

- ~~3) The applicant submit cut sheet specifications for the proposed door on the west façade and the two proposed windows on the east façade prior to building permitting, subject to staff approval;~~
- ~~4) The applicant remove all sconces from the parapet and relocate to the ground level, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~5) The applicant work with staff to provide an awning over the west elevation seating area.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0]~~

~~Mr. Scheier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with two (2) conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant provide the full height of the secondary copy text and spacing for both wall signs to ensure the 20% maximum permitted area of the sign face is met, finalized at building permitting, subject to staff approval;~~
- ~~2) The applicant submit permanent sign permits for both wall signs at building permitting through Building Standards.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0]~~

#### **4. 5055 Upper Metro Place, 22-062CP, Concept Plan**

Construction of a four-story, mixed-use building consisting of 175 residential units, 8,400-square-feet of commercial space with 211 parking spaces. The ±2.55-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial and is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Noble stated that the 2.55-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road and is currently zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial (BSD-C). Informal reviews of the proposed project occurred on July 8, 2021 and February 17, 2022. This is a Concept Plan, which is the first step in the Bridge Street District development review process. The site is largely undeveloped, except for an existing parking lot on the western end of the parcels. The surrounding area is comprised primarily of hotel uses, including Home2 Suites, Embassy Suites and Town Place Suites. To the south is a bank and an office use. The site is located within the Bridge Street District (BSD) and is proposed to be developed under the existing zoning classification. The site, however, is also located within the boundaries of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan, a Special Area Plan that was approved by City Council 2018 and amended in 2022. The Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) builds upon a previous study of Dublin’s legacy office parks and attempts to improve this area for businesses, employees and residents. Both zonings call for a mixed-use, walkable environment and open space. Although the application is being pursued under the BSD, both special area plans are considered. The proposal is for construction of an 111,318-square-foot building consisting of four stories and a mix of uses that includes a residential use, eating and drinking establishment, fitness center and conference rooms and is comparable to the proposals previously reviewed by the PZC. The applicant continues to propose a mix of parking options including on-street parking, surface parking and garage parking beneath the footprint of the

building. Parking has been re-oriented to have a one-way drive with angled parking spaces. The underground parking podium provides 138 spaces, and the total surface parking provides 73 spaces. This equates to 211 parking spaces, including 17 parking spaces along Upper Metro Place. Since the first iteration, the building has been bisected, with the two buildings now connected by a corridor. The open space has been placed to the front of the building on Frantz Road with a private pool located within the space. The Commission has encouraged that the pool be located in a more isolated area and that the open space include active uses. In this third iteration, the size and height of the building remain unchanged; there are 175 dwelling units. The commercial space is approximately 8,400 square feet in the Frantz Road building. The commercial uses include an eatery, fitness center and conference rooms. The pool has been relocated to be parallel to the Upper Metro Place building, allowing the public open space to remain east of that area. The parking remains essentially the same. A rendering of the open space has been provided, incorporating the step up in the grade change from Frantz Road, an outdoor patio space associated with the restaurant use, a music pavilion, a sports court and gazebos. Along Upper Metro Place is the private pool. The required amount of open space is 35,154 square feet; the proposed plan provides approximately 33,000 square feet. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Concept Plan with two conditions.

### **Commission Questions for Staff**

Mr. Fishman inquired how much of the required parking is being satisfied with on-street parking. Ms. Noble responded that only 17 spaces of on-street parking are proposed.

Mr. Way inquired if the width of Upper Metro Place is adequate to add the proposed on-street parking in a manner consistent with Code.

Mr. Hendershot responded that this question is part of the ongoing discussion. Part of that consideration is whether the center left turn lane is needed. There may be opportunity to utilize the existing pavement limits for onstreet parking.

Ms. Call inquired what the next steps would be in regard to engineering.

Mr. Hendershot stated that if the Concept Plan proceeds to a Preliminary Development Plan, discussions regarding the onstreet parking will occur and details would be identified.

Mr. Way stated that he assumes the discussions would attempt to ensure adequate space between the curb and the streetscape.

Mr. Hendershot responded that those would be part of the considerations.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Dwight McCabe, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, OH thanked the Commission for the previous interactive discussion with the Commission. The result of that session is a better project. He appreciates the consideration of onstreet parking, which will result in the street transitioning from what it is today to the intent of a Bridge Street District zoning. The parking has been a significant consideration from the beginning. This is a challenging, narrow site, but solutions are being identified that address the needs. Detailed architecture has not yet been addressed, but their current commitment is to: have an outdoor balcony space for every unit; provide differentiation between and within the two main buildings; the building closest to the street will have a street-centric character, i.e. a brownstone building appearance; the walk area from the hotel to the courtyard side could incorporate an art walk. Mr. Costandi, the architect, will address the changes that have been made in the courtyard space in response to the concerns raised previously by the Commission.

