



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 7, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

2. Monterey Drive Development at 201 and 191 W. Bridge Street
23-127INF **Informal Review**

Proposal: Development of approximately 6.87-acres consisting of single-family attached units, multi-family units, and commercial and office space.
Location: Both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street.
Request: Informal review of and feedback on a future development application.
Applicant: Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying
Planning Contact: Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information: 614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-127

RESULT: Commission members expressed support for upper floor residential uses in the buildings fronting on Bridge Street as a way to activate the street frontage and reduce the need for surface parking. There was also general support for the development of single-family attached condominiums on the rest of the site as a transitional use between the existing single-family detached uses to the south and the busier Bridge Street corridor to the north. However, there was consensus that the design, and possibly massing, of the structures needed to be improved over the character images provided by the applicant. The overall site layout was viewed favorably, although Commission members noted that traffic management details, open space location and design, and various other details will need further refinements if the project moves forward.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB125C5BEE06456
Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning



CONSENT CASE

- **Case #23-111AFDP – Overlook at Tartan Ridge**

~~A request for approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) to Modify the Development Text Standards for an Existing Residential Development on a 23.98-Acre Site Located Northeast of the Intersection of Hyland-Croy and McKittrick Roads, and Zoned Planned Unit Development - The Overlook at Tartan Ridge.~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of a Minor Text Modification to the Overlook at Tartan Ridge Development Text under Development Standards, Section F (1)(a and b), (2)(a and b)(iii), and (8)(a)(i and ii), setback requirements:~~

~~to extend the maximum building line setback for lots 6-9, 16-18, and 20-24 to be in line with that of the adjacent lots along the straight roadway segments, or as otherwise shown on Exhibits C-2 and C-3;~~

~~and to approve the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with the following condition:~~

- ~~1) After approval of the AFDP, should concerns arise with the placement of building line setbacks and/or extensions as depicted on the exhibits, the applicant shall work with staff to make minor adjustments to the building lines while meeting the intent of the development standards.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]~~

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #23-127INF - Monterey Drive Development**

A request for an Informal Review of a Development Proposal for a Mix of Residential, Commercial and Office Uses on a 6.90-Acre Site Zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood, Located on Both Sides of Monterey Drive, South of the Intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation

Matthew Starr, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated that they have been looking at this particular site for some time. Many development proposals have been made for the site, none of which have materialized. The current owners have had the site for 8 years. Tonight, they are proposing a project that they believe would be appropriate for this site. From their present development at Bridge Park, they have been watching where market needs and demands exist. They are interested in hearing both the Commission's and the public's feedback. They met last week with the neighborhood homeowners association and had a good conversation.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated Dublin's Code permits many uses for this historic transition site. There is a 4.5-foot general height restriction for this area, and no residential use is permitted on the ground floor of buildings within the Bridge Street Corridor. The Informal Review is a step early in the development process. There are a few significant items that could make or break the proposed project, so it is important to have this conversation with

the Commission. They have observed other proposals made for the site, which appeared to be attempting to place too much on the site. Although the Dublin Zoning Code permits 4.5-story buildings here, it has not “felt” right. With their awareness of the market, they are also offering a proposal. There would be single-family development to the south on the rear two-thirds of this site, and there would be more dense development to the front of the site. There would be commercial on the ground floor of the structures with either commercial or residential on the stories above. The City-owned Dublin Cemetery site is located on the southeast corner of Monterey Drive and Bridge Street. Their proposal considers an expansion of Dublin Cemetery, perhaps utilizing a land trade to obtain the frontage and the corner piece. Their proposal includes single-family townhomes, similar to those they have developed in Upper Arlington and similar to those being developed by Pulte Homes in Bridge Park. They are interested in developing single family, perhaps townhomes or patio homes. The bigger question is what occurs on the upper stories of the buildings along Bridge Street. There is agreement that there should be active uses on the ground floor. The Code permits residential or office uses above. However, the current market for office space is not doing well; in addition, office uses require additional parking. If they were to develop 2.5-story office buildings on Bridge Street, and one restaurant was included, it would be necessary to add another row of parking to meet the minimum parking requirements of the zoning. Placing 200 feet of asphalt between the buildings and the single-family does not seem appropriate. If they were to develop two or three-story buildings along Bridge Street with retail, commercial and restaurant on the ground floors and residential uses above, the parking would work. They are interested in learning the Commission’s opinion on whether that project could be pursued.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that an Informal Review is an optional first step, which provides an opportunity for the applicant to obtain non-binding feedback from PZC at the formative stage of a development concept. Following an Informal Review, the applicant may submit a formal Concept Plan for review and determination by the PZC. If a development agreement between the applicant and the City should be necessary, the Concept Plan would also require City Council review and determination. If the Concept Plan is approved, the next steps are a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and a Final Development Plan (FDP). After review and approval of those plans, the applicant may apply for building permits.

