



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 12, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the June 12, 2025 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: Gary Alexander, Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way
Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Jenny Rauch, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call explained the hearing process that would be followed.

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

CASE REVIEW

Case #25-042CP

All In Dublin – Concept Plan

Request for review and non-binding feedback for a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The 1.59-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District-Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located on the east side of Dublin Center Drive between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Dunham, Executive Director, All Inclusive Living, 215 North Front Street, Suite 600, Columbus, stated that the mission of All Inclusive Living is to expand housing opportunities for individuals with disabilities. The first project based on their inclusive housing concept is on its way to being developed in Dublin. After years of effort, a great concept has been assembled that will serve people with disabilities and older adults allowing them to live in communities where they are among people of different ages and abilities. TFG Housing Resources and The Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority are key partners in the project. They are here to share the design vision for this site. They believe it aligns with the intent of the Bridge Street District (BSD) plan.

Dan Gore, All In Board Member, 5577 Mountjoy Court, Dublin, stated that they are pleased to be before the Commission. He works as a Senior Vice President with The Pizzuti Companies. He volunteers his resources and time to the All Inclusive Living Board along with several others who are involved in the development community. As a Dublin resident, father and advocate for individuals with developmental disabilities, he feels passionate about the mission to build affordable housing for the disabled community, an underserved segment of our population.

Jena Kessler, Project Captain, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, stated that the building is oriented along two main street frontages (Dublin Center and SR161). The main feature is the corner of the building, which has been opened up to accentuate the gateway feature and activate the corner. There is a lot of storefront at the street level to increase engagement along the streetscape. There is landscaping shown with places to interact with the public. The façade materials are mainly brick with fiber cement siding on the fourth level. The vehicular entrance is off Banker Drive. They have created a circular parking lot to allow drop off on the passenger side of vehicles. They are looking at the green area on north end of the site as a quieter area with programming to sit and enjoy the outdoors.

Russ Garber, Senior Principal, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, was also present.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that this project is at the early stages in the review process. In the BSD, the Concept Plan review calls for non-binding feedback. If the plan progresses, it will come back to the Commission for Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan at which stages the Commission would be looking at all the details on how it exactly corresponds to Code requirements. The intent at this point is to look generally at land use and densities, general site layout, access and circulation, open space framework and those types of general details. The site is located just west of Sawmill Road at the eastern edge of the BSD. The parcel was split from the Fifth Third Bank site a few years ago and is currently undeveloped. It is within the Mixed-Use Urban Future Land Use as identified in the Community Plan. Principal uses are intended to provide a strong mix of different urban uses with orientation to the street. Buildings are generally three to six stories in height and the streetscape promotes gridded street networks. The intent is to transform the area

from an auto-oriented suburban environment to a more walkable, high-density environment. Parking is encouraged to be structured parking or behind buildings. The location is within the BSD Special Area Plan Subarea B. One of the key elements is that Dublin Granville Road (SR161) will be a future bus rapid transit (BRT) route so some of the considerations revolve around public transit, which provides breaks from some of the parking requirements. Residential uses are listed as complementary to office and hotel uses. Within the BSD Code, the site is in Sawmill Center Neighborhood, where the intent is for a strong mix of uses and physical and visual connections back to the surrounding areas.

There is also a specific street network plan. To the east, a potential future neighborhood street is contemplated. The proposed project is a combination of one- to three-bedroom units and a common area. 81 parking spaces are being proposed. The site requires a few more, but staff feels they can reach an agreement through some adjustments because the drive aisles are wider than necessary and the actual needs of this use can be studied. The building generally fronts on the two streets as required by Code. The BSD requires a minimum frontline coverage, and the building as proposed meets that except for the corners that bump back. That is different with the open space at the corner and the parking on the north side. If the project progresses, staff would work with the applicant on parking screening, utilities and access. Two access points are proposed. One is off Banker Drive, which staff has concerns about due to its proximity to Dublin Center Drive. There is another through the parking lot of Fifth Third Bank for which there is a cross-access easement. Eventually, if the potential neighborhood street gets built, that is expected to be another organizing factor to create a block system and buildings would be expected to front on Banker Drive and that new north-south street. Staff would like to work with them on what that means in the future. Another option for access might be at the property line between the site in question and the bank site. The BSD Code is very prescriptive regarding permitted open space types and how they are defined.

