



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening remarks: "Good evening and welcome to the May 7 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. We are living in extraordinary times. Both the State of Ohio and the City of Dublin have declared states of emergency. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the duration of the Stay at Home Order, we will be holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible. We welcome your comments on cases, please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. This is not a perfect system, but we will do our best in these difficult times. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mayor Amorose Groomes administered the Oath of Office to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) appointee Lance Schneier.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes, Jane Fox, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier

Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Nichole Martin, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Thaddeus Boggs

~~**ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS**~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded to accept the documents into the record.~~

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

~~[Motion passed 7-0]~~

~~Ms. Call stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive~~

~~Mr. Schoedinger responded that he does not believe there will be a need to have the gate unlocked to wheel the trashcan to the dumpster; however, if that is not the case, their staff can unlock the padlock to gain access.~~

~~Mr. Underhill pointed out that because building permits have already been issued, the language in Condition #5 should be revised to "occupancy permit."~~

~~Mr. Boggs concurred that the motion should be amended accordingly.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to amend the language in Condition #5 from "building permits" to "occupancy permit".~~

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

~~[Motion passed 7-0]~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the following five (5) conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant construct an on-site dumpster should the shared dumpster agreement be terminated at any point in the future;~~
- ~~2) The applicant meet with staff on-site once the driveway is staked prior to construction to determine if adjustments can be made to minimize disturbance to existing trees;~~
- ~~3) The applicant update the plans, subject to staff approval, if the intent is to install a gate across the access drive;~~
- ~~4) The gate be locked during times when overflow parking is not in use; and~~
- ~~5) The applicant include exhibit C prior to occupancy permit.~~

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

~~[Motion passed 7-0]~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Minor Text Revision to permit a zero setback for a shared access drive between 5980 Perimeter Drive and 5815 Wall Street.~~

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

~~[Motion passed 7-0]~~

5. Mango's Place Daycare, 19-125FDP, Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for the construction of an approximately 7,900-square-foot daycare facility and associated site improvements. The 2.16-acre site is northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Rings Road and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Presentation

Site

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for a new 7,818-square-foot day care building for Mango's Place, which is currently operating in

Emerald Town Center at 5601 Woerner-Temple Road. The 2.17-acre lot is located within the Thomas Kohler PUD, Subarea E, which also includes Emerald Town Center to the north. The applicant is proposing to build a new structure on the vacant site south of the current location. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Rings Road and Emerald Parkway and has frontage on three major corridors, including Woerner-Temple Road to the east. The development text requires consistency and common architectural themes across the entire Subarea. What is proposed on this site will need to reflect what exists in Emerald Town Center, which contains stone and red brick as the primary materials and stucco as a secondary material.

Existing Conditions

The Cramer Ditch runs west to east through the northern portion of the property. This ditch includes a large floodway and a 100-year floodplain that covers approximately half of the property. A large treeline is located in the northern and center portion of the site. The amount of area these conditions encompass has made it difficult in previous years to develop the site. The applicant has submitted a detailed Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) study to the City of Dublin and FEMA to adjust the effective floodway and 100-year floodplain limits on the site. The relocation of both the effective floodway and 100-year floodplain is critical to the applicant's ability to develop due to the limited buildable space on the site. The applicant must receive approval of the Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) formally revising the effective floodway and 100-year floodplain limits on the site from FEMA prior to building occupancy to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The Commission reviewed and commented on an Informal Review of the Concept Plan on November 7, 2019. Commissioners supported the layout and architectural design of the daycare. The Commission suggested the applicant include minor site and architectural improvements and landscape screening from Woerner-Temple, Emerald Parkway and Rings Road to the south. The site has had minor changes since the 2019 Concept Plan. The applicant is still proposing a 7,800-sq. ft. building with a 1,200 sq. ft. enclosed playground east of the building. 45 parking spaces are proposed where 43 are required by Code. The sole vehicular access to the site is from the south via Rings Road, where there is an existing curbcut. The applicant has improved the pedestrian connectivity, connecting to the existing sidewalk located along Emerald Parkway. Access to this building also exists via walkways on the northwest and south sides. The dumpster location has been moved slightly to the west from the previously proposed site, resulting in minor changes in the parking lot layout.