Mark Costandi, Architect, Costandi Studio, 2125 Sinton Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45206, clarified that there are actually 18 parallel street parking spaces; the overall count does not change. One surface parking space has been eliminated and added to the street to accommodate the large tree along the southern setback of that parking area. That parking space has been replaced with a large green island to protect the tree roots. That curb will move south the full space of a parallel parking space, creating the ability to add the space to the street parking. They will be taking advantage of the opportunities for various open space types. One such opportunity is the creation of a linear art walk along Upper Metro, connecting the hotel to the much larger plaza space, anchoring it to the corner of Frantz Road. Shifting the buildings created that opportunity. The pool has been closer to the primary residential entrance, where the lobby and lounge exist, and away from the public space along Frantz Road. Another excellent suggestion from the previous meeting discussion was to change the grade within the open space, bringing in some of the lower level into the heart of this space. The bocce court is currently in a lower area, level with the street. Circulation and landscaping wrap around it at a slightly higher 3-foot grade. The open space now offers more than a simple, flat plane. A bridge connects the two building wings. Conceptually, parallel street parking is depicted on the north side of Upper Metro, but that is not included in the parking counts for this development.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Way stated that the revised plan is impressive. Shifting the building really opened up the space, enabling it to be sculpted as private vs. public. The middle section, which is now at grade with the sidewalk, invites one into the space. This development will be a great addition to this part of the City, an area that really needs this type of activity. He congratulates the applicant for listening to the Commission's suggestions and incorporating changes. He is interested in seeing what the "planted steps" are. The Upper Metro Place building is currently a little monolithic, so that will need some additional work.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are many good elements in this Concept Plan. Because it is still early in the process, the architecture leaves much to be desired, but the inspirational images are compelling. There are a couple of great bookends around the created space. The corner nodules could be different things; the bridge could participate, as well. He encourages them to seize those opportunities and go somewhere special with the design. The open space will be a compelling feature for the City. It has layers and various functions. The restaurant spills out onto an engaging space. He appreciates their forward-thinking consideration of adding a stage for a music element. The art walk is another compelling feature. However, he remains generally concerned about the parking and the site coverage, which now feels "over built." If the site coverage could retract a little somewhere, it could relax what appears to be occurring on the site. The open space calculations are including little connector pieces. It is debatable whether they should really apply toward the open space calculation. Currently, they are trying to pinch every corner of the site, and the overbuilt nature is problematic. That also results in the monolithic building, to which Mr. Way referred. There are ways to modify and break up the coverage. This district is ready for mixed-use, and they are suggesting a small amount here – a restaurant, fitness center and meeting space. Is a 3,000-square-foot restaurant enough? Could more commercial space be added that would

relate to the greater surrounding area? Employees from the office and guests from the hotel are looking for such access; could more opportunities be added? Perhaps they could concede some of the residential units to achieve more commercial space, which would reduce the monolithic space and the open space numeric requirements. They may already have a construction type in mind, but he would comment that open floor plans can be modified more easily in the future. On the Frantz Road frontage, there is a plaza and a notched area in the property line. Perhaps there is a way to accommodate circulation from that end of the plaza and make it more inviting.

Ms. Harter stated that she likes the bridge concept and the parallel street parking. She appreciates that the restaurant has been located along Frantz Road and likes the art walk idea. In addition to Dublin Arts Council, there may be an opportunity to involve Dublin Schools in that opportunity. Including a dog park often is a way to connect people to a site. Any pathway connections are encouraged.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes one item has not yet been settled, and that is the limited change in the amount of commercial use provided. Several years ago, the Commission identified the need to change the zoning here and make the area more commercial. The major complaint was that people working in Upper Metro Center had no place to eat. He believes that what is needed is not just one restaurant, but several restaurants. A large amount of residential use is being included on this site. He would encourage them to include commercial opportunities for people to access on their lunch hour, such as Starbucks. Although much was accomplished at the previous meeting, the restaurant/commercial component still needs to be adequately addressed.

Mr. Schneier stated that he appreciates the applicant being responsive, and raising the bar for the Metro Center area. In regard to the use – the Live, Work, Play balance, he has no objection to the proposed use, as there is already a sufficient amount of the work component, and with the hotels, a temporary living component. The City is interested in including more of the Live component here. He agrees that the proposed 3,000-square-foot restaurant does seem small. In regard to the open space, they are providing approximately 95% of the required amount. However, they appear to have included the outdoor dining area of the restaurant in the open space amenity area. It is debatable whether it should be, as only diners would be using those tables, not the public. He would like this particular element to be brought up later for discussion. He has no additional concerns.

Ms. Call stated that this development has been a collaborative effort for a development that meets the Bridge Street Code in an area where that Code has not been implemented previously. It is a different look from the existing Metro Place look. She applauds staff and the applicant for considering this development through the lens of Bridge Street rather than the lens of Metro Place. The balconies are along the back portion of the building. Additional activation is needed along the Upper Metro Place frontage, such as planters or stepping back the building frontage to achieve some articulation and activation. She loves the inspirational images, particularly the different elevations incorporated in the open space. She agrees that some of the non-active open spaces should be considered as open space, but the spaces with a private appearance should not be included. Removing those would lower the calculation from 94%, however, making it less than what would be acceptable. She likes the art walk concept. The restaurant space does look a little too small. She would be supportive of the inclusion of forward-thinking flexible space in the building. She would encourage them to alleviate the parking and open space struggle by revising the plan further. She inquired if the applicant desired additional input from the Commission.

Mr. McCabe indicated they did not.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Concept Plan with two (2) conditions:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with staff to define how the open space will meet Bridge Street District requirements.
- 2) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure the on-street parking will meet Bridge Street District requirements.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Rauch stated that:

- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, August 4, 2022.
- In addition to the two regular PZC meetings in August, there will be a joint Council-PZC-ARB-BZA meeting at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, August 31, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

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

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

~~Bridge Street District. These type of facilities need convenient access; they are automobile-oriented, not pedestrian-oriented. Perhaps the applicant could find another more appropriate site in Dublin. He understands the need for this type of emergency service, and it is not his intent to discourage the applicant from pursuing it in another location. However, significant effort has been expended by the City and the Commission in the goal to make this particular district unique and different.~~

~~Ms. Call stated the use is valuable; she also encourages the applicant to seek another location within the City. The Commission appreciates the time and effort the applicant has expended.~~

## **2. 5055 Upper Metro Place, 21-094INF, Informal Review**

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the construction of a four-story, mixed-use building containing residential units and a commercial tenant space. The 2.55-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial and is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Noble stated that this case originally was presented to the Commission on July 8, 2021. Tonight, nonbinding feedback from the Commission is sought on a revised proposal. Should this application advance, it would return as a Concept Plan request. The 2.5-acre vacant site is located south of Upper Metro Place and west of Frantz Road. The site has frontage on Upper Metro Place to the north. There are pedestrian facilities on both Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. The site is zoned Bridge Street Commercial and is surrounded primarily by hotel uses, including Embassy Suites and Home2 Suites to the north; Town Place Suites to the west; to the south, an office and bank use; to the east, other hotel uses. Although the site is included in the Bridge Street Commercial District, it is also located within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The concepts of both areas are similar, specifically, a walkable and mixed-use urban environment. In this location, there is a need to attract amenities for workers, including usable open space. DCAP is a fully developed area, and the focus is now on additional infill development. When the Commission reviewed the case in July, they were generally supportive of the use but expressed concerns about the massing, which was essentially a 4-story linear wall located very close to the Upper Metro Place roadway. There also was concern that the open space located to the rear of the building would be perceived as private space, not usable public open space.

