern portion. Cosgray Creek runs along the southern property line, and I-270 is located immediately to the west. The site encompasses two zoning districts: Office, Laboratory and Research District and the Waterford Village Planned Unit Development District. The entirety of the site is within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which calls for a mix of uses, including Residential, up to 30 dwelling units/acre. Additionally, it promotes walkability and increased amenities and vibrancy outside of typical office hours. This particular site is identified as Site 7 in the DCAP Plan, which calls for four to eight-story buildings as well as higher density, multifamily and hospitality uses. The site is surrounded by office buildings and, to the north, hospitality uses. The buildings within that area

- 3) The applicant reserve half of the trees not being replaced on the site to be planted during development to enhance landscape buffers and screening in coordination with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector; and,
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the landscape plan around the retention basins, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Final Plat with two conditions:


- 1) The applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) The applicant work with staff to provide additional right-of-way along Shier Rings Road in coordination with the Final Development Plan and update the plat prior to City Council submittal.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next PZC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 8, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

May 24, 2021

Page 5 of 11

Held _____

~~Staff recommended Council approval of the lowest and best the bid of Paul Peterson Company, Inc. in the amount of \$186,997.00.~~

~~Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked about the bridge parapet replacement on the east end of the bridge.~~

~~Mr. Hammersmith stated that the southeast corner of the bridge there is a concrete parapet wall that has received significant vehicle contact, so 20 feet will be removed and replaced with timberback to minimize contact with vehicles.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked if this is a better aesthetic. Mr. Hammersmith stated that it will be a better aesthetic.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked how staff determines when galvanized steel will be used versus timberback. She stated that the Bristol Parkway location for example, may prefer the timberback versus the galvanized steel.~~

~~Mr. Hammersmith stated that it is a design consideration based upon the location and current standards. He stated that they always consider timberback first on residential roadways to see if it will work, but sometimes it is not feasible.~~

~~Mayor Amorose Groomes asked why we had only one bidder. Mr. Hammersmith stated that there were several larger state guardrail contracts that were being bid and given the limited capacity of these guardrail contractors, they would opt for the larger project that is more profitable than the smaller project.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.~~

Resolution 30-21

Acceptance of a Preliminary Plat for Towns on the Parkway Located within the Bridge Street District (Case 20-158PP).

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. Martin stated that this Resolution is an acceptance of a Preliminary Plat for Towns on the Parkway. The site is located north of John Shields Parkway, west of Village Parkway, and south of Tuller Road, and is zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The proposal includes the subdivision of 11.0 acres to establish four lots and the dedication of three public rights-of-way. Planning and Zoning Commission has recommended approval to Council. Staff recommended approval.

Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.

Maor Amorose Groomes verified that the streets located within this area are considered private streets and not public streets. Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mayor Amorose Groomes encouraged the applicant to listen to the Planning and Zoning Commission and their comments.

Vote on the Resolution: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

~~**Resolution 31-21**~~

~~**Acceptance of a Final Plat for Bridge Park East, Section 4 (Block C).**~~

~~Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.~~

~~Ms. Martin stated that this Resolution is a request for acceptance of a Final Plat to combine three parcels totaling 12.29 acres and to establish four public access easements for open space to facilitate development of Bridge Park, Block C. The site is located north of Bridge Park Avenue and south of Tuller Ridge Drive between Dale Drive and Mooney Street, and zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Scioto River Neighborhood District. The plat establishes a single, 2.286 acre developable lot (Lot 9) along with necessary public access easements for open spaces. Lot 9 is the result of the combination of three parcels: a .183 acre parcel, a .006 acre parcel, and a 2.097 acres parcel. Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval as did Staff.~~

~~Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.~~

~~Ms. Fox stated that everyone can be confident in the work that Planning and Zoning put into the approval of this plat.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes.~~



RECORD OF ACTION - REVISED

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

4. **Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991** **21-033FDP** **Final Development Plan**

Proposal: Development of 154 attached, single-family residential units with 0.71 acres of open space on an 11-acre site.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and approve a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057 - 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte Group/Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-033

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve four Administrative Departures:

1. **§153.062(E)(1)(a) *General Building Types*** — Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials
Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors shall be constructed of primary materials.
Request: Permit reductions in primary materials percentages on the following facades of these Elevation Models:
 - Elevation Models 1, 4 and 7; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 76 percent
 - Elevation Models 3, 5 and 6; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 79 percent
 - Elevation Models 5 and 6; Front Elevation – 79 percent
2. **§153.062(O)(2)(a)2 *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Lot Coverage
Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage shall not exceed 70 percent.
Request: Lot coverage for Blocks A, B, and C shall not exceed 77 percent.
3. **§153.062(O)(2)(b) *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Height
Requirement: That the story heights shall be a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 12 feet in height.
Request: To permit the 3rd story of the proposed townhouse units to vary from a minimum height of 9.69 feet, and a maximum height of 12.17 feet.
4. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(2) *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Non-Street Facing Transparency
Requirement: A minimum 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.



**4. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991
21-033FDP Final Development Plan**

Request: Reduction in the percentage of non-street facing transparency required for the side facades of the following Elevation Models to the following percentage:

- Elevation Models 1, 2, 3 and 7; Side Façade; 3rd Story — 12 percent minimum

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The four Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve **10** Waivers:

1. **§153.062(E)(1)(a) *General Building Types*** — Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials
Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors shall be constructed of primary materials.
Request: Permit Elevation Models 2 and 3 to provide a minimum of 70 percent primary materials at the front façade, and for all Elevation Models to provide a minimum of 66 percent primary materials with the non-High Impact Option.
2. **§153.062(E)(1)(d)(h) *General Building Types*** — Permitted Secondary Materials
Requirement: Permitted secondary materials are limited to details and accents and include glass fiber reinforced gypsum, glass fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber-cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding. Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.
Request: Permit architectural details, trim and shutters to be constructed of polyurethane.
3. **§153.062(H)(1)(h) *General Building Types*** — Windows, shutters, awnings and canopies, Window Proportions
Requirement: Windows in single-family detached, single-family attached, apartment building, podium apartment building, historic mixed-use, and historic cottage commercial building types shall have vertical proportions with architecturally or historically appropriate window divisions. Horizontally-oriented windows are permitted for these building types only on non-street facing building façades.
Request: Permit windows with a horizontal orientation on street-facing side elevations.
4. **§153.062(O)(2)(a) *Single-Family Attached Building Types*** — Lot Coverage
Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage for Single-Family Attached Buildings shall not exceed 70 percent.



4. **Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991** **21-033FDP** **Final Development Plan**

Request: Lot coverage for Block D shall not exceed 85 percent.

5. **§153.062(O)(2)(b)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Height, Minimum Finished Floor Elevation (FFE)

Requirement: That the FFE for the ground story be a minimum of 2.5 feet above the height of the adjacent sidewalk elevation.

Request: To permit the majority of the townhouse units to not meet the minimum 2.5-foot difference in elevation between the FFE and the adjacent sidewalk elevation.

6. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(1)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 20 percent transparency be provided on all stories of street facing facades.

Request: Reduction in the percentage of street facing transparency required for all side facades of all Elevation Models to the following percentages at street facing side facades:

- Ground Story — 17 percent minimum
- Third Story — 11 percent

7. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(1-2)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Blank Wall Limitations, Street Facing and Non-Street Facing

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with 15 foot or greater stretch of façade by windows or other architectural elements.

Request: Permit a maximum 19 foot blank wall along the side facades of all seven Elevation Models at the ground story and 2nd story.

8. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(2)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Non-Street Facing Transparency
- Requirement:** A minimum 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.

Request: Reduction in the percentage of non-street facing transparency required for all rear and side facades of the following Elevation Models to the following percentages:

- All Elevation Models; Rear Façade--Ground Story — 6 percent minimum
- Elevation Models 4, 5 and 6; Side Façade--3rd Story — 11 percent minimum

9. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(3)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Building Entrance, Number Required on Street Façade

Requirement: A minimum of one principal building entrance must be located along the street facing building façade.

Request: Permit Buildings 14 and 16 to not provide a principal building entrance along the street facing façade.

10. **§153.064(G)(1)** *Open Space Types* — General Requirements, Size

Requirement: Pocket Plazas shall be a minimum of 300 square feet and a maximum of 1,200 square feet in size and Pocket Parks shall be a minimum of 0.10 and a maximum of 0.50 acre in size.

Request: To permit Pocket Plaza area to expand up to a maximum of 2,778 square feet and Pocket Park area to reduce to a minimum of 2,778 square feet.