Building Elevations

The south elevation can be viewed from Rings Road, and the west elevation can be viewed from Emerald Parkway. The building will be 30 feet in length, which does meet the maximum requirement for this Subarea. The building does take significant inspiration from the Emerald Town Center. The proposed building materials are a "Glen Gery Olde Detroit" modular brick veneer on all four elevations with a "Ply Gen True Stack Calgary" stone water table along the foundation of the building. The applicant has changed the brick pillars to stone, per the request of the Commission and staff. The applicant has also included a thin set stone smooth band that wraps around the building, approximately 10 feet above grade. The proposed materials are consistent along all four facades of the building, with more stone incorporated into the south and east facades. The north elevation can be viewed from Emerald Town Center and the east elevation from Woerner-Temple Road. View of the north elevation is blocked by the treeline to the north, so has the least amount of visibility. The proposed playground will be enclosed by an Ameristar steel fence four (4) feet in height. The dumpster enclosure to the west of the building will be constructed of the same brick and stone proposed for the main building, and include a 6-foot tall

wooden privacy fence to enclose the southeast entrance into the enclosure. At the Informal Review, the Commission expressed interest in how the site would be screened, particularly the playground and the area along Emerald Parkway. Two large silver maple trees and a group of hackberry trees were removed, totaling 364 inches to be replaced. These trees will need to be replaced on-site, but full replacement of the trees will most certainly result in overcrowding. A fee will be required for the surplus inches. Replacement tree details are required to be provided at the building permit submittal. The development text requires a continuous landscape treatment along Emerald Parkway. Mounding and landscape beds containing ornamental trees and shrubs are proposed along Emerald Parkway to mimic the theme further north. Overhead lines exist on the south side of the parcel as well as large utility easements located along the south property line. Trees have been selected and located to accommodate these limitations. The playground is also screened per Code. Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with five (5) conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that previously, staff requested that the dumpster be located on the east end of the property, and it still remains on the corner, though well screened. She is curious as to the reason it could not be located at the far east end of the drive parking lot, closer to Woerner-Temple. There appears to be space there for a dumpster.

Mr. Hounshell stated that was a topic discussed with the applicant following the Concept Plan review in November. After a better understanding of the site constraints, staff was agreeable to this location, which has been shifted slightly to the west.

Ms. Husak stated that the issue was with the trash truck turn around. They tried to locate the dumpster in the location to which Ms. Fox is referring, but discovered the trash truck would be unable to turn around. Although the location ultimately decided upon was not the preferred location, it was the only location.

Ms. Fox stated that when she visited the site, there appeared to be a substantial amount of scrub trees and overgrowth in the Cramer Ditch. She noticed that the large tree has already been taken down in the area where the building will sit. Will the ditch remain natural, as it now is, or will some of the growth be removed?

Ms. Hounshell stated that it is his understanding that much of that scrub is within the floodway, and it is very challenging to remove scrub from that area.

Ms. Fox stated that she is not suggesting that it be removed but inquiring what would continue to exist. Is this not a protected stream corridor?

Ms. Husak responded that 90% of what currently is there would remain. The one large tree removed will be replaced and the applicant will landscape their site. Other than that, the site will remain natural within that area.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the keystone material to be used on the retaining wall at the rear of the building. Is that a manufactured stone? Will it be a natural-looking retaining wall?

Mr. Hounshell deferred that question to the applicant for response.

Ms. Fox stated that her last concern is regarding the tree selections. Does the opportunity remain to make any changes in the landscape materials?

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. She has shared Ms. Fox's previously mentioned concern about the Kentucky Coffee tree that is specified near the playground area with the City's landscape

architect, who has suggested alternative selections, such as a Tulip tree, Yellow Poplar or Frontier Elm – all of which would have less droppings. Therefore, a condition could be added that the Kentucky Coffee tree should be replaced with a species selected by the City Forester or City Landscape Architect.

Ms. Fox explained that because she was unfamiliar with the Kentucky Coffee tree mentioned in the landscape plan, she conducted a little research and discovered that it is a “messy” tree, dropping pods and seeds that are toxic to humans. She was concerned that a tree with poisonous pods would not be an appropriate tree to locate next to a toddler garden.

Ms. Husak responded that an alternative tree could be selected.

Ms. Call stated that the staff report refers to FEMA’s requirements regarding the 100-year floodplain. Was the Army Corps of Engineers involved in the review, as well as FEMA and the City Engineers?

Mr. Hendershot responded that the Army Corps is not involved with this review, only FEMA. As part of their review, a Community Acknowledgement Form must be signed by the City, which is the extent of the City’s review.

Mr. Grimes inquired if any history exists regarding any flooding that may have occurred up or downstream. There are many roadways within that area now; he is curious what impact those roads may have had on the water flow and the floodplain.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the applicant hired an engineer to conduct the LOMAR, which is a detailed study of the floodplain. The primary purpose was to update the floodplain map to reflect the two box culverts that have been installed as part of the Emerald Parkway/Woerner-Temple roadway construction project. It does not change the flooding limits.