The revised proposal essentially bisects the building, placing the two sections on the Upper Metro Place frontage and Frantz Road frontage, with a connector between the two. The open space includes a private pool for the building tenants; it also includes an outdoor patio space for use by the commercial uses on the first floor of the Frantz Road building. The building is proposed to be a Mixed-Use Building Type containing 175 residential units and 7,700-square-feet of commercial space. The commercial uses include a restaurant user, a fitness facility and conference space, available for use by the nearby hotels. Open space was a concern, as there is none in close proximity to the site. The Bridge Street District requires open space for both commercial and residential uses. This application proposes 35,000 square feet of open space, nearly an acre, but slightly under the amount required. The open space includes the inner corridor of greenspace, the area around the pool, landscaping along Upper Metro Place, and a patio. There will be a need to activate that space. The primary access to the site is from Upper Metro Place. The parking includes

53 surface parking spaces; 138 underground parking spaces; and 17 on-street parking spaces. It is anticipated the residential units will be studio apartments. If the residential component is comprised entirely of studio units, 33 of the proposed parking spaces would remain for the restaurant. The material selections will be natural materials with some modern elements.

The following questions are provided for the Commission's discussion.

- 1) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support the modified site design?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Parking Pan that would not meet the minimum requirements of the Code?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the open space design, location, and layout?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual mass, scale, and height of the building?
- 5) Any other considerations.

### **Commission Questions for Staff**

Mr. Schneier inquired if the open space and public space are calculated separately, and the public space portion would be a subset of the open space.

Ms. Call clarified that the open space calculation is public open space.

Mr. Noble noted that there is a numeric value to that.

Mr. Schneier inquired if all 35,000 square feet of open space would be accessible to the public.

Ms. Rauch responded that the required open space must be publicly accessible. All 35,152 square feet is required public open space.

Mr. Schneier stated that the application lacks 9% of the required amount. He inquired if the open space calculation does not include the pool, because it is not accessible to the public.

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of which portions of the site plan are not publicly accessible.

Ms. Call inquired if there is an overlay that would delineate the private open space and the public open space.

[Mr. Supelak referred to a drawing in the meeting materials that provided that information.]

Mr. Supelak requested clarification regarding how the number of residential units determines the required open space.

Ms. Noble responded that 200 square feet of open space is required per unit. The required open space for a commercial use is based on its square footage; accordingly, 154 square feet of open space is required for the proposed commercial space.

Mr. Supelak inquired the amount of commercial space.

Ms. Noble responded that the commercial space is 7,700 square feet, incorporating the restaurant, fitness center and conference rooms.

Ms. Call noted that excluding the required residential parking spaces, 33 spaces remain. Therefore, could only 3/7ths of the commercial space be designated for restaurant use?

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired if the small notch out of the property along Frantz Road were related to a utility area.

Ms. Noble deferred the question to the applicant for a response.

Mr. Supelak stated that the proposed residential property is located in close proximity to the parcel to the south, 409 North Metro Place. If the adjacent building property owner should desire to redevelop in the future, what sensitivity would there be regarding the side setback between the buildings?

Ms. Noble responded that the intent is to consider these sites in an integrated manner. Any future proposed redevelopment would come before the Planning Commission for consideration.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Dwight McCabe, McCabe Properties, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, OH 43064, stated that they have provided due diligence to the Commission's comments at their earlier review, and they believe the revised plan is a better solution. Previously, the issue was the dichotomy between the various overlays and zoning conditions in place on the site. They had attempted to meet Code, but agreed with the Commission's comments. Subsequent to submission of their application, there have been ongoing discussions with staff and the fire marshal; the need for emergency access has been resolved. The plan submitted included a full 20-foot fire lane easement on the south side of the building, but that is no longer a requirement. Consequently, the offset of the building will shift on the south side to align with the rest of the building. When that occurs, the green space will move to the front of the building. As a result, the amount of public space will exceed the minimum requirement. That amount is exclusive of the pool area and pool deck. The residential units will be approximately 670 – 690-square foot, one-bedroom units, not studio apartments. Two-bedroom units could be included at the building ends, and that would reduce the required parking spaces. They do not anticipate including a 7,700-square-foot restaurant in this location. The restaurant probably would be limited to a 3,200-3,500 square feet bar/restaurant, similar to The Goat in Hilliard. The other two commercial uses -- fitness center and conference rooms, are provided for users within the community. There have been some recent conversations regarding the possibility of having on-street parking on both sides of the street, consistent with the Bridge Street District. Regarding the possibility of redevelopment of the adjacent property, the bank intends to retain their current location long-term. They are interested in having the Commission's feedback on their proposal.

### **Commission Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Way inquired if underground parking would be provided only under the Frantz Road wing of the building.

Mr. McCabe responded that it would be provided under the entire building.

Mr. Way referred to his earlier question about the small notch on Frantz Road that is not part of this property.

Mr. McCabe responded that it is not part of their property, although they are not sure of the purpose of the notch.

Mr. Hendershot stated the right-of-way notch accommodates private utilities within that area, either electric or telephone. It would be very challenging to relocate those facilities.

Mr. McCabe stated that the stonewall runs through that area, which provides a consistent appearance.

Mr. Way noted that the stonewall actually presents a barrier to achieving the desired activation along the Frantz Road frontage. In regard to the private swimming pool, has consideration been given to locating the pool in a different location?

Mr. McCabe responded that extensive consideration has been given to location. Unfortunately, locating it on the southwest side would have a significant impact on the surface parking and access to the underground parking. They are willing to work on the correct solution regarding opacity and separation. If needed, a wall could be added.



Mr. Way stated that the proposed location is disruptive; it fragments the open space. Moving it closer to the building on the west would free up more of that open space.

Mr. McCabe indicated that would be a possibility.

### **Public Comments**

No public comments were received on the case.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Grimes stated the revised proposal is far superior to the earlier version. He is impressed with the changes to the layout. His earlier concerns regarding parking have been alleviated.