The applicant is proposing a pocket plaza to create a gateway envisioned in Code at this location. The site to the north is envisioned as open space and both are open to the public. There is one shown internal to the site that would not qualify as open space because it is not open to public. There are a few spaces along the front of the building that are identified as greenways. That type of open space is permitted in this district but the width shown does not meet the requirements. As this project progresses, staff would look at other ways to activate those spaces to see if a waiver would be appropriate. Similarly, with parking located close to Banker Drive, there are requirements for a street wall and some additional landscaping that would be reviewed at later stages. The architecture is a four-story building with brick and cementitious siding that fits with the apartment building type. That is one of the building types permitted in this area. It fits within height requirements. For a residential building, there is a requirement for a finished floor elevation that must be 2.5 feet above grade. That will need further review. Some windows have more horizontal proportions where the Code requires vertical. There are opportunities at the corner to accentuate the gateway element. Those are items that could be resolved in the future. Mr. Bitar shared the following for discussion by the Commission.

1. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed use?
2. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout?
3. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site access?
4. Is the Commission supportive of the architectural design approach?
5. Any other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked for more detail regarding the vision. The mix of uses and connectivity is important in this area, but this is not a mixed-use proposal. Mr. Garber stated that this is one of the first residential buildings in that area. They are proposing sidewalk connectivity along Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive. They are looking at creating gateway features at the corners and having them be open to the public. It is a relatively small site in a relatively large area. They agree to do what they can to promote public traffic like the connectivity of sidewalks, visibility at corners and the creation of public space. Mr. Chinnock asked staff for their input on the connection with Fifth Third Bank. He also asked if Banker Drive requires building frontage. Mr. Bitar stated that technically frontage is required on all streets. Generally, the intent has been to focus on a couple frontages because parking must be accommodated. There have been other projects in the BSD that had similar conditions where the focus was on the primary streets. There would have to be certain treatments along Banker Drive to create a more comfortable experience for pedestrians. There is quite a bit of parking already there but because this is a separately owned site, staff cannot say what will happen to the rest of the parking until there is a proposal for development. It is reasonable to accommodate parking here. As this moves into the more formal stages, it will have to be determined how much parking is needed given the transit and functions of the building. Mr. Chinnock asked for staff's preference regarding access. Mr. Bitar stated that the most efficient choice is to use the curb cut that straddles the property line, because it leaves less to consider if the adjoining site is redeveloped.

Ms. Harter asked if the applicant has had contact with Fifth Third Bank. Mr. Gore stated that they have made contact with Fifth Third Bank and they are aware of these requests. Ms. Harter asked if artwork or additional items have been considered. Mr. Gore stated that they will try to find a way to activate those places. Ms. Harter asked if there is a bus location at the site now. Mr. Bitar stated this is part of the larger area-wide BRT corridor, so eventually there will be a path through this corridor. There are already some COTA stops on Sawmill and Dublin Granville roads. Ms. Harter referenced open spaces and asked if other amenities, such as a dog park, had been considered to bring the community together. Ms. Kessler stated that this is a smaller site, so they are looking at ways to use the space for multiple functions like gardens, a dog park, or fire pit. Ms. Harter asked if street parking is being considered. Mr. Bitar stated that there will be a presentation coming before Council about the East Bridge Street Corridor that has been studied over the last couple of years. Here they are trying to accommodate the BRT but there could be some opportunities on neighborhood streets as the area develops. Ms. Harter asked for more information on the street wall. Mr. Bitar stated that a requirement of the BSD Code is that if parking is within 20 feet of a street, there must be a street wall, so it feels like a pedestrian is not looking at or walking beside a parking lot. Ms. Harter asked if staff would propose a speed limit change. Mr. Bitar stated that they will not at this point, but it will likely eventually change.

Mr. Way referenced the aforementioned requirement that the finished floor elevation be 2.5 feet above grade. He asked with this site being raised above SR161, what grade would be referenced. Mr. Bitar stated that the Code says the sidewalk level. Mr. Way asked about stormwater management requirements for this site. Mr. Bitar stated stormwater management would be required. That is an issue for a smaller site. It will come along with future stages. Mr. Way stated that when the lot split was done, the bank was using this site for stormwater management. He stated that it will have to be considered whether this site must absorb the neighboring site's stormwater or if that neighboring site will have to solve that problem when this develops. Mr. Bitar stated that the applicants' engineers have been in touch with City Engineers. Mr. Way asked