Mr. Bitar provided an overview of the 6.87-acre site, which consists of 13 parcels and is zoned BSD-HTN, Historic Transition Neighborhood. The site is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street. According to information obtained from the Franklin County Auditor, the existing gas station and convenience store on the site were constructed in 1988. As part of the Bridge Street District area-wide rezoning, the site was rezoned to BSD-HTN Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood. The site is adjacent to the Dublin Cemetery to the east, the Dublin Plaza shopping center to the west, and Monterey Park directly south. The individual parcels on the site are currently owned by Dublin Development LLC, except for the parcel at the southeast corner of W. Bridge Street and Monterey Drive, which is owned by the City of Dublin. The southern portion of the site was previously occupied by eight duplexes built at an unknown date, zoned R-2, which were demolished a few years ago. The site abuts the Historic District Public zoning on the east side, where the Dublin Cemetery is located, and the Dublin School site on the north side of Bridge Street. If this site were immediately adjacent to the Historic Core zoning, there would have been greater limits on the building heights. The site is separated from the Historic Core zoning by the church and the cemetery. To the south lies the

municipal park and the Waterford Village community. A Historic Transition District is intended to complement the Historic Core of the City by allowing a similar variety of uses within the district, streets and blocks similar to the Historic Core, and is intended to extend the walkable environment. The Historic Transition District provides larger, adjacent uses and permits additional residential opportunities, as well as a mixture of uses complementing the Historic Core. The Bridge Street District street network system includes several street classifications. West Bridge Street is classified as a Corridor Connector Street and a Principal Frontage Street. Those street designations require the area to promote walkability and limit conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. In this district, residential development is not permitted on the ground floor along West Bridge Street. Monterey Drive is a Neighborhood Street, which is similar to the streets in the Historic Core to the east.

The applicant is proposing to develop the southern portion of the site with 40 townhome units arranged on both sides of Monterey Drive. Two new east-west streets would be added to create a block system, providing frontage to some of the units and allowing for potential future connectivity to the west. An alley system would provide access to garages at the rear of the buildings. Approximately one acre along the east side is proposed to be traded to the City in exchange for the 0.63-acre, City-owned parcel along W. Bridge Street. The intent is to allow for potential expansion of the Dublin Cemetery and to account for the required open space.

The W. Bridge Street frontage is proposed to be developed with two buildings, each with a 20,000-square-foot footprint. Two options are provided, both of which would include commercial uses on the first floor. Option 1 would consist of two-story buildings, with the second floor allocated for office uses. Option 2 would involve three-story buildings, with the two upper floors incorporating 40 residential units. A surface parking lot is proposed along the south side of each building.

Staff has provided the following questions for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of upper floor residential uses along the W. Bridge Street frontage?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed layout of the site?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the height and massing of the townhome buildings?
- 4) Any additional considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated the street network information provided by staff shows a potential neighborhood connection from Monterey Drive to Corbins Mill Street. He requested additional information about that connection.

Mr. Bitar responded that the Bridge Street District contemplates future connectivity. The contemplated blocks and street system would allow for that potential connection.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there is any additional information other than what is contemplated in the District.