**4. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991
21-033FDP Final Development Plan**

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The **10** Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

MOTION 3: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with 16 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including tree lawn and sidewalk widths, and adjustments to the on-street parking layout, as necessary, prior to submitting Final Plat to City Council;
- 2) That the site staking plan and Final Plat be updated to reflect Corner Side RBZ distances along Holcomb Street and Seville Street;
- 3) That proposed roof penetration locations be located on the non-street side of the roof ridge lines, and that vents and other utility elements be located on the rear façade of the building and painted to match the color of the adjacent exterior cladding material;
- 4) That the optional roof terraces be prohibited **from the front facade at the end units of any building and no two adjacent units, in any location, both have front façade roof terraces;**
- 5) That the Juliet balconies, open porches and stoops comply with all dimensional requirements for installation and size;
- 6) That the applicant work with Staff to create a terminal vista along John Shields Parkway in the area of the mid-block pedestrianway through the specification of Elevation Models that can provide strong vertical architectural elements flanking the pedestrianway;
- 7) That the applicant work with Staff to develop a cohesive building to building variety concept that provides more balance in the amount of diversity proposed within each building through the measured repetition of Elevation Models and Color Schemes within each building;
- 8) That the applicant work with Staff to resolve the discrepancies in proposed amount of open space provided;
- 9) That the applicant provide supplemental information regarding the underground stormwater management chambers to ensure no conflicts exist with the proposed landscape plans in these areas, subject to Staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;



**4. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991
21-033FDP Final Development Plan**

- 10) That planting plans for all areas of the site to receive landscaping be updated to include plant specifications, locations and quantities, subject to Staff approval, prior to submitting for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant work with Staff to preserve the maximum number of existing street trees along Tuller Road/Village Parkway, utilizing similar tree protection methods employed during the construction of Tuller Flats along Tuller Road to the west;
- 12) That the applicant submit a final detail for space between vehicular driveways, not utilizing gravel mulch between the driveways, subject to Staff approval;
- 13) That the applicant work with Staff to refine the planting plan and street wall details to screen the vehicular-use areas located within 20 feet of any right-of-way, as required by Code;
- 14) That the applicant revise the layout of the proposed bollard lighting along the mid-block pedestrianways to a staggered pattern, and provide photometric site data for the areas of the proposed bollard lighting;
- 15) That the applicant submit a final phasing, subject to Staff approval, prior to submittal of the Final Plat to City Council; and
- 16) **That the applicant revise the landscape design details for the gateway corner in accordance with the Commission discussion specifically to incorporate public art and to increase granite, brick, and/or other accent materials, subject to Staff approval.**


VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 294AB0C6363F490
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**5. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991
21-034FP Final Plat**

Proposal: Subdivision of 11 acres to establish four lots, three public rights-of-way, and associated easements. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057 - 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte Group/Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-034

MOTION: Mr. Grimes, moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant remove all RBZ information from the Final Plat;
- 2) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council;
- 3) That the applicant update the open space provisions to align with the Final Development Plan; and
- 4) That the applicant add public access easements in any areas where publicly accessible open space is proposed.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Plat was recommended for approval with conditions to City Council and forwarded for their review.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 294AB0C6363F490...
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



- ~~4) The applicant work with Staff to address outstanding landscape concerns prior to building permitting, subject to Staff approval;~~
- ~~5) The applicant obtain approval from the City of Columbus and City of Dublin of the proposed fire hydrant location to the satisfaction of the Washington Township Fire Department;~~
- ~~6) The applicant work with staff to ensure proper navigation area for building ingress and egress, taking into consideration increased accessibility, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~7) The applicant work with staff to provide additional architectural detail on the front elevation of the building, including lintels and sills, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~8) The applicant work with staff to reduce the blacktop area forward of the building while still accommodating a Washington Township Fire Department fire apparatus, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.~~

4. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991, 21-033FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for 154 attached, single-family residential units with 0.71 acres of open space. The 11-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

5. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991, 21-034FP, Final Plat

A request for approval of a Final Plat for subdivision of 11 acres to establish four lots, three public rights-of-way, and associated easements. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat for the development of 154 attached single-family townhomes homes, approximately 0.7-acre of open space, and three public streets on an ±11 acres site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). The Bridge Street District review process was realigned in 2019 to more closely mimic the Planned Unit Development process. The three steps required in that development process are Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan. In March 2020, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed a Concept Plan for the development of 168 attached single-family townhomes, 0.9-acre open space and three public streets on ±11.6 acres site. In December 2020, the Commission reviewed and approved a Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for 155 attached single-family townhomes, 0.7 acre of open space, and three public streets. In February 2021, the Commission provided feedback on an Informal Review of the proposed architecture for the development.

Site

The site is approximately 11 acres in size and is located north of John Shields Parkway, west of Village Parkway and south of Tuller Road. It is surrounded by existing development, including Tuller Flats to the west, existing office and hotel buildings to the north, Dublin Village Center to the east, and the Greystone Mews neighborhood to the south.

Proposal

The Final Development Plan (FDP) proposal is to establish 4 blocks of development with 154 attached single-family units distributed across 29 buildings, which vary in size from three units to eight units, with

0.7-acre of open space. The open space will include 3 pocket plazas and 4 pocket parks. Because the amount of open space provided is deficient 3,000 square feet, a condition to the approval will require the applicant to work with staff to submit a revised open space plan. Landscape details have been provided. Details regarding benches, bikeracks, pavers and screening are also included with the FDP. Conceptual renderings of the gateway character at the intersection of John Shields and Village Parkway were included in the packet. With a FDP, in addition to the site-specific standards, the Commission is tasked with reviewing the proposal in regard to building type requirements. Building types are generally based on use and form. The Single-Family attached building type is the building type in this development, which establishes the site standards. Some waivers and administrative departures were approved with the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) due to the curvature of the surrounding street network; however, an additional waiver is needed for Block D due to the increase in impervious lot coverage in that block. With the FDP, all building and architectural standards are required to be met. If not met, Administrative Departures and Waivers are required, as are requested with this FDP. The applicant has worked to incorporate the Commission's feedback and staff's comments and established seven architectural unit types. The intent is that these unit types will be combined in various groupings to provide architectural diversity. The Commission had requested a traditional architectural character for this neighborhood, which has been reflected in the final design. The designs are primarily clad in brick and cementitious siding. Many of the unique architectural features will be fabricated from polyurethane, which permits additional architectural detailing and is resilient and maintenance-free. Staff recommends approval of a Waiver to permit this material. [description of architectural details]. The applicant has provided a variety in side and rear elevations, which vary based on the footprint of the unit. [photo of typical rear elevation shown.] There are two gateway elevations. They will not have rooftop balconies, but will have a closed, full roofline to accent the open space. Five material color schemes were provided. They will be combined based on the architectural features of each unit type. A detailed building variety plan and a number of architectural character renderings were provided for the Commission's review.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends the Commission's approval of 4 administrative departures; approval of 10 waivers and disapproval of 2 waivers; approval of the FDP with 16 conditions; and a recommendation for City Council approval of the Final Plat with 4 conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, stated that the architect has tried to incorporate all of the input provided by the Commission during the past reviews. Casto has owned this property for several years, and recognized that an apartment development is not desired here. PulteHomes is able to provide the product the community needs within the Bridge Street District. They believe it will fit well within the greater fabric of the community. This project has evolved over time, and they are now presenting the fourth design iteration. When they began this development process, the anticipated price point of the units was \$300,000 - \$350,000. With the changes that have been made as a result of the Commission's direction, the price point has increased to the \$400,000 - \$500,000. They have no issue with most of staff's recommendations; however, there are two Final Development Plan (FDP) conditions they would like to discuss:

- (3) *Use of polyurethane trim*. It is important to be able to use that material on all building elevations; and
- (5) *Rooftop terraces should be prohibited from locations at end units of buildings*. They would like to have the ability to include rooftop terraces at the rear of the end elevations, which would be less impactful than front terraces.