Mr. Supelak stated that the mass has not been reduced, but it has been broken up in an interesting manner. He applauds their efforts with the open space. The corner is inviting. The opportunity for The Goat-type facility to spill out onto the plaza is attractive. This type of facility would become the local cantina for the area, a self-sustaining facility. It would not necessarily need to depend upon vehicular traffic. His concern is the quality of the public open space. Would the greater public actually participate here? He would be interested in having the outside public drawn into the open space. As proposed, the public space is encased in the site; it reflects a private-public character. In regard to parking, could angled parking be an option? The street does not have a high level of traffic. The wall of residential units is not a particular issue for this project, although it may be for the next series of projects. The rear lot appears to be very tight and uncomfortable. In regard to the architecture, he has no objection to the proposed direction. There is one totem on the corner, could there be a series of totems that would draw the greater public into that space?

Mr. Way stated that breaking up the massing and placing the open space on the key corner was a good direction. That corner space and courtyard area present a good opportunity. More design detail is needed. This project has the ability to set the tone for the future of the Frantz Road frontage as it extends towards Tuttle Road. The individual steps are wasted, unusable space. He would encourage them to put in a retaining wall that extends backward, creating a usable space along Upper Metro Place. That would leave a separate public space for the restaurant. He would encourage the applicant to consider some options for the pool. It is difficult to differentiate the private versus the public open space. Increasing the amount of connected, obvious public space would improve that distinction. Locating the pool nearer the building on the west, would achieve more contiguous open space. He would encourage the applicant to work with the Dublin Arts Council regarding a corner piece. He is not supportive of diagonal parking. He would encourage that the color of the massing fit with the family of colors that exist within Upper Metro Place. He would like to see a footprint for the underground parking; perhaps there would be opportunity to extend that footprint and gain more parking spaces.

Mr. Schneier stated that is this a great project. The changes made in response to the Commission's earlier comments were positive. There is concern about the amount of usable public space. The small orphan public spaces are not inviting to the public. The buffer between the private pool and the public open space is a concern; again, the public open space does not invite use by the greater public. Aside from that element, he likes the proposed project.

Ms. Call stated that the articulation of the building is good. The fact that every unit will have a balcony is not only attractive architecturally, but it will enhance the street activation. The activation

along Frantz Road is good, and addition of the plaza is a positive element. If the fire lane is deleted on the south side, it will achieve the additional 9% of needed open space. Due to the desire to activate the street frontage, she would not advocate for provision of fencing on the corner. She has a couple of concerns. She is not a fan of on-street parking here. This is a right-in, right-out street, and vehicles would be entering on the wrong side of the road. A potential restaurant client would not be aware that parking is available on the other side of the building, and accessing those public spaces would not be easy. While she really likes the plaza, which activates the corner, she does not like the required step up into that space; that step up is another barrier for the public. She likes the suggestion to rotate the pool location back into the green space, which would improve the amount of usable and inviting public space. She reiterated the suggestion made to work with the Dublin Arts Council on a corner piece.

She inquired if the applicant desired any additional clarification.

Mr. McCabe requested clarification of the activation of the public space. Are there types of activities that the Commission believe should be considered?

Ms. Call responded that the Commission encourages applicant creativity.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission encourages placemaking and activities that draw the public, such as music.

Ms. Noble clarified that there have been conversations about on-street parking, but it would be developer-driven. The City is not proposing to add on-street parking.

Ms. Call thanked the applicant for their presentation.

## **NEW CASES**

### **~~3. OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital at 6905, 6955, & 7450-7500 Hospital Drive, 21-190AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan~~**

~~Ms. Call stated that this is a request for sign modifications for an existing hospital on a 53.28-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Ohio Health, on a site located west of the intersection of Hospital Drive with Avery-Muirfield Drive.~~

#### **Staff Presentation**

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and determination of an Amended Final Development Plan for the OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital and an updated sign plan. OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital was developed following approval of a rezoning of the site in February 2005 to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, OhioHealth. The campus includes a 309,118-square-foot hospital building, a 99,280-square-foot Medical Office Building and additional ancillary office buildings throughout the campus. An overall sign package for the campus was approved with the hospital's Final Development Plan in May 2005 and was amended in both November 2006 and 2009. The applicant is proposing modifications of the existing sign plan to include two new wall signs, revise two existing ground signs and one existing wall sign, and revision of the address identification signage for the site. The remaining signage throughout the campus will not be impacted. Planning and Zoning Commission is the designated reviewing body for sign package modifications.~~



# RECORD OF DISCUSSION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 8, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. 5055 Upper Metro Place  
21-094INF**

**Informal Review**

Proposal: Development of a four-story, mixed-use building consisting of 174 residential units, 13,500-square-feet of commercial space, and associated site improvements on a 1.84-acre site.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road and zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial.

Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a future development application under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Dwight McCabe, McCabe Companies

Planning Contact: Tammy Noble, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4649, [tnoble@dublin.oh.us](mailto:tnoble@dublin.oh.us)

Case Information: [www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-094](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-094)

**RESULT:** The Commission conducted an informal review and provided non-binding feedback on a proposal to construct a four-story, mixed-use building with 174 residential units, 222 parking spaces, and 0.80 acres of open space. The Commission expressed support for the mix of commercial and residential uses. The Commission expressed concern regarding the mass and scale of the building on the site. The Commission recommended the mass be broken down into multiple buildings. Members of the Commission identified a desire for engaging architectural character with a future iteration of the design. Members of the Commission expressed differing direction regarding the total number of stories. The Commission recommended that the open space be more accessible and engaging. Some members of the Commission were supportive of on-street parking while other members of the Commission expressed reservations.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
  
 B62DEF02B6D24C7  
 Tammy Noble, Senior Planner



~~different building. She is concerned that there will be little sunlight penetration; people will feel “warehoused” here. The massing needs to be broken up significantly to provide interest for public and private spaces for the senior residents. She agrees that providing more space on the backside would provide some beautiful landscape opportunities.~~