Applicant Presentation

Mary Frances Curtis, co-owner/manager, Mango’s Place, 3901 Bickley Place, Upper Arlington, stated that they have a pandemic operation license, so their Dublin facility has been open during this time to provide service for essential workers. They are waiting for the Governor’s authorization to open to full capacity. They are looking forward to building and opening a larger facility with more room for their clients.

Scott Curtis, co-owner/manager, Mango’s Place, 3901 Bickley Place, Upper Arlington, stated that their landscape architect is present to answer any questions, as well. In regard to the question about the dumpster, there have been discussions about the possible extension of the Old Rings Road, if needed. In regard to the trees remaining on the site, every tree intended for removal has been removed. In regard to the trees selected for landscaping, their architect, Mr. Clarke, has been working with the City landscape architect and will follow those recommendations. Mr. Clarke can also answer any questions regarding the keystone retaining wall.

Jim Clarke, Clarke Architects, 7844 Flint Road, Columbus, stated that the keystone, stacked stone is a fabricated material. A brown or tan color would be selected to match the building. The wall will only be about two-three feet in height. They have an option with the contractor to use concrete, and if that should be used, the keystone product would be applied to it, as well, to match the building.

Ms. Kennedy thanked the applicant for taking into consideration the Commission’s previous feedback. The changes that have been made are nice upgrades to the building.

Ms. Call noted that she has one observation about the landscaping around the playground enclosure. Barberry bushes are thorny and, immediately adjacent to the semi-private fence, children's fingers could reach through and touch the thorns.

Ms. Curtis stated that they will be working closely with the landscaper on selection of the plantings around the playground area.

Public Comment

No public comments were received regarding this case.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak inquired if a condition is needed regarding the modifications to the landscaping specifications.

Mr. Hounshell responded that a sixth condition has been added.

Ms. Call suggested that the language of the condition be generic, providing direction that the applicant work with the City landscape architect to identify the suitable plant material.

Ms. Fox stated the Planning report referred to a concern about sidewalk access. Has that been addressed?

Mr. Hounshell stated that there was a discrepancy in the plans discussed at the Informal Review. Those plans showed egress doors on the north elevation -- the rear of the building, but showed no walkways on that side of the building. They have been added to the plans, so that is no longer an issue.

Ms. Call stated that the report indicates that, "Staff has concerns with the lack of sidewalk access to the west parking lot and around the entire building, including the playground." Has that been mitigated?

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox stated that many of the light poles she has seen recently have a 3.5-ft. concrete base. They are very unattractive. What is the purpose of the concrete base, and is it the only option? Could light poles be installed at-grade?

Mr. Clarke responded that if the light poles are not located near traffic, they could be installed at grade without the bases. If they are close to traffic, it is preferable to have the light poles located on top of concrete bases to avoid the potential of vehicles striking the poles. It is primarily a safety precaution.

Ms. Fox stated that there must be a more aesthetic solution for light pole bases. That is not a request for this project, but it is worth a future conversation.

Ms. Husak responded that approximately ten years ago, light pole bases were required to be clad in stone. Such a discussion could be scheduled, should the Commission desire to do so.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the six conditions as indicated.

Mr. Curtis indicated that they are in agreement with the conditions.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with the following six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant grants a utility easement to the City of Dublin that will encompass the existing 18'x5' box culvert located at the west property line of the site;

- 2) That the applicant obtains an approved Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA to revise the effective floodway and 100-year floodplain limits on the site prior to building occupancy to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 3) That the applicant demonstrates compliance with Chapter 151 – Flood Control of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 4) That the applicant pay a fee in lieu of the caliper inches not being replaced on the site;
- 5) That replacement tree details be provided to staff with submittal for building permits; and
- 6) That the applicant work with Planning staff to finalize the Landscape Plan, subject to staff approval.

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

~~COMMUNICATIONS~~

~~Ms. Husak stated that staff would be contacting PZC and ARB members to poll for the best date within the first week of June for a Special Joint PZC/ARB meeting to review/discuss the following items, per City Council's request:~~

- ~~• Property Maintenance Code, which is pending before Council.~~
- ~~• Temporary Sign Code. There is a need to ensure Dublin's Code is aligned with the recent Supreme Court ruling regarding temporary signs.~~

~~Ms. Call inquired if this is what is referred to as the "contents law," from a case concerning content discrimination in a city in either New Mexico or Arizona.~~

~~Mr. Boggs responded that it is related to that ruling, which concerned the town of Gilbert, Arizona.~~

~~The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m., Thursday, May 21.~~

~~ADJOURNMENT~~

~~The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.~~

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 7, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Mango's Place
19-097INF**

**5600 Rings Road
Informal Review**

Proposal: Potential construction of a 7,818-square-foot daycare facility and associated site improvements on the 2.17 acre site zoned Planned Unit Development.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Rings Road

Request: An Informal Review and feedback of a possible future development application.