Keith Filipkowski, Director of Construction Operations, PulteGroup, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that at the last review, there was general support for a traditional architectural style, so that has

been maintained. With these most-recent improvements, they have attempted to focus on the front entranceways. They have complied with Code in terms of the depths of the porches. For any full covered porches, there will be a 6-foot clear space, which will provide usable opportunities. They have articulated the appearance of the rooftop terraces, front and rear, and how those will be incorporated with the interrupted roof ridgelines. They have proposed that in the instances where front rooftop terraces are provided, they occur with the unit elevations that have the raised roof. That will allow the terraces to be hid within the envelope of the existing roof condition. They have also worked on the appearance of the architecture on the side and rear elevations, incorporating some specialty masonry details. There is an elevated sense of architecture for the gateway in the southeast corner. They believe they have responded to all of the Commission's comments to the extent possible. With respect to the polyurethane trim – achieving the finer details in the trim that will be provided with the front entryways requires use of a material that permits those details. In his research, he has not found another material that offers a pre-manufactured solution that will ensure quality. They have requested use of that material be permitted on the ground level of the units. In terms of the end unit rooftop terraces, the intent is to offer the rooftop terraces on the front elevations of those units with raised roofs. Rear rooftop terraces would be available for any of the units, including end units, as the end units are the premium units on any building. They will address the visibility factor for both the unit owners and the public.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak inquired if the units would not be built until the buyers had made selections re. elevations and balcony details, or would the construction be completed first and the units subsequently sold.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the building string would be identified first, working with staff to ensure a mutually agreeable building variety. After those elements are identified, buyers would be offered an option of interior structural options associated with the units. The rooftop terrace would also be an option. Ideally, the units would be sold before construction begins, but that may not occur. Construction may begin with a 50% sold occupancy.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there would be other exterior elements on which the buyers would have discretion in addition to the rooftop terraces.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that they would have no other discretion on the exterior elements.

Ms. Fox inquired if all buyers of units would be permitted to select a rooftop terrace on the front elevation.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that a front rooftop terrace would be available only for units with raised roof heights.

Ms. Fox inquired if that might mean only two or three of six units that would have raised roof heights.

Mr. Filipkowski responded affirmatively. Rear rooftop terraces, however, would be available for any of the units, although not both front and rear on the same unit.

Ms. Fox complimented Mr. Filipkowski on the many attractive architectural changes made. She remains concerned about the potential appearance of the front rooftop terraces on the streetscape. She also would like to have clarification of the polyurethane trim material that is proposed. Will a particular brand be used; does it have a warranty; and what is its durability for both lower and upper levels?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the intent is to use Fypon for the decorative trim. It is an excellent product both in terms of durability and appearance sustainability. They are very comfortable with the product and use it for much of their single-family and townhome architecture.

Ms. Call requested staff's comments concerning the product. Is it a product typically used within the City, and if so, is distinction made between its use at ground or upper levels?

Ms. Martin responded that there is precedent for this type of product being requested in the Bridge Street District; however, previously, it has not been approved. There may be merit here, given the fact

that this type of architecture is far more detailed than the modern, streamlined forms existing elsewhere in the District. Staff recommended approval of the synthetic material on the upper stories, but had recommended wood or an alternate synthetic material be used on the ground story. The architect has indicated that potentially, some of the architectural detailing may need to be simplified at the ground story if made from a natural material. Historically, however, this material has not been approved.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the box bays and Juliete balconies would be ornamental only. Although the Juliete balcony has doors, the depth would not accommodate use.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the Juliete balcony projection is 12 inches. Code permits it to project up to 24 inches but not extend 6 inches past the fenestration. Although, they did not provide a dimension in the materials, they would ensure they were compliant with Code.

Mr. Fishman inquired if this is a condominium project with an homeowner association (HOA) responsible for maintenance of the buildings.

Mr. Underhill responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman stated that previously, polyurethane material has not been approved. He has observed many polyurethane windows that are faded, warped and damaged. What is PulteHome's history of use with this trim material?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that Fypon is a proven, superior industry material. The geometry of a long fence plank is different than that of compact corbels and dentils, which would not readily permit warpage. Pulte Homes has one of the best warranties in the industry, including on materials, mechanical plumbing, water infiltration and structural. They stand behind their products, as does Fypon. Field-built trim that is not being painted or otherwise maintained has potential to rot, warp and twist.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there is a site the Commission could visit and view use of the material, such as single-family homes that would now have some age.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that there would be examples that they could identify and provide to the Commission, if not on a Pulte Home, perhaps on an older home.

Mr. Fishman stated that this is a large project within Bridge Park, and its character will be impactful as it ages. Using quality materials on a project this size is very important in such a prominent location. He is unfamiliar with the product and would like to view the product in use and with age – 10 years old, perhaps. How long has this product existed?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that he is unsure about its inception of use. However, their concern is the same as the Commission's, and in their opinion, the best product to use is the Fypon. Otherwise, they would not suggest it.

Mr. Fishman stated that, regardless, he would like to see it aged. Has Mr. Filipkowski personally viewed it in an aged condition? This is a very important project, on which slim brick also is being permitted, and he has serious concerns about the quality and longevity.

Mr. Filipkowski clarified that they have proposed real brick for the project rather than slim brick.

Mr. Fishman thanked him for the clarification. Quality and longevity are the important elements to him. He has seen many other products that did not meet the anticipated expectations.

Ms. Fox inquired if Fypon is the white, solid synthetic material that can be purchased at many lumber and Home Depot stores. It looks like wood with a simulated wood grain.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that he believes that is a less durable, composite material. The same articulation in moldings cannot be found in the products in those stores. They will be using a product with specialty details consistent with traditional architecture.

Ms. Fox stated that she raised the question because there are concerns about durability of the product, and she has had the experience of replacing wood window trim that had rotted 2 or 3 times. It was replaced with an alternative synthetic product approximately 10 years ago, and today, looks just like the original wood product. It has resisted all water damage and remained consistent in both hot and cold

temperatures. She is not opposed to a synthetic product, particularly if he would have to simplify the architectural details. If staff is convinced that the product will meet the required durability and aesthetic standards, it could be appropriate when this level of detailing is desired.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the amount of open space. One of the waivers would permit 27,000 square feet where 30,000 is required, but the plan indicates 30,000 square feet.

Mr. Underhill responded that his understanding is that it will be 30,000 square feet. He requested Mr. Chillog to address the question.

Greg Chillog, Planner/Landscape Architect, Edge Group, 330 W Spring St, #350, Columbus, OH 43215 stated that as a result of recent discussions with staff, it is now essentially a technical or accounting issue. Some of the boundaries depicted on the submittal have been revised and other boundaries adjusted to make up the deficiency. When the report was written, the amount of space was deficient because of an inaccurate boundary, but they have now identified a way to remedy the deficiency.

Mr. Way referred to the C-1 Pocket Park. A low, curvilinear wall is shown in the plans, but there is no reference to what material is used.

Mr. Chillog responded that is actually curb detail, so would be made of concrete.

Mr. Way inquired if it would not be made of granite, which would match the planters along the street.

Mr. Chillog responded that it would not be granite.

Mr. Way inquired about the wood fence that ties two of the buildings together.

Ms. Call inquired if that is the same wood fence for which staff is recommending disapproval.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that if that means the fence will be eliminated, he is supportive of that decision.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox reiterated her compliments on the architecture. The changes made have elevated this project to a level that she is confident will be proven to be timeless and attractive. She appreciates the applicant's responsiveness to the Commission's previous comments. If staff is confident, she would be supportive of the use of polyurethane for this project. She is not supportive of giving choices with the front rooftop terraces. She has no concerns with rooftop terraces on the rear elevation. Great care has been taken with creating the architectural variety, and she is concerned that the front rooftop terraces could become the focal point instead of the attractive architecture. In regard to the detail at the rear of the buildings, the balconies and the garages appear all the same, which is a disservice to the rest of the architecture. Could the garage door styles and railing materials be varied for particular units? At the street level, all the garages appear the same. She drove through Bridge Park earlier and observed that many of the Juliete balconies in Bridge Park, even the smallest, contained chairs. These balconies are popular, providing opportunity to sit outside. She would prefer a modification that would permit these balconies to be 3 feet deep, which would permit an individual to sit on their balcony. It would provide more interest and activate the street. The pocket park is located at a significant, gateway corner. She would like to see that be more interestingly designed and landscaped – perhaps with some artwork or a fountain, something that sets it off as the entrance to neighborhood. The entrances to Greystone Mews, next door, are designed more comprehensively and distinctively. Another issue, which also was pointed out by staff, is that some of the elevations look the same; for example, Elevations 3 and 5 look the same, as do Elevations 3 and 6. As depicted, only a change in materials has been made. It is important that staff work with the architect to ensure there is a good variation from one building to another, even if it means an additional style is necessary.

Mr. Fishman stated that he assumes this project will have a well-funded HOA, which would have the responsibility of addressing any issues with the appearance of the polyurethane. He appreciates that the applicant took the Commission's previous comments into consideration. He was pleased to learn that instead of thin brick, full brick will be used, which reflects quality. He agrees with Ms. Fox's preference to see the rooftop balconies at the back, not the front, and that the Juliete balconies be usable. Those that currently exist in the District are being used. He appreciates all the efforts made on this project.