~~Ms. Call stated that she concurs with fellow Commissioners’ comments. She believes that the current reduction in parking and open space is due to the size of the proposed building. She agrees with the need to be very cautious with shared spaces, whether open space or parking, and not for accounting purposes only. A reduction in open space already has been permitted for each of the blocks, and when an open space or parking space is shifted to other blocks, the walk distance to reach those amenities is increased for the patrons or residents. With the already reduced amount of open space inherent to the nature of this District, we need to be cognizant of that issue. If we were to permit any further reduction in either open space or parking, shared-use agreements would be necessary for documentation purposes. Future Commissions will need to administer the redevelopment of these areas and it will be difficult for them to undo all the “spaghetti arrangements” that have occurred in the preceding years. Although she is not opposed to podium buildings, a certain level of detail and quality is expected within the Bridge Street District. In summary, she is not in favor of the reduction in parking and open space; reducing the size of the building should mitigate those issues.~~

~~Mr. Fishman agreed with the need to reduce the size of the building and provide more open space at the entrance. Unlike Chicago or Los Angeles, apartment residents here should not have to park in another building. Walking 300 feet to park in another building is not common within the Columbus, Ohio area. He is opposed to reducing the number of parking spaces provided for senior residents.~~

~~Ms. Call noted that when considering terracing and steps, it is necessary to be cognizant of ADA standards.~~

### **Public Comments**

~~No public comments were received on the case.~~

~~Ms. Call inquired if the applicant required further address.~~

~~Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH, stated that he appreciates the comments. He would point out that the residential parking ratio in the neighborhood is 1.15 to 1.2 cars per standard unit. The proposed parking envisioned a 1.0 parking ratio. For 530 units, there is ability to park 580+ cars. They have sufficient direction on the other elements.~~

## **2. 5055 Upper Metro Place, Informal Review, 21-094INF**

Feedback on development of a four-story, mixed-use building consisting of 174 residential units, 13,500 square feet of commercial space, and associated site improvements. The 1.88-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial and is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Noble stated that this is a proposal for a mixed-use development on a vacant 1.88-acre parcel. The applicant is requesting feedback on the development of a four-story, mixed-use building consisting of 174 residential units, 13,500-square-feet of commercial space, and associated site improvements. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road and zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial, as is the area to the north and west. Community Commercial is located to the east and a PUD is located to the south. The primary uses within the immediate area are hospitality uses. Home2 is located to the north; to the west is Embassy Suites; to the west is Town Suites.

An 111,318 square-foot, 4-story mixed-use building is proposed, which would contain 174 residential units and 13,500 square feet of commercial space. This will be an L-shaped building with frontage along Frantz Road and Upper Metro Place. Open space is located south of the building. This mixed-use building type is a permitted building type in the BSD Commercial District, permitting a maximum of five stories. This site is also located with the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), a Special Area Plan under review by the Commission. The objectives of that area plan are to create a more walkable, dense community within an area that has been predominantly Office uses. Commercial activity is proposed on the first floor of the building and will consist of a pub/restaurant use located in the northeast corner of the building. It will also include an outdoor dining area. The internal space along Frantz Road will provide a fitness facility for both the building residents and the general public. The remaining space will be conference space to meet the needs of surrounding hotel uses. The proposal provides approximately 35,000 square feet of open space, which largely addresses the need for the residential uses, but does not account for the requirement for the commercial uses. Underground parking will supplement the on-street parking provided on the site for commercial uses and service parking, providing a total of 222 parking spaces. 17 on-street parking spaces will be located along Upper Metro Place.

Staff has provided the following questions to facilitate the Commission's review:

- 1) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission generally support the proposed site layout?
- 2) The open space provide in the proposal does not meet the open space requirement for both residential and commercial uses. Would the Commission support a waiver from this requirement?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the open space design, location and layout?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual mass, scale and height of the building?
- 5) Does the Commission support on-street parking?

### **Commission Questions for Staff**

Mr. Grimes inquired if on-street parking currently exists here.

Ms. Noble responded that it does not.

Ms. Fox stated that she is unclear how both the requirements of the Bridge Street District Plan and the DCAP recommendations are being blended within this proposal.

Ms. Noble responded that the two plans are very different, and Commission feedback is sought regarding the building height. However, this plan has focused on providing mixed use, open space and vitality within the area, which is the intent of the DCAP.

Ms. Fox stated that the DCAP calls for one to two stories on Frantz Road. She requested Ms. Noble to review the building height requirements for vertical mixed use and Office.

Ms. Noble responded that with this building type, the Bridge Street Commercial zoning permits a maximum of 5 stories. The proposed DCAP would permit 2 stories along Frantz Road.

Ms. Fox inquired if both the commercial and vertical mixed use are permitted to be 5 stories.

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Dwight McCabe, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, OH 43064 stated that there is lengthy history with this particular property, which has been vacant for many years. It has been difficult to develop this property, but the Bridge Street zoning now presents an opportunity to develop it. There are varieties of overlays impacting this site, but there is an intent to revitalize Metro Park. The desire is to develop a live-work-play concept within an existing developed corridor and office park. Grandview Yard is an example of that occurring successfully. That area provides commerce, hospitality and residential. Those uses work together because the vehicular component has been minimized and the walkable component has been elevated. This site is very narrow with a small amount of Frantz Road frontage. The adjacent uses of a hotel and a bank are not likely to change; however, south on Frantz Road, redevelopment of the sites will be occurring. The challenge was how to insert this proposed development in a connected and purposeful manner.

Mr. Way stated that the applicant has indicated that the on-street parking is vital to their operations. He requested more details on that element.

Mr. McCabe responded that what makes this site difficult is that the access is right-in, right out on Frantz Road. That is part of the reason commercial previously not fared well on this corner. There is no parking along Frantz Road. If it is necessary to drive around the block to find parking at the rear, patrons will not be interested. The on-street parking will provide more easily accessible parking and also show evidence of activity, attracting more customers. The parking would be provided in a manner to encourage a walkable environment.

Ms. Fox inquired about the open space thoroughway, which staff proposed. She agrees with some of the traffic issues the applicant mentioned. City Council and many of the neighbors are very interested in the DCAP. The streetscape along Frantz Road is a high priority, and where multifamily and the sensitive infill areas are very important. As we discuss this proposal, it is very possible that the massing will change. Is the applicant open to that type of conversation?