Mr. Bitar responded that there is no additional information. Currently, it is privately owned land, not owned by this applicant.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the driveway/alleyway adjacent to the west side of the target parcel. The Marathon gas station is located on that corner. Is that also privately owned land?

Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the current restrictions of the zoning and the permitted uses. The zoning would permit residential or commercial on the second floor. What would be Commission's authority in directing one use over the other?

Ms. Call requested the Assistant Law Director to expand upon an answer to Mr. Schneier's question and also provide clarification of the zoning, permitted uses, next steps, and purview of the Commission and City in regard to engineering, a traffic impact study (TIS), public safety and schools.

Mr. Boggs responded that properties within the Bridge Street District (BSD) are already zoned. That differs from other portions of the City where a planned unit development can occur, essentially making its own zoning code for the properties within that PUD. With this application, there is no rezoning that accomplishes the uses proposed in this application, but there are a number of regulations in terms of location of activities, form and other development standards that exist for any application in the BSD. Mr. Boggs reviewed the primary uses permitted on any site within the Historic Transition District. In the Bridge Street District, residential uses are not permitted on the first story of a mixed-use building. The City has no authority to limit a lawful residential use above the first story, although it can impact the form of the building and subsequently, how that second story can be used on the street-facing side, such as balconies and windows. In regard to the City's purview with engineering, traffic, etc., because this site is already zoned BSD-Historic District, no traffic impact study is required. The required TIS already occurred at the time this area was zoned, and the intensity of use took into account the TIS and traffic protections that were designated at that time. There still are some engineering elements, such as curbcuts, that engineering can require. However, a TIS, which would impact the zoning and the use, is not required for properties that are already zoned BSD or have a straight zoning. In terms of impact on the school districts, the City, through its planning processes – future land use plan, area plan, etc. lays out future development opportunities for properties. The school district relies on those plans when they are projecting student populations. The presence or absence of potential students is not really a function of zoning, especially where the uses have already been established for a property. Public safety is also outside of the purview of zoning, although there is an element of public safety in terms of configuration of lots and blocks to ensure they can accommodate public safety vehicles. Whether a particular retail use tends to generate property crime is not a zoning consideration for the Commission. In regard to process, the Bridge Street development review process has 3 steps, all of which come before the PZC. The Informal Review is an optional early step, preceding the other three iterative steps: Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan, and Final Development Plan.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the Commission's purview to specify that a residential property be either rental, condominium or single-family.

Mr. Boggs responded that the Commission does not have purview to mandate owner-occupied, rentals, or a precise mix of property ownership and tenant arrangements. Planning looks only at the use of property.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if a traffic signal should be needed at Monterey and Bridge streets, is the City restricted by the proximity of the traffic signal at Corbins Mill Drive or other nearby signals?

Mr. Bitar responded that he has spoken with the Transportation and Mobility staff. If this project moves forward, the City would look at that intersection. Signal warrants are necessary to signalize an intersection, which involves a specific process. Other details would be considered, as well.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the proposed land trade. Does the plan meet the greenspace requirement? Does the traded space factor into that requirement? If space is used as an extension of the Dublin Cemetery, that would impact the amount of greenspace on this site.

Mr. Bitar responded that the proposed acreage accommodates both an expansion of the cemetery, as well as the open space requirements of this project. The latter would be met even if there were no land trade with the City. However, the details of how that open space is incorporated would have to be defined.

Mr. Way stated that the drawing shows frontage and open space, which is potentially the cemetery expansion space.

Mr. Bitar responded that some portion of it is intended to be cemetery expansion space; those details would need to be defined.

Mr. Way stated he was clarifying that although the drawing shows it as open space, it is not being planned as open space. He inquired if any improvements to Bridge Street in this area are included in this plan.

Ms. Rauch responded that she is not aware of any at this point, but if this plan proceeds, any such improvements would be coordinated with Transportation and Mobility.

Mr. Way stated that he has been told that a multi-use path was being planned for this side of the street.