if staff's suggested access on Banker Drive would be a full-movement intersection. Mr. Bitar stated that based on initial review of the proposal, staff would expect that to be sufficient for full-turn movements. Mr. Way stated that he is interested in the residential units on the street level. This proposal puts people very close to cars. Even though the speed on SR161 may reduce, it is still a fairly high-speed road. He asked if there was discussion regarding people in proximity to fast-moving cars. Ms. Kessler stated that there was a need to maximize units. They tried to maximize the common area on the first floor so that there are fewer units there. The strategy of putting the parking lot on the back of the site means that any dropping off will happen on the protected side of the site. The landscape buffers and different requirements help create a buffer between private homes and the public street. They are not considering balconies on this building. Mr. Garber stated that the intent of the 2.5-foot requirement is so that units are elevated off the pedestrian level. They have not done a grading study but he thinks there is an opportunity to address that and elevate the building to provide more separation for privacy. There are only a couple of units at this far end and the majority are elevated or along the backside of the building. They have not gotten into stormwater management but expect an underground detention system. Mr. Way asked if the applicant explored options that lifted all units up and kept the bottom floor as community uses like a lobby, coffee shop, fitness center, etc. Mr. Garber stated that programmatic elements and funding requirements dictate the amount of common space on this building. They feel that they have done what they could to activate that corner and put common area programming where needed.

Mr. Alexander stated that this plan has some larger, three-bedroom units. He asked if they anticipate any children in the units. Mr. Boggs stated that the age of residents would not be within PZC's purview. Mr. Alexander stated if there were going to be children, the building might need to be modified and design considerations be made as a result. Mr. Dunham stated that the project is designed to address the unmet housing needs of adults with disabilities. They have 25% of units set aside as deeply affordable units for that population. They are also developing a preference for older adults (40% of units) because we see them as programmatically integral to the mission. The remaining units will be workforce housing for individuals and potentially families. Mr. Alexander stated that the two streets are very different and classified differently. He asked the applicant if they thought about differentiating the building mass based on the different conditions. Mr. Garber stated that from an overall massing study, they feel good about it. The programmatic requirement, parking and open space necessitated a four-story building. They did look at varying building heights. They will take into consideration how each elevation develops uniquely for its street façade.

Mr. Deschler asked if there has been consideration for underground parking to create more green space. Mr. Garber stated there are elevation challenges and economical challenges with underground parking. Mr. Gore stated that they have worked closely with staff to meet Code and underground parking has not been brought up, so they did not consider it. Mr. Deschler asked for the City's position on underground parking as greenspace is somewhat inadequate. Mr. Bitar stated that they have not discussed underground parking. Factors like Fire Department access can make underground parking more challenging when it is for one building versus a larger development. Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that this is one of the first projects for All Inclusive Living. Mr. Dunham stated that this is the first project for All Inclusive Living. The concept is informed by several different successful affordable housing models around the country. This will be unique to Ohio. Mr. Deschler asked if All Inclusive Living would be the property manager making decisions regarding applications. Mr. Dunham stated that TFG Housing

Resources will be leading the application process along with the property management firm. They will hire a qualified property management firm with experience in this space. Mr. Deschler inquired if once the 25% is filled, there is a preference for another 40% for older adults. Mr. Dunham stated that they are pursuing a 40% preference for older adults. They would have the right of first refusal for those units. If they are not rented by older adults within the first six months, they would go back to the general population. They are confident, given the demographic and need, that there will be a high demand amongst older adults for those units and those will be at a higher income level than the disability units. Mr. Deschler asked if it is the same application process for seniors and the general population. Mr. Dunham stated that after looking at other projects around the country, having a unified application seems to be a good way to handle this, but it remains to be seen. Mr. Deschler asked about associated tax credits.

Brad Carman, President, TFG, 685 South Front Street, Columbus, stated that they will get a legal opinion, but the intent is to have seniors neighboring the disability population. They will hire a qualified property manager that has tax credit experience. TFG and the Metropolitan Housing Authority will be in the project for 15 years providing guarantees. Mr. Deschler asked if TFG has done other projects around the area that they could review for massing, parking and location. Mr. Carman stated that TFG Housing Resources was started two and one half years ago. They partnered with Wes Finch of the Finch Group, who has been in the industry over 40 years and has done over \$1 billion of development. They have a renovation project in Newark, Ohio for which they used Ruscilli Construction. Their approach is to use the best partners they know.