Applicant: Mary Frances Curtis

Planning Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/19-097

RESULT: The Commission reviewed and commented on an Informal Review application for the development of a new 7,818-square-foot daycare facility on a 2.17-acre lot. Commissioners supported the layout and architectural design of the daycare. The Commission commented that the landscaping in the final design will be important to reduce the visual impact of the parking lot along Emerald Parkway. The Commission mentioned the design is close to complete, with a few minor site and architectural improvements needed to tie the building into the surrounding architecture.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Victoria Newell	Absent
Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Absent
William Wilson	Absent
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Zachary Hounshell, Planner I



~~Ms. Fox stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Although Case 2, 19-098MSP – Master Sign Plan for Ohio Health Primary Physicians was tentatively scheduled for consideration by consent, she has some questions, so it will be considered under the regular agenda. Therefore, tonight's cases will be heard in the order in which they were originally listed.~~

CASES

1. Mango's Place, 5600 Rings Road, 19-097INF, Informal Review

Ms. Fox stated that this application is a request for informal review and feedback for the potential construction of a daycare facility and associated site improvements. The site is northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Rings Road and zoned Planned Commerce District.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review of an Informal Review application for Mango's Place daycare. The Commission will provide non-binding feedback for the applicant so that they may move forward to a Final Development Plan. The rezoning and preliminary development plan for this development site occurred in 1996.

Site

This particular site is located in Subarea E of the Thomas Kohler development site in the same subarea as Emerald Town Center. It has remained undeveloped since the site's original rezoning, primarily due to natural features on the site. Emerald Town Center is located just north of the property. Mango's Place daycare is currently located within the Center. Because the proposed site is within the same subarea as Emerald Town Center, the development text requires consistency in architectural themes between adjacent buildings. The site features include a tree line that extends from the north end to the center of the property, and one mature tree to the south of the tree line. The site has many natural features that prevent utilization of the entire site. The Cramer Ditch runs across the northern portion of the lot, which prevents development on the top half of the site. The site also has a large floodplain that limits development. [Diagram of floodplain specifics shown.] The applicant is currently pursuing a request for adjustment of the floodplain with FEMA. The application is moving forward with the expectation that FEMA will approve the adjustment.

Concept Plan

The concept plan is for a 7,800-square-foot daycare facility with a 1,200-square-foot enclosed playground to the east of the building. Although the Code requires 43 parking spaces, 45 parking spaces are provided. The Commission is requested to approve a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for this site. In the past, the Commission has approved similar requests for other daycare facilities. This will permit provision of needed parking spaces versus provision of parking spaces per Code. Staff also is concerned about the dumpster enclosure. Rather than positioned in front of the building facing Emerald Parkway, staff recommends it be located on the east side of the parking lot. The majority of the structure will have a brick veneer with stone or stucco accents. Façade improvements are recommended on the sides facing the major roadways. The west façade of the proposed structure will face Emerald Parkway; the east façade will face Woerner-Temple; the south façade will face Rings Road. The improvements will provide consistency with the buildings along Emerald Parkway. The main entrance to the building on the

south façade facing Rings Road is covered by a portico with cement siding on its face. Given that this building has frontage on three major roads, the applicant has improved the west façade facing Emerald Parkway to add interest to this façade; however, the east façade facing Woerner-Temple Road lacks architectural detailing. As discussed above, the applicant should take additional cues from the architectural character and details from the buildings in Emerald Town Center to provide a similarly high level of quality and character for this proposal. Similar features might include arched portico entrances, lighting fixtures above the entrances, and creative material uses throughout the building. A five-foot sidewalk will connect to the existing sidewalk along Emerald Parkway and extend to the west, northwest, and south sides of the building. Staff has concerns with the lack of sidewalk access to the west parking lot and around the entire building, including the playground. In the elevations provided in the packet, the applicant is showing egress doors from classrooms that do not have a concrete sidewalk extended to them in the site plan. That connection will need to be added per Code.