Mr. Supelak stated that this project is architecturally rich and detailed. This has not been easily achieved, given the array of styles present. Although a good variety has been provided, if that variety is evenly distributed, it becomes homogenous in a different way. That is the danger at this point. It has been some time since he last used Fypon, but he could be convinced of its use on the lower level. Wood cannot be detailed as well as Fypon, a molded, synthetic material. Perhaps it would be beneficial for the Commission to view an actual sample before committing to its use. He agrees that there is a need for a focal element in the gateway park and the park in the southwest corner. He agrees that there are opportunities to add some variation in the garages – the Clopay catalog offers several designs. Variation in the rails on the upper balconies would also improve the appearance of the rear of these buildings. He really appreciates the high-impact ends – the box bays at the gateway and the herringbone details. He believes a few more could be added, particularly near the main park on the west side. Buildings 14, 15 and 16 have ends in proximity to the park, where there will be significant foot traffic. The ends of those buildings would benefit from having box bay bumpouts. Aside from those suggestions, this is an attractive project. Kudos to the applicant for navigating this process with the Commission.

Mr. Grimes stated that there has been a thoughtful development of this project. In regard to the polyurethane project – perhaps this is the time to try it. The materials may be what is needed to differentiate this project. He likes the idea of a 3-foot Juliete balcony. He has no objection to both front and rear terraces. It is obvious from the number of waivers and conditions that staff has worked diligently with the applicant to be responsive to the Commission's previous comments. He thanks the applicant for offering this beautiful project; he would like to see it happen.

Mr. Schneier stated that this iterative process has yielded a fantastic result. He echoes a couple of his fellow Commissioners' comments. Having the Juliete balconies be functional would be preferable and consistent with the City's desire to encourage opportunities for people to be outside and offering both front and rear rooftop terraces is a plus. He has no objection to the polyurethane material. The joint effort invested has achieved an excellent result.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with fellow Commissioners' comments.

Mr. Way stated that, as a new member on the Commission, this is his first review of the proposal. This is an incredible project and will be a great addition to this area. He is amazed at the amount of investment made in the "look and feel" of this development. It is spectacular. His only comment also concerns the gateway corner, which at this point is not reflecting a "gateway" impression. Some additional elements could make the difference. He does not believe a concrete seatwall there would fit. The planters along the street are granite. If that feature were to be used here, stone should be used.

Ms. Call requested clarification on the direction the Commission desires to give on the polyurethane and prohibiting rooftop terraces on the end units. The applicant has requested ability to offer rear terraces only on the end units.

Ms. Fox stated that she had not realized that a terrace, either front or rear, would be available on every unit. Her concern is that the feel of the front terraces does not appear to match the lower architecture. They appear to be cut out with only a rail added. Could they limit the number available on a building or could better integration with the lower architecture be achieved?

Mr. Supelak inquired if the percent of terraces at the front could be limited to a certain percent.

Ms. Fox stated that they are only permitted on the units with the higher roofs, so are already somewhat restricted. However, the front terraces will change the view at the street level, so should they be permitted?

[Number and percentage of front terraces discussed.]

Ms. Fox stated that the reason she encouraged deep porch stoops and usable Juliete balconies was to offer ability for outdoor activity at the front and perhaps have less need for front terraces. She has no objection to the terraces at the rear, but would prefer not to see them on the front.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's position. What the architect has achieved with the beautiful architecture could be minimized with views of the front rooftop terraces.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission should see what 3-foot Juliete balconies would look like. He is not sure the Commission would like that look within the composition of these facades. He could not support that without first understanding how they would look.

Mr. Fishman agreed.

Ms. Call stated that it would be a shame for this project to come this far, then, at this point, require 3-foot balconies that we may not like the look of when constructed. It would be a disservice to the applicant, the Commission and to the City itself. We have an application on the table, and the Commission needs to make a decision on the conditions proposed. She has seen polyurethane peel and that material gives her some unease. Although an HOA will be responsible, it is preferable that there be no issues to address. The other condition in question is permitting terraces on the end units. In regard to front terraces, the roof articulation will limit the number of front terraces and prevent any two being side-by-side. What is the Commission's position on permitting some front terraces?

Mr. Supelak clarified that where there is a choice, front/parkside terraces will be the choice, so a maximum of 50% of the units would have front terraces.

Mr. Filipkowski clarified that in the instance where there is a reverse gable at the front or a box bay that engages with the main roof, that architectural element would not be disturbed. Rooftop terraces would not be available on those units, so the percentage of front terraces would be further limited. This plan has evolved, and although a terrace railing system with trim on the ends was proposed with the earlier iteration, that is no longer included. With 3.5 stories and parapet walls, the front terraces will be much less visible.

Ms. Fox stated that she would prefer the Juliete balconies be somewhat usable, but that will be an architectural decision.

Ms. Call inquired if there was consensus on permitting the polyurethane on both upper and lower stories. [Commission indicated consensus.] There was no request for staff to view material samples.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any questions or objections to the condition concerning landscape design details in the gateway park.

Mr. Underhill responded that a fountain would be difficult to add at this point, but they would look into opportunities for addition of artwork.

Ms. Martin indicated that it would be staff's expectation that granite be incorporated into the landscape design instead of concrete, which would result in a mix of materials, brick, granite and concrete.

Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, requested the recommendation to be clarified.

Ms. Martin responded that the recommendation was to replace the concrete curb and/or seatwall with granite. It would not be a holistic redesign of that space but an elevation of the material selections in the gateway open space only.

Mr. Callahan responded that they would work with staff to identify the right material solution there.

Ms. Call inquired if there was consensus on adding variety to the garage detail and railing.
(There was insufficient support to add that condition.)

Mr. Supelak noted that it would remain a suggestion, not a requirement.
[Conditions were reviewed and clarified.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following 4 Administrative Departures:

1. Section 153.062(E)(1)(a). General Building Types - Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials.
Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors to be constructed of primary materials.
Departure: Permit reductions in primary material percentages on facades with the following Elevation Models:
 - Elevation Models 1, 4 and 7; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 76 percent
 - Elevation Models 3, 5 and 6; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 79 percent
 - Elevation Models 5 and 6; Front Elevation – 79 percent
2. Section 153.062(O)(2)(a)2. Single-Family Attached Building Type - Lot Coverage
Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage shall not exceed 70 percent.
Departure: Lot coverage for Blocks A, B, and C shall not exceed 77 percent.
3. Section 153.062(O)(2)(b). Single-Family Attached Building Type - Height
Requirement: Story heights shall be a minimum of 10 feet and maximum of 12 feet in height.
Departure: Permit the 3rd story of proposed townhouse units to vary from a minimum height of 9.69 feet, and a maximum height of 12.17 feet.
4. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(2). Single-Family Attached Building Type - Non-Street Facing Transparency
Requirement: Minimum of 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.
Departure: Permit 12 percent transparency for side facades of Elevation Models 1, 2, 3, and 7.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following 10 Waivers recommended by staff:

1. Section 153.062(E)(1)(a) General Building Types - Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials
Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors shall be constructed of primary materials.
Request: Permit Elevation Models 2 and 3 to provide a minimum of 70 percent primary materials at the front façade, and for all Elevation Models to provide a minimum of 66 percent primary materials with the non-High Impact Option.
2. Section 153.062(E)(1)(d)(h) General Building Types - Permitted Secondary Materials

Requirement: Permitted secondary materials are limited to details and accents and include glass fiber reinforced gypsum, glass fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber-cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding. Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: Permit architectural details, trim and shutters to be constructed of polyurethane.