Ms. Rauch responded that if that should be the case, staff would ensure that this plan is accommodated.

Mr. Way stated that the Bridge Street Vision Plan envisioned that the school building across the street might be eliminated at some point and redeveloped. He believes the Bridge Street Area Plan shows that.

Mr. Bitar responded that he does not have that plan in front of him.

Mr. Way stated that his point is that the north side of the street potentially could change in the future and would probably follow a similar plan of development as is exhibited tonight. Therefore, the Commission should not look only at what is proposed on one side of the street, but how it might fit in with what might occur on the other side of the street in the future.

Ms. Call explained the Envision Dublin Community Plan process and shared that the information might be viewed by the public on the City's Envision Dublin website.

Mr. Way inquired about the greenspace depicted on the west side of the building close to the gas station.

Mr. Hunter responded that it is tentatively patio space for a restaurant, but it is currently undefined.

Mr. Way responded that he assumed it was space being left for such an opportunity. The plan images show outdoor activity space on the front not the side of the building.

Ms. Harter stated that this site is very close to a cemetery. Has staff searched the City's history and confirmed that this site was never part of the cemetery?

Mr. Bitar responded that in the past, there were residential structures on the site. The presumption is that nothing else of historical value was there, but that would be confirmed.

Ms. Harter inquired if the contemplated expansion of the Dublin Cemetery were to go forward, Council be involved in that conversation.

Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter referred to the building frontage and inquired if the building would be entered from the front or the rear.

Mr. Hunter responded that City Code requires the front doors to be on Bridge Street, although there would be opportunities for the tenants to have a secondary rear entrance.

Ms. Harter stated that her assumption is that the townhomes would not have basements.

Mr. Starr responded that as currently contemplated, that is correct.

Ms. Harter inquired if they had considered underground parking for the townhomes.

Mr. Hunter responded that the site is fairly flat, so it would be difficult to add. If the grade is flat, ramps must be incorporated to reach the lower level, which would take up more space. They were able to incorporate lower-level garages in some places in Bridge Park, because the sloped grade permitted it. The townhomes proposed for this flat site would have garages at the back.

Public Comments

Ervin Keith Barnes, 279 Clover Ct., Dublin stated that he lives in Waterford Village. He was one of the property owners who met with the applicants. They shared their proposal and requested community input. He is not speaking for other residents, as the development proposal has not yet been discussed at their homeowners association (HOA) meeting. He has received feedback, however, from some neighbors who are concerned about the traffic. The original TIS was conducted before most of the development that has occurred in Old Dublin and on Bridge Street. The traffic often will back up to Frantz Road. It is virtually impossible and certainly not safe for traffic to turn left from Monterey Drive to Bridge Street. There are four lanes of constant traffic flow on Bridge Street. Assuming 2 vehicles per residence in this development, approximately 150-200 vehicles will be added to the current traffic flow on Monterey Drive. Monterey Drive is used as a cut-through street to Waterford, Franklin Street and High Street. It is also difficult to turn left on Frantz Road. There is a community park in this neighborhood, and there is only one sidewalk to reach the park. From Clover Ct., it is necessary to cross Monterey Drive to reach the park. He has lived in this neighborhood for 8 years, during which time significant development has occurred in Old Dublin and Bridge Street. He is concerned about the level of traffic in this area and safety.

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she is in charge of the community's civic association. They have not yet had a formal HOA meeting to discuss this topic, but she has shared the Crawford Hoying proposal with the neighbors. She reiterated the traffic and safety concerns for this community of families. There are approximately 220 homes in the Waterford community, so adding 80 residential units would increase their neighborhood by 36 percent, concentrated within this 6-acre area. All of their homes are one or two stories. Historic Dublin has 2.0-2.5 story homes, and they would prefer to see that height restriction continued here. The applicant has proposed townhomes and 40 apartments. They would prefer there to be only owner-occupied residences. This site is directly across from the Dublin School site. No other Dublin schools have apartments directly across the street. They have community activities, and it would be preferable that any new residents build the relationships necessary to be part of their small community. Many apartments will be added in Metro Center, so it should not be necessary to add apartments here. The other concern is the commercial component. This site is directly across from the schools, so it is a concern what type of retail would be included here. They are open to conversation with Crawford Hoying to achieve a suitable development adjacent to their neighborhood, but what is proposed does not yet achieve that.