Mr. Garvin stated that the bus stop is relevant because a 10% reduction in parking spaces is being discussed. He asked for more information on bus stops in the area. Mr. Bitar stated that there are already existing bus stops, and there will definitely be more in the future. The project is within the distance prescribed by Code for a reduction. Mr. Garvin stated that there may be an issue with impervious lot coverage and not enough parking. He asked how projects like this typically deal with that. Mr. Bitar stated that this is at the preliminary stage. Staff thinks the drives could be narrow if the Fire Department has no concerns with the circulation. There may be other ways to get back to the 70% lot coverage or there is a waiver process as all requirements are considered. Mr. Garvin asked if the pocket plaza counts toward open space. Mr. Bitar stated that that areas facing outwards that could be programmed will likely be counted. Ones completely internal would not count toward the requirement in Code. Mr. Garvin asked if a traffic impact study will be required. Mr. Bitar stated that with the BSD zoning, there was a comprehensive traffic study at that time. There may be some trip generation questions that may need to be answered. Mr. Garvin asked if that would impact the access. Mr. Bitar stated that it would likely not impact it in a major way but there would be more detail needed. Mr. Garvin asked if any thought was given to reorienting the building to create more open space opportunities. Mr. Garber stated that many comments have been received. They feel optimistic that they can find other locations to capture that square footage.

Ms. Call asked the applicant if, with the compounding requirements of parking and open space, they are confident those can be met. Mr. Garber stated that they are certainly going to look at the project and opportunities to meet requirements. It will be tough but with this proposed population, they do not have the automobile traffic that a straight market rate multi-family housing project would have. This proposal meets the parking needs of the population of the building. Ms. Call stated that the Commission has to look at the building as a multi-use residential building. Mr. Carman stated that the owners of the property next to this wanted to see the

outcome of this meeting. The applicants will go back and continue to communicate with them. Ms. Call asked if historically a single point of access has been allowed for a residential use in this dense of an area with these types of streets. Mr. Bitar stated that Transportation and Mobility staff were comfortable with this access. The Fire Department has looked at this and the initial indication is they may not need to have their apparatus on site. Ms. Call asked if there are definitions for horizontal mixed use and vertical mixed use. Mr. Bitar stated that the intent in the BSD is to look at the area as a whole. This is within the east subarea. The intent was to introduce uses that will help densify the area that do not exist right now. There is no specific requirement that it has to be a vertical mix of uses. Staff does believe that this is introducing one of those uses that are listed as a principal use in an area where it does not exist. Ms. Call asked staff to clarify “ground floor activation” and to state whether this application qualifies for that. Mr. Bitar stated that ground floor activation refers to something that interacts with the street. Staff feels that the way the corner has been designed, not just with the plaza, but also the storefront treatment of the common open space on the interior that shows activity is a component of that activation for an otherwise single use building like this.

Mr. Deschler asked if anywhere else in Dublin there is a building with this type of density on this type of lot. Mr. Bitar stated that within Bridge Park there are a lot of buildings of that nature. The intent of the plan is to try to densify this area and create more volume. There was a previous proposal for a hospital use at this site and there was commentary from the Commission that it needed to be more substantial at that corner. With the intent to create a gateway there, densify the area and support other uses within the area including transit, staff believes the scale is appropriate and it meets the frontage requirements along the streets.

Public Comment

Ms. Rauch stated that one public comment was received and forwarded to the Commission regarding density and traffic. The Commission reviewed the comment received electronically.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that Dublin Granville Road is a significant artery to the City, so this site is important. Options other than having residential that close to that corridor need to be considered. He would support a taller building as there is leeway to do a more significant building. He is generally supportive but feels there are a lot of opportunities for improvement. We need to consider how this fits into the overall long-term plan. There have been many things brought up tonight to be thought through. He is concerned about the amount of surface parking. Creating a vibrant streetscape is incredibly important to this area specifically.

Ms. Harter stated that this is such an important area. It must be walkable, safe and well-lit. It should also be sustainable. Landscaping will be very important. She feels the lack of vertical mixed use is a missed opportunity.

Mr. Way stated that as the first redevelopment in the area, there is no context for this building yet. In terms of walkability and street level connectivity, he is struggling with having residential units at grade. There is residential at grade in Bridge Park, but it is all on side streets. SR161 is a busy corridor and will get busier with the BRT. This is the first project where we get to test the Code, guidelines and plans. He has no problem with the proposed use but struggles with the

ground floor. There are not a lot of options with the site layout. The site access will be determined by Transportation and Mobility. Regarding the open space framework, he is not sold on any of those proposed beyond the pocket plaza and the little park on the other end. A greenway is something to be walked through. The dimension between the sidewalk and building is basically a landscape setback, not a greenway. It is too early to comment on architectural design, but as a gateway corner, even more could be done architecturally to celebrate that. There could be something done to make the two edges look different. He is totally supportive of the project but thinks there are some things that need to be worked through.