3. Section 153.062(H)(1)(h) General Building Types - Windows, shutters, awnings and canopies, Window Proportions
Requirement: Windows in single-family detached, single-family attached, apartment building, podium apartment building, historic mixed-use, and historic cottage commercial building types shall have vertical proportions with architecturally or historically appropriate window divisions. Horizontally-oriented windows are permitted for these building types only on non-street facing building façades.
Request: Permit windows with a horizontal orientation on street-facing side elevations.
4. Section 153.062(O)(2)(a) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Lot Coverage
Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage for Single-Family Attached Buildings shall not exceed 70 percent.
Request: Lot coverage for Block D shall not exceed 85 percent.
5. Section 153.062(O)(2)(b) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Height, Minimum Finished Floor Elevation (FFE)
Requirement: That the FFE for the ground story be a minimum of 2.5 feet above the height of the adjacent sidewalk elevation.
Request: To permit the majority of the townhouse units to not meet the minimum 2.5-foot difference in elevation between the FFE and the adjacent sidewalk elevation.
6. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(1) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Street Facing Transparency
Requirement: A minimum 20 percent transparency be provided on all stories of street facing facades.
Request: Reduction in the percentage of street facing transparency required for all side facades of all Elevation Models to the following percentages at street facing side facades:
 - Ground Story - 17 percent minimum
 - Third Story - 11 percent
7. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(1-2) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Blank Wall Limitations, Street Facing and Non-Street Facing
Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with 15 foot or greater stretch of façade by windows or other architectural elements.
Request: Permit a maximum 19 foot blank wall along the side facades of all seven Elevation Models at the ground story and 2nd story.
8. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(2) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Non-Street Facing Transparency
Requirement: A minimum 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.
Request: Reduction in the percentage of non-street facing transparency required for all rear and side facades of the following Elevation Models to the following percentages:
 - All Elevation Models; Rear Façade--Ground Story - 6 percent minimum

- Elevation Models 4, 5 and 6; Side Façade--3rd Story - 11 percent minimum
9. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(3) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Building Entrance, Number Required on Street Façade
Requirement: A minimum of one principal building entrance must be located along the street facing building façade.
Request: Permit Buildings 14 and 16 to not provide a principal building entrance along the street facing façade.
10. Section 153.064(G)(1) Open Space Types - General Requirements, Size
Requirement: Pocket Plazas shall be a minimum of 300 square feet and a maximum of 1,200 square feet in size and Pocket Parks shall be a minimum of 0.10 and a maximum of 0.50 acre in size.
Request: To permit Pocket Plaza area to expand up to a maximum of 2,778 square feet and Pocket Park area to reduce to a minimum of 2,778 square feet.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with 16 conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including tree lawn and sidewalk widths, and adjustments to the on-street parking layout, as necessary, prior to submitting Final Plat to City Council;
- 2) That the site staking plan and Final Plat be updated to reflect Corner Side RBZ distances along Holcomb Street and Seville Street;
- 3) That proposed roof penetration locations be located on the non-street side of the roof ridge lines, and that vents and other utility elements be located on the rear façade of the building and painted to match the color of the adjacent exterior cladding material;
- 4) That the optional roof terraces be prohibited from the front façade of the end units of any building; and no two adjacent units, in any location, both have front terraces;
- 5) That the Juliet balconies, open porches and stoops comply with all dimensional requirements for installation and size;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to create a terminal vista along John Shields Parkway in the area of the mid-block pedestrianway through the specification of Elevation Models that can provide strong vertical architectural elements flanking the pedestrianway;
- 7) The applicant work with staff to develop a cohesive building to building variety concept that provides more balance in the amount of diversity proposed within each building through the measured repetition of elevation models and color schemes within each building;
- 8) That the applicant work with staff to resolve the discrepancies in proposed amount of open space provided;
- 9) That the applicant provide supplemental information regarding the underground stormwater management chambers to ensure no conflicts exist with the proposed landscape plans in these areas, subject to staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;
- 10) That planting plans for all areas of the site to receive landscaping be updated to include plant specifications, locations and quantities, subject to Staff approval prior to submitting for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant work with staff to preserve the maximum number of existing street trees along Tuller Road/Village Parkway, utilizing similar tree protection methods employed during the construction of Tuller Flats along Tuller Road to the west;
- 12) The applicant submit a final detail for space between vehicular driveways, not utilizing gravel mulch between the driveways, subject to staff approval;

- 13) That the applicant work with staff to refine the planting plan and street wall details to screen the vehicular use areas located within 20 feet of any right-of-way, as required by code;
- 14) That the applicant revise the layout of the proposed bollard lighting along the mid-block pedestrianways to a staggered pattern, and provide photometric site data for the areas of the proposed bollard lighting;
- 15) The applicant submit a final phasing, subject to staff approval, prior to submittal of the Final Plat to City Council.
- 16) The applicant revise the landscape design details for the gateway corner in accordance with the Commission discussion specifically to incorporate public art and to increase granite, brick, and/or other accent materials, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.

Mr. Grimes, moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Plat with 4 conditions:

- 1) The applicant remove all RBZ information from the Final Plat;
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council;
- 3) The applicant update the open space provisions to align with the Final Development Plan;
- 4) The applicant add public access easements in any areas where publicly accessible open space is proposed.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

Ms. Call thanked the applicants for working with the Commission on this product -- 90% of which was invested by the applicants.

Mr. Underhill responded that the process has resulted in a fantastic product. This is a good example of how public-private partnerships can work.

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~The Commission thanked staff for the joint training session on May 17. The goal is that the bodies will continue to improve their team effort, which will be constructive for applicants, staff and members.~~
- ~~Ms. Fox indicated that Council has begun discussion of "big ideas" for the 2035 Framework Plan. Commissioners will be involved in the envisioning process, as it continues. She would provide more details at the next meeting.~~
- ~~The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, June 3, 2021.~~

~~The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.~~

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 10, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

4. Tuller Road Townhomes PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991 20-159PDP-WR Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review

Proposal: Construction of a 155-unit, attached, single-family residential development with buildings to include three to seven units per building on an 11.61-acre site.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and review a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-159

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve two Administrative Departures as follows:

- §153.060(C)(2)(a) — Maximum Block Size
Requirement: One side of a block may not exceed 500 feet in length.
Request: 505-foot block length (Block 1) along John Shields Parkway.
- §153.062(O)(2)(b) — Story Height
Requirement: 10 feet minimum – 12 feet maximum for each story.
Request: Minimum 9.5 feet measured floor to floor.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The two Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve a Parking Plan as follows:

1. To permit four parking spaces per unit where 125% of the minimum of two spaces per unit is the maximum; and
2. To permit parking and vehicular use areas within Required Build Zones where buildings are required to be located.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 3: Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve four Waivers as follows:

1. §153.062(O)(2)(a)(1) — Front Property Line Coverage
Requirement: Minimum 75% coverage.
Request: Block 2: McCune Avenue=58%; Block 3: Village Parkway=27%; and, Block 4: McCune Avenue=52%
2. §153.062(O)(2)(a)(1) — Occupation of Corner Required
Requirement: Buildings are required to occupy corners of each block.
Request: To permit deviation from buildings occupying the corner.
3. §153.062(D)(2)(b) – Roof Type Requirements – Roof Pitch
Requirement: The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate.
Request: Decorative eaves with a 24:12 (2 percent) pitch.
4. §153.062(E)(1)(c) – Permitted Primary Materials
Requirement: Permitted primary materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, and glass.
Request: Permit thin brick as a primary permitted material.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The four Waivers as written above were approved.



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 4: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Waiver:

1. Planning recommends **approval** of the following Waiver:

§153.062(D)(2)(c) – Roof Type Requirements – Parallel Ridge Line

Requirement: When the principal ridge line is parallel to the street: Gable ends, perpendicular ridge lines, or dormers shall be incorporated to interrupt the mass of the roof.

Request: No architectural element to interrupt the parallel ridge line.

VOTE: 0 – 7.

RESULT: This Waiver was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	No
Warren Fishman	No
Kristina Kennedy	No
Mark Supelak	No
Rebecca Call	No
Leo Grimes	No
Lance Schneier	No

MOTION 5: Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the following Waiver:

1. §153.064(G)(b) – Open Space Proportions

Requirement: All open Space Types (except the Greenway) shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width.

Request: To not meet the minimum proportions for Pocket Plazas B, F, G H, and I.

VOTE: 0 – 7.

RESULT: This Waiver was disapproved.