Kathryn Lecklider, 274 Monterey Drive, Dublin stated that she is supportive of development in this area and understands that it is part of the overall Historic Business District Plan. A rich and walkable business district is the essential reason they moved to this neighborhood. She is optimistic in her support and willingness to partner with Crawford Hoying on this project. This is the first stage of the proposal, and it has many positives. However, at this point, there has not been enough discussion with the neighborhood. She is concerned about the scale and density of the proposed development of an infill project adjacent to one of Dublin's original neighborhoods, built in the 1970-1980s. Less scale, height and density is important; this is not Bridge Park. She understands the allowable zoning height, yet with the Dublin Cemetery to the right and no other 3-story buildings within the Historic Business District, anything over 2.0-2.5 stories will look stark and out of place. 40 townhomes and 40 apartments is an unmanageable residential volume to add to this area, is not to scale and would not blend well with the neighborhood. There are other options. Any development here should look like the original development, not new development. Her biggest concern is the traffic and safety. They live on Monterey Drive and have young children, as do her neighbors. The neighborhood is full of young families with children. This cannot become a cut-through street where their children's safety is compromised. Traffic implications must be comprehensively addressed on the front end or they likely would not occur. She does not believe a traffic signal is necessarily the answer, as it could encourage additional traffic down Monterey. She suggests the City consider terminating Monterey Drive into a cul de sac before the new development occurs, routing any new traffic out to Corbins Mill Drive. This is not an isolated project. Consideration should be given to what else is planned long-term for the Bridge Street Corridor, as significant impacts to their neighborhood and traffic volume will also result from whatever is ultimately developed in the infill anticipated for Frantz Road and Metro Place.

Mary Ann Clark, 146 Corbins Mill Drive, Dublin stated that she is a daily walker through Monterey Park. There is a proposal to add many more residents in their neighborhood, yet there is no proposal to expand the park. The park is used by young families, the elderly and pet owners. Dublin is very supportive of community parks. This proposal will add residents, and at the same time enclose the park so it can never be expanded to accommodate the additional people. She sees no greenspace in the proposed plan, so the additional residents will use the Monterey Park. The residents in the Corbins Mill condominiums are older, and the negative impact should be limited on the quality of life and activities of those residents.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin stated that there have been remarks about a land swap, and that the property surrendered to the City would still count as open space for this project. That does not sound right, so he is hoping to see that clarified.

Patricia Paolucci, 325 Old Spring Ct., Dublin stated that she has lived in this neighborhood for 15 years. She has watched this community grow, and in many ways, it has been nice. However, the community has too many apartments. She questions if all the apartments in Bridge Park are filled. It is not necessary to add more apartments within this small area adjacent to their community. What the community does need is more greenspace for the park and expansion of the cemetery. She is opposed to this development. The traffic in this neighborhood is a serious issue. She asks the Commission not to overdevelop this beautiful city.

Michael Skalak, 249 Old Spring Lane, Dublin stated that this proposal is better than the earlier proposals for this site. He understands that something will be developed here, but the residents want to make sure that it fits well with their neighborhood. He has spoken with other dads within

the neighborhood. They have expressed concerns about the traffic and the proposed apartments across from the elementary school. Many of those students live in this neighborhood. More school space is needed in Dublin, and adding more people here will exacerbate the problem. He described the impact of the traffic on the walkability of the neighborhood for the families. Walking along Bridge Street past the Dublin Cemetery is very dangerous. Pedestrians on that sidewalk are within 3 feet of semi-trucks traveling down SR161. Adding the traffic signal at Franklin Street was an improvement, but pedestrians crossing to the other side of SR161 encounter obstacles on the sidewalk, particularly in front of the veterinary office. The obstacles make it difficult to walk down the sidewalk to Old Dublin. In conjunction with this project, he would encourage consideration of ways to make this area walkable and safe. Although their school is across the street, the children in the neighborhood cannot safely cross SR161 to reach the school. Perhaps a pedestrian bridge or tunnel could alleviate the walkability issue in the neighborhood.