Mr. Alexander stated that he generally agrees with comments made by his fellow Commissioners. He is supportive of the use because it turns the area into a mixed-use area by introduction of residential, which is what the guidelines are recommending. This project is close to being able to conform to current zoning codes. He is supportive of the project but thinks some adjustments are going to need to be made. Much needs to be done to minimize that large sea of parking. He agrees with staff comments and recommendations regarding access. He does not see a greenway in this plan compared to other greenways that have been introduced in other projects. The architecture does not acknowledge that corner. By having those two identical wings, it dissipates visual interest instead of concentrating it. A lot more needs to be done in the architectural development of the corner.

Mr. Deschler stated that he agrees with many of the comments of his fellow commissioners. While he is generally supportive of the use, significant work needs to be done relative to parking and the open space framework. He is in favor of trying to remove some of the parking and/or moving some parking underground. He likes the idea of raising the height of the building with more focus on the gateway. The site layout is fine. There is not enough open space. There is no area for kids to go outside. It does not make sense to have residential units on the first floor with frontage on SR161 and Dublin Center Drive.

Mr. Garvin stated that he agrees with comments of fellow commissioners. He is partially supportive of the use. The goal of the BSD here is to promote walkability. Having a greater mix of uses at the ground floor does that better. He supports keeping the parking off of Dublin Center Road. He echoed Mr. Deschler's comments about finding a way to vary the parking to make it more visually appealing from the street as this is intended to be a walkable area. It is important to have the site be appealing from as many angles as possible. He is supportive of the site access as recommended by staff. He is skeptical of sharing access through the other parking lot. It is important to move it away from the intersection. In its current iteration, this plan does not provide much useful open space. There is an opportunity to make an amenity that is visually appealing and useful to the community.

Ms. Call stated that she echoes what her fellow commissioners said about the proposed use. It is supported by the Code. However, there are some conflicting items. She supports the residential use but there has to be consideration of the adjacency to higher speed, higher traffic corridors. Safety has to be paramount and first floor activation is required by Code. Neither of those are met in this proposal. The corner is well done but the legs are residential adjacent to significant street corridors. She sees the need for consolidation of open spaces. Open space is created for use of the community and a greenway that is adjacent to sidewalk is not equal to a parking lot does not equal a pocket park. Parking is her biggest struggle. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines' instruction for parking is, "above or below ground structured parking, structured

parking, on-street parking, garages screened from major corridors with liner buildings.” This plan does not meet those. She agreed that the eastern access as recommended by staff is her preference. She thinks the architectural design is nice. Pedestrian transportation at the parking lot needs to be considered with future iterations. The Commission will be concerned about details and meeting Code requirements. We appreciate every applicant and treat all things equally. They look forward to continuing to work on this project to build something we can all be proud of. There is no action required for this application. She asked if the applicant would like any clarification. No clarification was sought by the applicant and appreciation was expressed for working with the Commission.

DISCUSSION

Building Materials

Review and discussion of the use of existing and proposed building materials presented by staff and the City’s architectural consultant.

Mark Ford, Ford & Associates, stated that he and his team have been working with staff on multiple projects where he or his team has been asked specific questions about products that are being proposed. He would like to share his process for reviewing and making recommendations or evaluations of those products.

They evaluate what is good design by considering the selection of materials and the proper application of those materials. He provided an example of having a good material but poor design - brick pavers as a walking surface that become slippery and hazardous when wet. When reviewing materials, he tries to be objective and not consider his preferences. Cost is a consideration. That can play into the idea of sustainability and innovation. Innovation is a focus of the City of Dublin. Materials can also impact the structural requirements for a building. Projects that use lesser quality materials to meet a financial goal can create long-term maintenance issues. For reference, he uses the encyclopedia of different testing standards for different materials and what the manufacturer’s product literature provides. Manufacturer’s literature can be self-serving, however a way to divorce himself from the salesmanship of the literature is to try to find a project in which the product has been used. With some of the newer products, he reaches out to regional sales representatives and asks for projects in Central Ohio where the product has been used. He also collects samples of products and considers where the material will be located. With regard to sustainability, there is a consideration for how the products are manufactured. They then consider if the material is being used appropriately. Mr. Ford considers questions like where the material is being used on the building, how it will react with other materials, what type of flashings are required, and installation details. If it is a new material, what is the limited risk we are willing to accept? Installation is critical and is the most difficult to police.