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	No
Warren Fishman	No
Kristina Kennedy	No
Mark Supelak	No
Rebecca Call	No
Leo Grimes	No
Lance Schneier	No

MOTION 6: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve a Preliminary Development Plan with 14 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to reflect 154 units;
- 2) That the applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including on-street parking and tree lawn widths, prior to the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 3) That the applicant provide Washington Township Fire Department an auto-turn analysis with the Final Development Plan, and locate/designate a Fire Apparatus Road (FAR);
- 4) That the applicant meet the provisions of 153.062(D)(2)(c) — Parallel Ridge Line, to provide architectural details to break up the mass of the roofline with the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 5) That the applicant provide a minimum 3-foot variability to the roof height between each unit, unless an alternative design solution reaching the same result is approved by the PZC with the Final Development Plan, as determined at its sole discretion;
- 6) That the applicant use corner-piece design to emulate full-depth brick, in the application of thin brick;
- 7) That the applicant meet the required 80 percent coverage of primary building materials along street-facing facades for all buildings with submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 8) That the applicant works with staff on an appropriate location and screening of A/C units and refuse containers, prior to submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 9) That all parking and vehicular use areas located within a Required Build Zone are screened with a treatment that provides 100 percent opacity;
- 10) That the applicant work with Staff to provide a minimum 50 percent of the total required bicycle parking spaces within open space areas;
- 11) That the applicant work with Staff to provide the total required amount of open space with the Final Development Plan;



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

- 12) That the plans be revised to provide the required mid-block pedestrian way in Block 4 prior to Final Development Plan submittal;
- 13) That the architectural style be revised to ensure that each unit appears as an individual attached single-family home; and
- 14) That the applicant work with staff to ensure the front elevations provide traditional elements such as stoops, porches, columns, awnings and brick walks.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 10, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

5. Tuller Road Townhomes **PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991**
20-158PP **Preliminary Plat**

Proposal: Preliminary Plat of ±11.61 acres to create four lots and three public rights-of-way to accommodate a residential development of 155 attached, single-family units with buildings to include three to seven units per building.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-158

MOTION: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the Preliminary Plat to provide specific acreage of each lot; and
- 2) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat was conditionally recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490
Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



4. Tuller Road Townhomes at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991, Preliminary Development Plan, 20-159PDP

Construction of a 155-unit, attached, single-family residential development with buildings to include three to seven units per building on an 11.61-acre site located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

5. Tuller Road Townhomes at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991, Preliminary Plat, 20-158PP

A Preliminary Plat of ±11.61 acres to create four lots and three public rights-of-way to accommodate a residential development of 155 attached, single-family units with buildings to include three to seven units per building on a site located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat. The development will be comprised of 155 attached single-family townhomes homes on 0.7 acres of open space and 3 public streets on a ±11 acre site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). This differs from a Planned Unit Development (PUD), as no rezoning is required. The zoning standards within the Bridge Street District are already established, and the uses are permitted. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. The site is comprised of two parcels and a tree line bisects the site. It is necessary to consider projects within the context of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Special Area Plan, which was adopted by City Council in 2010 and is included in the Community Plan. The BSD Special Area Plan provides recommendations for land use and character. This site is zoned BSD-SCN, Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active mixed-use environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. Townhomes and multifamily buildings are recommended. A gateway is identified at the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. Neighborhood districts allow for special attention to be given to location and character of streets, buildings and open spaces with an emphasis on a coordinated mix of uses. The BSD Code is built upon a Street Network Framework map, which calls for a 'T' intersection at Village Parkway and Tuller Road. That intersection is located beyond this particular site, and the associated right-of-way is within the City's jurisdiction. As proposed in March 2020, the applicant had planned to incorporate that intersection improvement in this project in partnership with the City. In subsequent conversations, the City has decided that the intersection improvements in that area will be deferred; therefore, the applicant has re-designed the plan within the boundaries of the site. This is a Preliminary Development Plan, and similar to a Planned District, a subsequent Final Development Plan will permit a final review of all details associated with the project. In the Preliminary Development stage, the uses are evaluated. A townhome dwelling is a permitted use on this site. Both the Sawmill Neighborhood standards and the Street Network Map are applicable. The lots and blocks are established with the Preliminary Development, establishing the framework for the development. Building layout, form and height are confirmed in this stage, as well as the amount and location of open space. Parking is the final element of the Preliminary Development Plan. The Final Development Plan provides building type requirements, including materials, architectural details and finishes; the design of the open space; and landscaping and lighting of the public realm.

Proposal

The proposal is for 154 attached single-family units distributed across 30 buildings varying in size from 4 units to 7 units and 0.7 acres of open space. The proposal also includes the extension of McCune Avenue and two new public streets (Grafton Street and Hobbs Landing Drive West), which will provide access to interior private drives accessing private two-car garages for each unit. Compliance with the Street Network Map results in the creation of a proposal that establishes four blocks. The Code includes standards for maximum block dimensions. In the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, any one side of a block may not exceed 500 feet in length, and the cumulative total of the perimeter of all sides of block may not exceed 1,750 feet in length. All the

block lengths are compliant with the exception of the southern length of Block 1, which has a length of 505 feet along John Shields Parkway. The block length is a direct result of the curvature of John Shields Parkway. Staff is supportive of an Administrative Departure to deviate from the numeric standard by 5 feet.

In reviewing the building layout, it is important to consider the Code constraints on the building placements. The build zone for a single-family, attached building type requires a minimum 5-foot setback, but the building must be located within 20 feet of the property line. The proposal meets this requirement in all locations. Front property coverage is also required, which is the percentage of the required build zone occupied by a structure. In several locations, the proposal is deficient in front property line coverage, therefore, a waiver is requested. The deficiency is due to street connections along McCune Avenue, as well as the open space provided at the intersection of John Shields and Village Parkway. In addition, buildings are required to be sited at the corner or occupy the corner. In several instances, buildings are not sufficiently occupying the corner. In all cases, it is due to a desire to provide open spaces at corners and key gateway locations or to permit preservation of mature trees. The final lot coverage will be provided with the Final Development Plan. The maximum impervious lot coverage permitted in this district is 70 percent.

Open Space and Parking

The proposal provides 10 open space areas, including pocket plazas, a square, and several mid-block pedestrian ways. The total open space requirement in the Bridge Street District is calculated differently than that in a Planned Unit Development. The Bridge Street District requires 200 square feet of open space per dwelling unit. Although .71 acres of open space is required, the proposal provides only .64 acres of open space. Staff is recommending that the applicant work with staff to identify ways in which to provide the additional open space and to pursue opportunities to enhance the mid-block pedestrian ways, which could include water features, art and lighting. The applicant is seeking a waiver for the proportion of open spaces. The proportion is required to be at a ratio of 3:1. The intent is to provide square, not linear open spaces. Linear open spaces provide connectivity, while activated open spaces are typically square. Staff is supportive of that waiver. A parking plan is requested with this application. The Bridge Street District parking requirement for townhomes is 2 spaces per dwelling unit. The applicant is providing 2 spaces per dwelling unit plus 2 additional driveway spaces. This results in 308 parking spaces across the site, which exceeds the 161 required. In some cases, the parking spaces occupy the required build zone. In these cases, the parking should be screened at 100% opacity, to be detailed with the Final Development Plan.

Architecture

The Code provides Building Type requirements, which are highly prescriptive, providing parameters to ensure high quality development. The Single-Family Attached Building Type permits buildings that are 1.5 to 4 stories in height. This application is proposed at 3 stories in height. The proposed Building Materials are brick, stone and glass. The applicant is seeking a waiver to be permitted to use thin brick. In previous cases, the Commission has been supportive of the substitution of thin brick for full-depth brick. The Code also provides minimum story height requirements. Although the requirement is 10-12 feet in height, the applicant is proposing a story height of 9.5 feet. Because the request is within 10% of the requirement, it is an Administrative Departure, not a Waiver. The form of the building is an important consideration of the Preliminary Development Plan. The form is largely attributed to the roof. At the Concept Plan for this project, the Commission requested that a more traditional roofline be provided, and the plan has been revised to a pitched roof and traditional materials. Details are provided along the roofline to mimic a flat roof, providing a transition between Greystone Mews and Tuller Flats. The flat details also require a Waiver, of which staff is supportive. However, staff is not supportive of a Waiver to permit an uninterrupted ridge line. As proposed, the ridge line is consistent with no architectural features. More variation is necessary in the height and form of the roofline, distinguishing each unit as a "for sale" townhome versus an apartment building. The elevations provided with this proposal differ from those provided with the earlier Concept Plan. Significantly warmer tones for the Primary Building Materials are proposed, such as brick. The side elevations will wrap the corners with brick. The applicant is requesting Commission feedback tonight on the architecture and the proposed color scheme, in advance of submitting the architecture and color palettes with the Final Development Plan. With the intent of providing a diversity of Building Types, proposed Building Types have been provided.

Conceptual landscape character and features within the public realm and at the gateway of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway also are provided for consideration. Finally, the applicant is requesting a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio stated that much work has been invested in this proposed development to date. This is a challenging site; there is much occurring around it, and a very detailed Code is associated with it. The Concept Plan for this development was reviewed and approved by the Commission in March 2020. At that time, due to the proposed T-intersection as required by the Bridge Street District plan, a development agreement approved by City Council was necessary, which would have involved a land swap and TIF funding. Since then, it has been determined that it would be advisable to work with only this site, and the project has been redesigned without the T intersection. The Commission's comments with the Concept Plan review were considered carefully, and the proposal has been revised accordingly. Due to the three existing public street rights-of-way, the development to the west, and the Code, the "box" for this development was restrictive. Previously, the Commission stated that the architecture for this development should be differentiated from the Tuller Flats development to be less monolithic. This is a "for sale" product with individual, self-parked units. The architecture has been revised to a more traditional design, including pitched roofs and roof terraces on the fronts of the buildings. They believe they have been able to address the Commission's concerns, and if the Commission approves the requested Waivers, the project can proceed to the next step. They welcome the Commission's feedback tonight, as they move to the final design stage. The rest of their team members also present will be happy to respond to questions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated that there are four dead-end streets in this development. Is there a reason they are not being connected to the major thoroughfares?