Public Comment:

[received via livestream]

Andrea Milner, 323 Clover Lane, Dublin stated that she would strongly discourage moving forward with this plan as proposed based upon the following: (1) An increased degree of overcrowding and congestion to the neighborhood and surrounding areas. This will only exacerbate the existing quagmire that is rush hour traffic on Bridge Street. Perhaps consider adding a traffic signal. (2) Adding more vehicular traffic on Monterey Drive decreases the safe space for children to play. (3) Overcrowding of the local schools. (4) The proposed structure will ill match the Dublin aesthetics. (5) In the age of remote work, why would this proposal include mixed-use office space? There currently are office spaces in the City that are far under-utilized and by the conclusion of this project, that utilization rate would further decline.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission appreciates the public's interest and response in the proceedings. He is empathetic because he lives in Historic Dublin and walks these streets, as well. The Commission is constrained in its authority with respect to the use of this parcel. It is limited to the Code. The proposed project is a good start. The public comments tonight represent the residents in this neighborhood. However, the front of this site lies along a state route – SR161. If there were not a residential community behind this site, the discussion would be very different. We would be talking about what should be built along a state route with a high volume of traffic. Within this small area, there is a state route, a residential community, a gas station and a municipal cemetery. The needs and desires seem to be mutually exclusive. He commends the applicant for making an effort to accommodate them. He likes the mixed-use. He is in favor of greater walkability and having attractions in Dublin. There are other examples of areas that have been developed close to schools. Jones Middle School in Upper Arlington is located at the end of the Mallway, where there are restaurants and retail with office above. It is a very commercial area. In Grandview Heights, across from the elementary school, there is a strip center with restaurants and a bar. While he would not like to see that type of zoning here, he does believe the uses can co-exist. He believes the proposed use is appropriate, and the Code prescribes it. He is supportive of working with the applicant and residents to achieve the best outcome.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the residents' comments. They live there and are probably better experts than Commission members as to what should or should not be there. He believes the site will be developed, but what is proposed lacks creativity. There are two rows of townhouses

and two large surface parking lots, and a small strip as an extension for the cemetery. This area deserves something much more creative and attractive. It sits along SR161 and is very visible to people entering Dublin. This area is a distance away from Bridge Park, and he would like to see something less dense and really beautiful and creative. The site backs up to residential neighborhoods and is in the center of Dublin in a very visible, well-used neighborhood. The development should be attractive, something of which the residents can be proud. He would recommend the density be lowered and the townhomes be arranged in a more attractive manner. The traffic issue described by the residents is quite accurate; adding more traffic here should be avoided.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the proposed project is a nice start for a challenging site. He is sympathetic with the residents. We need to start to consider how to make our community more walkable, rather than using traffic mitigation. The traffic should be eliminated by creating a true, walkable community, creating places to walk to, such as a school. Creating more safety down SR161 would make it more walkable and discourage vehicles driving there. Adding traffic circles and traffic signals does not reduce traffic. There need to be fewer cars and more things to walk to in the area. He is not in favor of making Monterey Drive a cul de sac, as it would be diverting traffic somewhere else and creating the same issue. He agrees that the proposed townhomes need to be much more creative. There is too much proposed paving. Children will be cutting through the site to reach the nearby park, and that amount of paving and vehicles would create risk for the pedestrians. Confusion remains about the land trade. Does it account for the required greenspace for the project? The intent is that the greenspace for a development be usable greenspace. The park is already very crowded, so this project could alleviate the need by providing true usable greenspace.