Mr. Way stated that another consideration could be a material’s relationship to other materials it is coming in contact with. Mr. Ford stated that it is an age-old problem and provided the example of steel railing in concrete rusting.

In response to Ms. Call’s question regarding thin brick, Mr. Ford stated that thin brick is a clay product. It is brick that is baked and sliced and is applied to the face of a building. One manufacturer had a metal grid system where they come in and grout the joints just like true brick. There are other products designed to look like brick. He shared an example of styrofoam panels scored to look like brick.

Ms. Call opened with questions for Mr. Ford. She stated that when a new material is proposed that has not been used before, her predisposition is to use it on a small scale first. She asked if Mr. Ford had any other suggestions. Mr. Ford stated that is what he does. A big part of the consideration is how and where the product is being used.

Mr. Chinnock asked for Mr. Ford's perspective on synthetic wood. Mr. Ford stated that there is the James Hardie type of wood that is paintable and there is a time and place for that. Synthetic woods that are on the screen need scrutiny. The next generation of wood he would expect to see is a product being used in Europe that is freeze dried to remove moisture and make it dimensionally stable and rot resistant. Mr. Chinnock asked if Trespa and other high pressure laminate products should be considered. Mr. Ford answered affirmatively adding that it needs the right fastener and flashing types.

Mr. Alexander stated that building materials are becoming so much thinner. He asked if some are more reliable than others. Mr. Ford stated that it is difficult to find some that have been out there 15-20 years. As a consultant, it is his job to present the information and it is for the client to make decisions. He tries to provide the most accurate information. Time is the best test.

Mr. Garvin expressed appreciation for Mr. Ford's work. The Commission's first thoughts on materials are aesthetics, durability and longevity. He would like to see the process oriented more to that than the cost. Mr. Ford stated that he is cost agnostic. Mr. Garvin stated that it may make sense to put together a panel of contractors for opinions on materials. They might provide perspectives that are independent and align with the Commission's goals.

Mr. Deschler asked if feedback is provided in written form. Ms. Call stated that PZC receives the reports from Mr. Ford in the packet materials. She asked staff to provide previous reports from Mr. Ford when there is a material included that he has provided an opinion on. Ms. Rauch stated that material information can be added in OnBoard for the Commission's reference. Mr. Deschler asked if Mr. Ford's review considers the reputations or longevity of the product makers. Mr. Ford stated if it is a company he is familiar with, he will reach out to the manufacturer's representatives. For newer products, he looks at testing standards. He tries not to let the name of the product guide his recommendation. Mr. Deschler asked how to determine the true longevity of a product. Mr. Ford stated that time will be the judge. They do simulations much like is done in the auto industry.

In regard to how much input the Commission would like, Mr. Alexander stated that they want his opinion on all these issues. Mr. Alexander asked if Mr. Ford receives enough information to evaluate material detailing and installation. Mr. Ford stated that if something is presented on which he needs more information, he will ask questions of staff to obtain more information from the applicant. He tries to lead staff to ask the applicant for further information so the Commission can judge whether a material is being used appropriately. He does not have direct contact with the applicant. Mr. Alexander asked if the Commission can make a request for additional information as a condition for review of the project. Ms. Call answered affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that their packet materials always contain renderings. He asked Mr. Ford if he evaluates whether a material is presented properly. Mr. Ford answered affirmatively. Ms. Call stated that the Commission likes that context.

Ms. Harter thanked staff for the database. She stated that installation is one of the major factors. Mr. Ford stated that policing that is a challenge. It is incumbent upon the design professional under the quality assurance section of specifications. This Commission has no control over that.

Mr. Chinnock stated technology is great but the Commission is often presented photorealistic renderings too early in the process and we fail to think about it as a sketch or concept. Mr. Ford's wealth of knowledge is beneficial and incredibly helpful. Ms. Call stated that revisiting the material board for every project would be helpful.

Mr. Bitar shared that staff is receiving a lot of questions about roofs, so PZC will likely see that, especially concerning the older cedar shake roofs.

Ms. Call stated that City Council asked her to communicate to the Commission the need to consider how to incorporate new materials into existing developments.

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council