Ms. Martin responded that staff had encouraged the applicant to disconnect those streets. The Bridge Street District must maintain a fine balance. In addition to connectivity, one of the other principles of this District is to have uninterrupted street frontages that allow for pedestrian circulation in a safe manner. Instead of prioritizing vehicular circulation, which is more than adequate on this site due to the other connections, the attempt here was to prioritize pedestrian circulation and safety.

Ms. Kennedy requested staff to re-state the items that staff does not support.

Ms. Martin responded that staff is not supportive of the Waiver to permit the consistent roofline. Staff believes it is important to differentiate the single-family units and provide more diversity across the development. In addition, a condition is recommended that the required open space be provided. Through creative site design, that should be possible. Staff has also conditioned that the final architectural details and materials on street-facing facades meet the intent of the Bridge Street District. That is very important at the gateway intersection with Village Parkway. Other minor conditions are recommended to ensure clear direction is given to the applicant for the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Fox stated that she was unable to be present for the earlier Concept Plan review. Although she has reviewed those records online, it would be helpful for staff to summarize the primary recommendations that were offered by the Commission.

Ms. Martin responded that for the Concept Plan, the applicant provided two architectural concepts as Option A and Option B. One option was more modern and provided some of the forms reflected elsewhere in the District, such as in Tuller Flats. The other was significantly more traditional. A pitched roof was the Commission's preferred solution, and the applicant has blended Option A and Option B into a cohesive design. The Commission also encouraged that the street-facing façades be activated. Initially, the rooftop terraces were provided at the rear of the units facing the auto-oriented area; now the rooftop terraces are provided facing the principal frontage streets, with select units having the option to have them rear facing instead. The

applicant was also encouraged to refine the design to ensure the auto-oriented areas were minimized from view.

Ms. Fox inquired about the previous discussion regarding the open space.

Ms. Martin responded that the discussion focused on the development of the gateway location at the intersection with John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Fox inquired if the previous design met the open space requirement.

Ms. Martin responded that it did meet the requirement, but the site area was .6 acres larger, which allowed a second pocket park. Now, due to the curvature of the street, that is no longer possible.

Ms. Call stated that there is a 3:1 open space requirement. What are the open spaces included in the requested waiver? One of the main features in the previous Option 1 was the very nice mailbox enclosure. There also was discussion about the addition of amenities and activation of that space.

Ms. Martin responded that the open spaces that meet the required proportion include the large open space square, the gateway location and the open space at the intersection of Hobbs Landing and John Shields Parkway. The open spaces that do not meet this provision are the linear open spaces – the mid-block pedestrian ways. A condition has been recommended that the applicant provide additional enhancements in those areas to counteract the linear form. To provide additional amenities, staff is supportive of a waiver to modify the shape.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if thin brick has been used in the surrounding areas.

Ms. Martin responded that most of the buildings within Bridge Park area use thin brick. Due to the height of the buildings, full depth brick would become very heavy. In some instances, Tuller Flats also uses thin brick.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes it is problematic to have dead-end streets here, although he understands the desire for a more pedestrian environment. However, the entire Bridge Street area is a more quasi-urban area, and this is a townhome development. He does not believe there would be an issue with having a couple more connected streets; otherwise, a vehicular circulation issue is created on this site. In the Concept Plan, there were some corner issues; those have been improved, but there is need for further improvement. The architectural renderings provided with the Concept Plan were more compelling than those provided with this proposal. The corners of the buildings present opportunities for improvement. He recognizes that a finite number of variations to the units are practical, but the two end units near the pocket park at John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway should not have the standard "end" architecture. Something additional is needed, such as a two-story extension that might address the corner condition differently. There are a few obvious places for such variations to be added. He agrees with staff regarding the need for variation in the roof ridge line. That is the only variation that could also be experienced on the back façade. A ridge line variation will be important.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is important that the buildings look like individual single-family homes, not apartments. The intent is that this not be another Tuller Flats development. He also would like to see more greenspace. Currently, the area is very dense. The original intent with the Bridge Park development was that pocket parks and open space would minimize the density. Therefore, in addition to making these buildings appear more residential, it is essential to achieve as much greenspace as possible.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the information submitted by the applicant states, "The Pulte Group submits this plan in furtherance of the goal of providing a unique product type.... The buildings will create vibrancy along the public streets and be additive to the visual character of the area." Unfortunately, those comments are in conflict with some of the waivers being requested tonight. She is not supportive of the Roofline Waiver or the Open Space Waiver, as those waivers do not create vibrancy nor add to the visual character of the area.

Ms. Fox stated that this is her first review of the proposed development. As always, she is interested in the streetscape provided. In her view, the first concept was more traditional than this concept. The previous concept had a greater mixture of façade materials and more negative versus positive spaces. The Commission is requesting a different look than what already exists in Bridge Park. On principal frontage streets, any terminal vistas and gateways should have an interesting look. Simply providing a greenspace is not sufficient in a gateway area. She believes the architecture should be unique, unlike anything seen elsewhere in the District. She understands the desire to keep the units at the mid-\$300s price point, and there is a need for such a product. It is important, however, that the development still have a look of high quality. The proposed facades do not have a timeless look of a development that would last 30-40 years. Although the Commission previously suggested a more traditional architecture, she believes it needs to be much more traditional. To help the applicant understand what she is looking for, she has forwarded to Ms. Martin some streetscape photos to share.

[Slide images shown.]

Ms. Fox pointed out that all of the photos show ways in which to achieve a more traditional front door look. There is an invitation to come to those front doors. The front facades have detail and movement; they are not flat. The buildings are large with linear units. In some of the building examples, there is a variation between levels in the units. In other building examples, there is significant difference in the detailing; some have columns and stoops, where one could sit and have a cup of coffee. In all the examples, the individual units look uniquely individual and extremely inviting, and provide a traditional look that currently does not exist in Bridge Park. She believes these type of units would not be overly expensive to achieve and would be extremely marketable. In regard to open spaces – she preferred those proposed in the previous plan, where the buildings faced the open spaces. In this revised plan, the open space seems to have been added wherever there was room.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if these front-door design ideas would have been more achievable at the Concept Plan review stage. At this point, the plans may be too solidified to revise significantly.

Mr. Schneier stated that this is an attempt to put a development in what probably is not the best location in the City or Bridge Park. John Shields Parkway may eventually lead to an abandoned AMC Theater. Perhaps we are unfairly expecting the applicant to improve what exists here. Regardless, it is essential the site be developed per the character of the Bridge Park neighborhood. While he agrees with Ms. Fox's perspective, is this development too advanced to permit such modifications? If not, would the applicant be agreeable to such modifications, which could change the character somewhat? This development will be a great asset and improvement to the area. He is unsure how much more should be expected of the proposed development in view of the fact that it is probably not in the best area of Bridge Park.

Mr. Underhill stated that he believes adding the variation in the roof ridge line could present some design difficulties, but they could be overcome. Some of the project photos provided by Ms. Fox were quite beautiful, and some of the elements could be incorporated into the design, which would activate the streetscape. In this stage of the development, it is very appropriate to offer suggestions for the final design that will be presented. He invited Mr. Filipkowski, the architect for the project, to respond to the suggestions.

Keith Filipkowski, Director of Construction Operations, PulteGroup, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that he is the architect for this project. He is very open-minded to the suggestions shared. The design is not too far advanced for some of the suggestions. They also are amenable to adjusting the roofline. The best way in which to achieve that is yet to be determined. However, they understand the concept, and the reason it is requested. They agree that it would help to break up the scale of the building, With the Final Development Plan, they will be adding the finer details, including more focus on the front entryways and additional architectural details. Similar to the Juliette balconies that have been added to side elevations, perhaps there are other accents or projections that could be added to the front elevations. The comments and photos shared tonight have provided some good ideas.