Ms. Harter stated that it is good that the applicants are meeting with the residents. She believes this site should achieve a flow with the neighborhood and the park. There is an existing traffic issue in the area that is already a challenge for the residents, and addressing that concern will be important. She noted that there are apartments adjacent to the Dublin Scioto High School and providing mounds and landscaping between the two have been helpful. The walkability in this area is important to consider, as the pedestrians include many young students. She would suggest adding creative entrances, perhaps including artwork and a dog park.

Mr. Way thanked the residents for participating. It is equally important for the Commission and developer to hear the comments and for them to be on the record. This project seems to fit well with the Bridge Street District Code, so it is difficult for the Commission to offer comments on anything inconsistent with that Code. In terms of the uses along Bridge Street, additional parking would not be good; therefore, he would be supportive of residential rather than office uses. He believes the proposed site layout works well. He is supportive of transitional land uses, so the idea of transitioning from single-family detached to single-family attached on a busy corridor is a perfect transition. It is difficult to do layouts on tight sites, and the applicant has managed to get it all on the site in a manner that works well. Townhouses with garages at the rear are a direction the City has been encouraging. The project meets the permitted height, but the community is asking that the height not be higher than 2.0 or 2.5 story. He would recommend the applicant show some options, and let the Commission consider the look/feel of the height and massing. He is supportive of the proposed plan and looks forward to seeing the evolution of it.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission and the developers profit from hearing the residents comments. He is supportive of the proposed use and project. Adding the commercial along the thoroughfare creates a buffer, which then steps down to the single-family townhouses, which then steps down to the single-family home community. That is a nice transition on the site. He applauds the collaborative thinking behind the contemplated land trade. It creates a nice quid pro quo opportunity, although the specifics have yet to be determined. He is supportive of meetings continuing between the applicant and the community. The traffic issue is a concern at all points. The property owner has the right to develop the property according to the current Code, so the hope is that we leverage that collectively to improve the situation. Adding a traffic signal at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street would alleviate the traffic access issue and provide a crosswalk across Bridge Street to the school site. He agrees that the walkability of SR161 is a safety issue, and efforts should be made to alleviate that.

Ms. Call stated that it is not the Commission's purview to discuss land swaps, acquisitions and the associated legal implications. As an administrative body, the Commission's job is to make sure applications meet the Code and that includes the required open space. One of the public comments referred to obstacles in the public walkways along SR161. She would ask Ms. Rauch to speak to Code Enforcement about that issue and ensure public walkways are not being obstructed. In regard to the suggestion for a pedestrian tunnel or bridge over SR161, that would be a very large project and involve many stakeholders. It would be outside the purview of this applicant, but it is an intriguing idea. There was also a comment about the future use of the school site; however, that would be a joint school-City decision. None of those discussions are within the Commission's purview, at least not at the current time. She is generally supportive of the proposed site layout. She does believe the architecture and character images are lacking. She has viewed previous Crawford Hoying applications that were much more conducive to what the City is looking for in those areas. The proposed architectural feel of the next case would be nice to see in a future application of Crawford Hoying. The cemetery expansion is outside the purview of the Commission, but it would be nice if that cemetery could better accommodate the needs of the City. She believes the residential and office use components could provide a positive activation of the area. She inquired if the applicant needed additional input.

Mr. Hunter responded that they did not require anything additional at this time. He noted that with their 520 rental units at Bridge Park, there are 14 school-age children. The density there is 32 dwelling units (du) per acre; with this site, it is 11 du/acre. The images shared in the application were intended to represent scale and massing more than design, which will be further developed as the plan evolves. They prefer multifamily for the upper floors, as it would have a better parking solution. They appreciate the Commission's feedback.

- **~~Case #23-107CP Penzone Live/Work~~**

~~Review of a Concept Plan (CP) for the Construction of a Proposed Live/Work Building on the Existing Penzone Campus. The 2.54-Acre Site is Zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is Located Southwest of the Intersection of Village Parkway and Cooperstone Drive.~~

Applicant Presentation