Mr. McCabe responded affirmatively. The dilemma identified early in the process is that the Bridge Street zoning requirements are very explicit about buildings facing the street. The massing can make it impossible to meet that requirement. Their hope is that variances will not be needed. They would like to fit within the box given. They have attempted many layouts to identify one that would work. It is necessary to provide parking under the building, or too much parking is lost, and functionally, the site does not work. Providing more surface parking results in loss of greenspace. In addition, any amenity included must actually function. The intent of this proposal is to provide an easily understood portal to the site. He pointed out that "The Goat" in Hilliard is a very successful development with great synergy. That is the kind of place that people seek out.

Mr. Way inquired if the underground parking is a 60-foot bay that runs along the entire length of the building.

Ms. McCabe responded affirmatively. The shift of grade makes it work.

Mr. Way inquired if there would be parking under the greenspace.

Mr. McCabe responded that there would not be.

Mr. Way inquired if the on street parking would be restricted.

Mr. McCabe responded that it would not be restricted, although building tenants would have assigned parking within the underground parking. Part of the parking seen within this parcel includes approximately 22 spaces allocated to the hotel.

Mr. Way inquired why the structure is 4 stories, although 5 stories are permitted. Mr. McCabe stated that if the on-street parking would not work, it must be provided onsite, so they decided to allow sufficient flexibility to make the site work.

Mark Costandi, Architect, Costandi Studio, 2125 Sinton Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45206, stated that he has been involved with the preliminary designs. He would like to point out the individual issues of parking, open space and building height must all work together. For example, the height was determined by the need to limit the number of units to permit the required 200 square feet of open public space per unit. The open-air amenities for the residents could not be included in that equation. The proposed plan is entirely about meeting Code and making the numbers work in a coordinated manner. This plan makes it all work as closely as possible. Although the amount of setback provided is dictated by the public utility extended through there, they have been able to take advantage of it as public space. Linear and gathering types of open space will be included. The public space will not be one-dimensional. One thing that is not very clear in the slides shown is that multiple concepts of open space are included on the site. One public space, a plaza, penetrates the building. It will be under cover, due to the bridge of the apartments above it. The commercial spaces will be able to take advantage of that open space and the public space along Frantz Road. This will provide constant visual recognition of activity, inspiring people to discover for themselves what is occurring on the site. This will not be a one-dimensional development.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Grimes stated that the general layout is a beautiful concept, but the parcel is too small for it. Too much is being provided on this size of a parcel. He would not be in favor of a waiver for the open space requirement. He has concerns with the on-street parking, as there is currently no on-street parking on this street.

Mr. Way stated that he understands the challenges of this parcel. He believes the mixed-use is appropriate here. He is very concerned about the massing of the building. It is a linear façade that is articulated but not broken up well. He believes it should be two 5-story buildings that would still achieve the number of units desired and the necessary parking. The separation between the buildings could be the open space desired with a public face along Metro Place. If done well, it would attract people from the hotels across the street. He is in favor of the project, but consideration needs to be given to breaking up the building. He is supportive of 5 stories, as the adjacent building is 5 stories. The other nearby hotels are 4 and 8 stories.

Mr. Schneier stated that he commends the architect, as this is a difficult parcel. He previously had an office in Metro Place, and if this will be the first project in the revitalization of Metro Place, it must set a high standard. If Grandview Yard is the inspiration, this layout does not meet that expectation. The proposed look is more institutional, not a desired look. He is supportive of mixed use here and the on-street parking requested. His issue is the building mass.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes this is too much building for this site, although dividing the mass into two buildings might help. He does not understand how providing the public space between the commercial and multi-family would work. The intention of the Bridge Street zoning is to raise the bar, requiring something special. This proposal has a long way to go to achieve that. Covering the space with building and nestling small public spaces within the building will not result in true public areas. The trend seems to be forcing more building on a space than is necessary.

Downtown Bridge Street is very special and the City has been careful with that area. We really value open space, and he would not be in favor of an open space variances. Less building or two buildings would be preferable on this site.

Ms. Fox stated that there is a push-pull between the Bridge Street zoning and the DCAP. As Mr. Way pointed out, there is some opportunity here, which the architect has attempted to address by finding ways to activate the streetscape. Instead of greenspace, what is desired is activated, socially connected open areas. The site does not need anything this massive. Per the DCAP and Bridge Street zoning principles, what we want to achieve here are buildings with dynamic design that are not flat-faced and linear. The buildings should be designed per human scale based on the District and the location. This location is a gateway location for both Bridge Street and the DCAP. She agrees with the suggestion to break the building into two buildings. It is not necessary to be close to the street. What we are interested in is not how many feet away the building is but whether it draws visitors to the site. This is a front-door site, and the development has to be great. She believes multi-residential would be appropriate here, but it does not need to be located on the side of the street. That is where the restaurant and dynamic energy should be located, inviting people to linger. She is not opposed to on-street parking, as it was described. She would be supportive of underground parking and some front doors from the residential component to the street. In summary, the plan must have architectural character. Following the form-based Code can be restrictive; what we want to see here are elements of interest, something that is timeless.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with Mr. Grimes' comments. The massing on the parcel is very intense. She is supportive of Mr. Way's suggestion to break it up into two buildings with inviting open space between. She believes mixed use is appropriate in this space and likes the proposed ground-floor commercial. She is not particular supportive of on-street parking, but depending on the ultimate layout, she could be persuaded to permit 17 on-street parking spaces. However, cars are not a component that can activate a space; people are, as evidenced by the Bridge Street District. Waivers are a potential mechanism, if warranted.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant sought clarity on any items.

Mr. McCabe stated that it was very frustrating not to be able to have provided architecture. He understands the direction regarding the massing. What he is hearing from the Commission is that, although the proposal meets Code, the Commission does not want the plan to feel as massive. They are able to meet the open space requirement if the parking is required to be on site. There is excess open space available with the hotel site that could be re-distributed.

Ms. Call responded that it would have been necessary to consider that option with the hotel development, not after the fact.

Mr. McCabe that the site is actually over-parked, so they would be able to provide that onsite, if on-street parking is not permitted.