Ms. Martin responded that the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) is the opportunity for the Planning Commission to impose any conditions or provide final direction to the applicant to incorporate elements into the design. If the Commission is looking for specific traditional elements or materials, now is the appropriate time to add that condition. Similarly, if there are architectural details the Commission does not consider appropriate, it is appropriate to provide direction that those be refined, as well.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the revised plan, including the pedestrian pass-through areas. He is in agreement with staff's recommendations regarding the waivers, including the one for disapproval. He agrees that the roof ridge line should be broken up. The view of this development from the AMC Theater should be that of variation. If the AMC Theater site were to be redeveloped at some point in the future, the view of this site will be important. In considering Mr. Supelak's concern about the dead-end streets, he wonders if there will be sufficient room to back up or turn around within the neighborhood. However, the pedestrian circulation is consistent with what is desired. The corner parks on John Shields Parkway should be inviting signature sites. In particular, the gateway open space on Village Parkway should be made interesting.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with Ms. Fox's suggestions. It is essential to improve these front elevations. That can be accomplished with brick walks, columns and deviations in the façade. The current residential development in this area appears so dense; it resembles office or commercial space. There is an opportunity with this Pulte development to achieve a residential community that is unique and rich looking. Adding the suggested architectural elements would be a significant improvement. The photos shown by Ms. Fox are exactly what it is needed. Adding such amenities would make the individual units look like attached single-family homes.

Mr. Supelak suggested adding vertical landscaping to create distinct separation between the units. Mr. Underhill thanked him for the suggestion. Those elements would not pose a significant cost addition.

Ms. Fox stated that as they work on adding some of these suggestions to the design, her hope is that these buildings will not look like those on every other block in Bridge Park -- rectangular facades exist throughout the district. A variation in design, style and shape is needed. Adding trim detail to the windows is important. The buyers of these units do not want their units to look exactly like the others. Separate them out and add detail that makes each appear to be a separate unit. Add traditional elements to the front doorway that are warm and inviting. That will break up the monotony of the contemporary, urban look that exists throughout Bridge Park. If they could reduce the depth by four feet, perhaps there would be more opportunity to create an entranceway with a front stoop. The balconies are a nice feature, but she would recommend adding an overhead cover, if possible. Could the positions of the balconies on the elevations be staggered, so that the height variation would offer a level of privacy? This would be preferable to having all the balconies on the same flat plane. Awnings are traditional elements that could soften the view along the street. The gateway location and the terminal vista are very important. She preferred the pocket park, walk-through spaces in the first plan, which provided more space. The spaces proposed in this plan are tiny and uninviting; she would encourage creation of spaces in which people can comfortably stop awhile. In her view, this plan is not yet where it needs to be.

Ms. Call stated that she appreciates the changes made -- the addition of brick, improvements to the side elevations, and the additional parking spaces. The Commission is concerned about density and intensity, and while what is proposed is a good use of density, it is a little too intense. She is supportive of pulling back the front façade somewhat to add a more warm and inviting front door. She is supportive of staggering the roofline. She is not supportive of adding plantings on either side of a required walkway and calling it usable open space, nor of a waiver of the 3:1 required ratio of open space. She believes the verandas are a positive addition to the units, but adding an overhead cover would make them usable more months of the year. She is supportive of the requirement for 80% primary materials. Similar to the vertical landscape element that Mr. Supelak suggested, she would suggest similar elements be added to the streets that terminate but do not connect to other roads. If those are being used as a pedestrian thoroughfare, adding vertical greenery at the

terminus would be inviting. Although not a complete screen, they would eliminate the straight views into the driveways, and create a sense of privacy and seclusion for the neighborhood.

Mr. Underhill stated that if some of the waivers are not approved, they would be required to meet those particular Code requirements. However, they will do their best to do so. They have no objection to the conditions recommended in staff's report, nor would they object to the addition of a condition to clarify the Commission's direction regarding the front doorways.

Ms. Call stated that the vote would be taken first on the Administrative Departures and Parking Plan, followed by clarification of the revisions and then the vote on the Waivers, Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the following 2 Administrative Departures:

- 1) Administrative Departure to permit a 505-foot block length for Block 1 along John Shields Parkway where 500 feet is required.
- 2) Administrative Departure to permit a minimum story height 9.5 feet where 10-12 feet is required.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the proposed Parking Plan:

- 1) To permit four parking spaces per unit where 125% of the minimum of two spaces per unit is the maximum;
- 2) To permit parking and vehicular use areas within Required Build Zones where buildings are required to be located.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Per Mr. Grimes' inquiry regarding the open space waiver request, Ms. Martin clarified that open spaces should be square or rectangular. The mid-block pedestrian ways are narrow and linear. Due to their shape, some members have stated that they are not supportive of counting them as open space. Disapproval of that Waiver would mean those areas are not eligible to be counted as open space.

Following clarification, Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the following Waivers:

- 1) Waiver to permit reduced front property line coverage along Block 2: McCune Avenue (58%), Block 3: Village Parkway (27%), and Block 4: McCune Avenue (52%) where a minimum 75% is required.
- 2) Waiver to permit deviation from buildings occupying the corner where occupying the corner is required.
- 3) Waiver to permit a reduced roof pitch of 24:12 for decorative eaves where a roof pitch of 6:12 to 12:12 is required.
- 5) Waiver to permit thin brick as a permitted primary building material where full depth brick is required.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Boggs recommended that the remaining two waivers receive separate motions and votes.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Waiver:

- 4) Waiver to permit an uninterrupted ridge line parallel to the street that does not include architectural details where architectural details are required.

Vote: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Schneier, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Call, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Mr. Grimes, no; Ms. Kennedy, no.

[Motion failed 0-7]

Matt Callahan, VP of Land Acquisition, PulteGroup, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, stated that in regard to the following Waiver concerning open space, staff had recommended approval with certain conditions. They would be willing to work on the conditions with staff and present a solution with the Final Development Plan to address the concerns raised tonight.

Ms. Martin responded that if that is acceptable with the Commission, the applicant could rescind the Waiver request tonight. This item would be before the Commission again with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Call stated that her concern is that at the Final Development Plan stage, the footprints of the buildings have been finalized. If there were any requirement at that time to incorporate additional open space, it could not occur on the site; it would need to be added off-site. That solution would involve a Fee in Lieu of. Although the Commission has no issue with the density, it does have an issue with the intensity.

Commission consensus was that the open space issue not be deferred to the Final Development Plan stage and to proceed with a vote on the Waiver.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the following Waiver:

- 6) Waiver to permit open space proportions to exceed the maximum 3:1 (length:width) proportions

Vote: Ms. Call, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Fox, no; Ms. Kennedy, no; Mr. Schneier, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Mr. Grimes, no.

[Motion failed 0-7]

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following 14 conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the plans to reflect 154 units;
- 2) The applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including on-street parking and tree lawn widths, prior to the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 3) The applicant provide Washington Township Fire Department an auto-turn analysis with the Final Development Plan, and locate/designate a Fire Apparatus Road (FAR);
- 4) The applicant meet the provisions of 153.062(D)(2)(c) — Parallel Ridge Line, to provide architectural details to break up the mass of the roofline with the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 5) The applicant provide a minimum 3-foot variability to the roof height between each unit, unless an alternative design solution reaching the same result is approved by the PZC with the FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, as determined at its sole discretion;
- 6) In the application of thin brick, the applicant use corner pieces designed to emulate full-depth brick;
- 7) The applicant meet the required 80 percent coverage of primary building materials along street-facing facades for all buildings with submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 8) The applicant should work with staff on appropriate location and screening of A/C units and refuse containers prior to submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 9) All parking and vehicular use areas located within a Required Build Zone are screened with a treatment that provides 100 percent opacity;
- 10) The applicant work with staff to provide a minimum of 50 percent of the total required bicycle parking space within open space areas;
- 11) The applicant work with staff to provide the total required amount of open space with the Final Development Plan;

- 12) The plans be revised to provide the required mid-block pedestrian way in Block 4 prior to Final Development Plan submittal;
- 13) The architectural style be revised to ensure that each unit appears as an individual attached single-family home;
- 14) The applicant work with staff to ensure the front elevations provide traditional elements such as stoops, porches, columns, awnings and brick walks.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Preliminary Plat with the following 2 conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the Preliminary Plat to provide specific acreage of each lot;
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]

OTHER ACTIONS

- **Proposed 2021 PZC Meeting Dates**

~~Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the 2021 proposed meeting dates.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]~~

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~A joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB/BZA is scheduled for December 14 to provide an update re-policies, challenges and issues. In advance of that meeting, Commissioners should forward desired discussion topics to the Chair.~~
- ~~The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.~~

~~The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.~~

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council