Ms. Call stated that at this time, only the massing is considered, not the architecture. However, the Commission is not in favor of the open space placement. If that is moved, the building footprint would be impacted and could, therefore, not meet the requirements. Some members of the Commission are supportive of the proposed on-street parking. In regard to the architecture details which would be provided in a future iteration, the Commission is looking for a 3.0 version of Metro Place. There are two opposing versions of Code applicable to this site, and the Commission would take both into consideration. The applicant would not be required to meet over and above Code.



Ms. Fox stated that the massing is too large. She would prefer to see a 2-story building along Frantz Road, but the residential building behind it could be more stories. The DCAP document is very important, as that sets the stage for the streetscape. She would not be supportive of a 4-story building along the Frantz Road streetscape.

Ms. Call noted that Commission support for a higher number of stories along Frantz Road appears to be split. However, the Commission is not requesting a reduction in building square footage, only the massing of that square footage.

Mr. McCabe stated they would re-think the massing and bring back a future plan that reflects the Commission's guidance.

### **Public Comments**

No public comments were received on this proposal.

Ms. Call stated that due to the number of residents present for the DCAP Cases, Cases 5 through 7 would be heard next, followed by Case 3.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE CASES**

#### **~~5. DCAP Code Amendments, MUR-4, Informal Review, 19-117ADMC~~**

~~Feedback on proposed amendments to the City of Dublin Zoning Code to create the MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional – Llewellyn Farms Office District, which includes the creation of a new zoning district and associated development standards.~~

#### **~~6. DCAP Design Guidelines, Informal Review, 21-086ADMC~~**

~~Feedback on proposed design guidelines to complement the proposed MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional – Llewellyn Farms Office, Zoning District requirements.~~

#### **~~7. DCAP Area Rezoning, MUR-4, Informal Review, 21-087ADMC~~**

~~Feedback on a proposed area rezoning accompanying the creation of the MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional – Llewellyn Farms Office, Zoning District.~~

### **Staff Presentation**

~~Ms. Rauch stated that the proposed Zoning Code requirements, Design Guidelines and Area Rezoning for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), MUR-4 Zoning District were introduced at the June 17, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. The Commission reviewed the materials, provided feedback and requested additional information for future consideration.~~

#### Background

~~Four districts were created when the DCAP was adopted in 2018. The proposal before the Commission this evening is only for the MUR-4, the Llewellyn Farms Office District. The DCAP documents recommend lower density Office use, and when adjacent to residential areas, the building story height is limited, setbacks are increased and landscaping buffering is provided. At the June meeting, the Commission discussed the various limitations and specifically discussed Site 11, the only undeveloped parcel within the District. No numbers, other than building heights, were~~

# UPPER METRO PLACE FINAL PLAT

COPY

The undersigned, CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, by OLIN A. JONES, President, COOKER RESTAURANT CORPORATION, an Ohio Corporation, by G. ARTHUR SEELBINDER, Chairman of the Board, DUBLIN SUITES INC., an Ohio Corporation, by THOMAS E. BANTA, Senior Vice President, UPPER METRO PLACE LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, by ROBERT C. WHITE, President, UPPER METRO PLACE LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, by TIMOTHY C. HANSLEY, City Manager, owners of the lands platted herein, duly authorized in the premises, do hereby certify that this plat correctly represents their "UPPER METRO PLACE FINAL PLAT", a subdivision \* containing lots numbered 1 to 5, both inclusive, do hereby accept this plat of same and dedicate to public use as such all or part of the road shown hereon and not dedicated heretofore.

\* of 22.672 Acres,

In Witness Whereof, TIMOTHY C. HANSLEY, City Manager of CITY OF DUBLIN, an Ohio Municipal Corporation, has hereunto set his hand this 2nd day of January, 1998.

WITNESSES:  
Theresa Caplinger CITY OF DUBLIN  
Ann C. Claus by: Timothy C. Hansley  
 TIMOTHY C. HANSLEY,  
 City Manager

STATE OF OHIO S.S. Franklin County, Ohio

Before me, a notary public in and for said State, personally appeared TIMOTHY C. HANSLEY, City Manager of CITY OF DUBLIN, an Ohio Municipal Corporation, who acknowledged the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his free and voluntary act and deed and the free and voluntary act and deed of CITY OF DUBLIN, an Ohio Municipal Corporation, for the uses and purposes therein expressed.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 22 day of January, 1998.

My Commission Expires: May 16, 1999  
Linda S. Glick  
 Notary Public, State of Ohio

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, in Virginia Military Surveys No. 2542, originally containing 23.704 acres of land, more or less, being conveyed to Capitol Square, LTD., an Ohio Limited Liability Company, by deed of record in Instrument 199802050026186, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

In Witness Whereof, Olin A. Jones, President of CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD an Ohio Limited Liability Company, has hereunto set his hand this 30th day of October, 1998.

WITNESSES:  
Barbara R. Sammons CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD  
Paul Shedd by: Olin A. Jones  
 Olin A. Jones,  
 President

STATE OF OHIO S.S. Franklin County S.S.

Before me, a notary public in and for said State, personally appeared Olin A. Jones, President of CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, who acknowledged the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his free and voluntary act and deed and the free and voluntary act and deed of CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, for the uses and purposes therein expressed.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 30th day of October, 1998.

My Commission Expires:  
Paul Shedd  
 Notary Public, State of Ohio

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, in Virginia Military Surveys No. 2542, containing 2.580 acres of land, more or less, being conveyed to Cooker Restaurant Corporation, by deed of record in Instrument 199807010164724, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.


In Witness Whereof, G. Arthur Seelbinder, Chairman of the Board, Cooker Restaurant Corporation, an Ohio Corporation, has hereunto set his hand this 5 day of December, 1998.

WITNESSES:  
G. Arthur Seelbinder COOKER RESTAURANT CORPORATION  
G. Arthur Seelbinder by: G. Arthur Seelbinder  
 G. Arthur Seelbinder,  
 Chairman of the Board

Before me, a notary public in and for said State, personally appeared G. Arthur Seelbinder, Chairman of the Board, Cooker Restaurant Corporation, an Ohio Corporation, who acknowledged the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his free and voluntary act and deed and the free and voluntary act and deed of COOKER RESTAURANT CORPORATION, an Ohio Corporation, for the uses and purposes therein expressed.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 3 day of December, 1998.

My Commission Expires:  
Kevin L. Baxter  
 Notary Public, State of Florida



LOCATION MAP

NO SCALE

Easements are reserved where indicated on the plat for the construction, operation and maintenance of all public and private utilities and the cable television industry, both above and beneath the surface of the ground and, where necessary, are for the construction, operation and maintenance of service connections to all adjacent lots and lands, for storm water drainage and, where specifically designated, for bike paths and public landscape/buffer areas. Maintenance responsibility for public landscape/buffer easements remains with the property owners dedicating the easements and or their assigned successors.


Surveyed and Platted By  
**C.F. BIRD & R.J. BULL, INC.**  
 Consulting Engineers & Surveyors  
 2875 W. Dublin-Granville Road  
 Columbus, Ohio 43235

We do hereby certify that we have surveyed the above premises and prepared the attached plat and that said plat is correct. All measurements are shown in feet and decimal parts thereof. Dimensions along curves are chord measurements unless otherwise indicated. Iron pipes are indicated by the following symbol: —|—. Permanent monuments to be set upon completion of construction necessary to the improvement of this land are indicated by the following symbol: —|—.

BASIS OF BEARINGS: The north lines of Reserve "A" and Lots 1, 2 and 3, being N 83° 15' 23" W, as shown upon the plat of Metrocenter of record in Plat Book 55, Pages 8 & 9, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

The property is in Zone X (Areas determined to be outside 500-year floodplain) as shown on Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel 107 of 387, Franklin County, Ohio and Incorporated Areas, Map No. 39049C0107 G (Effective Date: August 2, 1995).

By: Kevin L. Baxter  
 Kevin L. Baxter ~ Ohio Surveyor No. 7697



Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, in Virginia Military Surveys No. 2542, containing 6.500 acres of land, more or less, being conveyed to Dublin Suites, Inc., by deed of record in Instrument 199808280219366, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

In Witness Whereof, Thomas E. Banta, Senior Vice President, Dublin Suites, Inc., an Ohio Corporation, has hereunto set his hand this 9th day of November, 1998.

WITNESSES:  
Barbara R. Sammons DUBLIN SUITES, INC.  
Thomas E. Banta by: Thomas E. Banta  
 Thomas E. Banta,  
 Senior Vice President

STATE OF OHIO S.S. Franklin County S.S.

Before me, a notary public in and for said State, personally appeared Thomas E. Banta, Senior Vice President, Dublin Suites, Inc., an Ohio Corporation, who acknowledges the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his free and voluntary act and deed and the free and voluntary act and deed of DUBLIN SUITES, INC., an Ohio Corporation, for the uses and purposes therein expressed.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 9th day of November, 1998.

My Commission Expires:  
May 18, 2003  
Barbara R. Sammons  
 Notary Public, State of Ohio



BARBARA R. SAMMONS  
 Notary Public, State of Ohio  
 My Commission Expires May 18, 2003

Situated in the State of Ohio, County of Franklin, City of Dublin, in Virginia Military Surveys No. 2542, containing 7.785 acres of land, more or less, being conveyed to Upper Metro Place LLC, by deed of record in Instrument 199806080139919, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

In Witness Whereof, Robert C. White, President, Upper Metro Place LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, has hereunto set his hand this 27th day of October, 1998.

WITNESSES:  
Robert C. White UPPER METRO PLACE LLC,  
Paul Shedd by: Robert C. White  
 Robert C. White,  
 President

STATE OF OHIO S.S. Franklin County S.S.

Before me, a notary public in and for said State, personally appeared Robert C. White, President, Upper Metro Place LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, who acknowledges the signing of the foregoing instrument to be his free and voluntary act and deed and the free and voluntary act and deed of UPPER METRO PLACE LLC, an Ohio Limited Liability Company, for the uses and purposes therein expressed.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 27th day of October, 1998.

My Commission Expires:  
Paul Shedd  
 Notary Public, State of Ohio

Approved this 9th day of January, 1998.  
Barbara M. Walker  
 Secretary of Planning Commission

Approved this 21st day of January, 1998.  
Bobby S. Lindner  
 City Engineer, City of Dublin, Ohio

Approved this 21st day of January, 1998.  
Richard B. Metcalf  
 Director of Development, City of Dublin, Ohio

The attached plat was approved and accepted by motion of Council, passed the 19th day of October, 1998, wherein subject to this plat being properly recorded, that Upper Metro Place is accepted for the City of Dublin, Ohio.


Ann C. Claus  
 Clerk, City of Dublin, Ohio  
 Transferred this 5th day of February, 1999.

Joseph W. Leta (Just Learning)  
 Auditor, Franklin County, Ohio


Filed for record this 5th day of FEB, 1999 at 10:43 A.M.  
 Fee 86.40 File No. 199902050030381 Richard B. Metcalf By P.R.  
 Recorder, Franklin County, Ohio

Recorded this 5th day of FEB, 1999 in Plat Book 90, Pgs: 94 & 95.  
Phillip H. Banks II  
 Deputy Recorder, Franklin County, Ohio

COPY




H:\JOBS\1997-2000\PLAT\PLAT.DWG 9-30-98 3:16:57 PM EST



1 CAPITOL SQUARE, LTD. ORIG. 23.704 AC. INSTR. 199806080139908 P.N. 273-000271

3/4" I.D. Iron Pipe Set Unless Otherwise Shown

I hereby certify that this plat was prepared from an actual field survey performed under my supervision in December, 1997. Each 3/4" I.D. iron pipe set is marked with a yellow plastic cap imprinted "Bird & Bull, Inc."



- (A) The access point of Upper Metro Place onto Frantz Road (south bound) will be Right-In/ Right-Out only.
- (B) No parking is allowed along Upper Metro Place.
- (C) Curb cuts for the proposed lots as shown on the Engineering Drawings for Upper Metro Place.

HA:\BDS\DWG\97-20\PLAT\PLAT2.DWG 11-21-98 7:44:11 on EST