Staff recommends the following discussion questions:

- 1) Is the proposed site design reflective of the established character of sites along Emerald Parkway?
- 2) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support a reduced parking requirement for the site?
- 3) Does the proposed architectural character sufficiently complement the established character of the Thomas Kohler Planned District, including the adjacent Emerald Town Center?
- 4) Other comments by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman inquired if the proposed building has four-sided architecture -- brick and stone on all sides. Was siding also mentioned?

Mr. Hounshell responded that there is brick veneer on all sides. Siding is located only on the portico.

Ms. Fox stated the plan indicates a 40-foot easement for utilities and a bikepath, and the parking lot appears to overlay the easement. With the proposed parking layout, will there be sufficient room for a future bikepath?

Mr. Hounshell responded that Planning staff inquired if there would be sufficient room for a future bikepath, and Engineering indicated that it is unlikely that a bikepath would be located along the southern edge due to the existing sidewalk that connects to Emerald Parkway. There is an existing bikepath along Woerner-Temple, and a sidewalk would be the only connection to that bikepath. It would not impede the proposed parking for this site.

Ms. Fox responded that she was interested in future proposed connectivity. The City is interested in providing bikepath and pedestrian connectivity for every parcel. Was that a consideration in this site layout?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff would discuss future connectivity plans with the applicant before submission of their application.

Ms. Call stated that it was indicated that the Commission has frequently approved a reduction in parking requirements for daycare facilities. If that occurs regularly, she would prefer to revise the Code requirements for daycare facilities than to approve a reduced number for each case.

Mr. Hounshell responded that there were three previous cases where the Commission approved a reduction in the Code-required number of parking spaces for similar-sized daycare facilities. However, the northwestern extension of the parking lot was added recently to show where the Code-required number of parking spaces could be added.

Ms. Husak stated that in terms of revising the zoning code, there was a previous unsuccessful attempt to update the parking code holistically for several uses where there had been a need to approve a reduction or addition of spaces. The PUD process allows the parking to be tailored to a specific user, based upon supporting data and/or experience.

Ms. Call stated that for this particular application, she would be supportive of looking at the parking requirements for each type of use permitted in the current zoning in addition to the proposed use, and basing the decision on all potential uses, not only on Code requirements.

Ms. Husak stated that often, the numbers that are approved meet the parking needs if the use were to be converted to Office.

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff would compile the information for the Commission's future consideration of this project.

Ms. Call stated that staff's report indicates the parking extension to the west would be inefficiently used. The inefficiency could be overcome if all 22 of the daycare employees parked on that side, and all remaining traffic used the parking spaces nearest the doors.

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff has had such discussions with the applicant, and the applicant will explain their parking expectations.

Mr. Fishman stated that uses can change, and there should be sufficient room to expand the parking, should that occur. He would prefer the space remain grass until additional parking might be needed.

Mr. Hounshell stated that is the reason staff asked them to demonstrate where the additional parking would be located if the current parking code requirement were to be met. Staff would compile numbers on what other uses would need for parking for a building this size.

Mr. Fishman noted that the parking need would be greater at times the facility might be hosting recitals and special events.

Ms. Call stated that the ingress and egress have a single point of entry/exit. There is an adjacent development with multiple buildings, and there appears to be a parking lot between the two structures nearest to this site. Have there been any discussions about shared use of their ingress/egress to provide more than a single point for this site?

Ms. Husak stated that there is a stub at the most southwestern end of the building. Originally, there was an intent for this parcel to develop along with Emerald Town Center with cross access from Emerald Town Center south to this parcel. However, it would have required extensive engineering work, including creation of a culvert and crossing the stream. With the site being in the floodplain, it was likely not financially feasible. At the time, the landowner wanted to be

included in the zoning, but not in the development. Staff has not encouraged that this be considered, due to all the natural features on the site.

Ms. Fox stated that a brick veneer is proposed. Is the adjacent development brick veneer, as well, or is it full-width brick?

Mr. Hounshell stated that staff is unsure. The staff report accompanying the Emerald Town Center approval in 2005 indicates use of stone and brick veneer, a Glen Geary brick, which is available in thin or full brick.

Mr. Supelak clarified that "veneer" does not mean that a full-width brick is not used. Veneer means the brick is applied to the structure with an air gap between.

Ms. Fox inquired if there are comparable materials on both sides of the development -- materials of the same thickness, style and quality. What is the reason the applicant has requested underground stormwater management? Normally, there would be a retention pond or the stormwater would flow out to the nearby creek.

Mr. Hounshell stated that there are site difficulties. It would be difficult to fit a retention pond on the site. The entire northern portion of the lot is unusable. Typically, City Engineering has no objection to underground stormwater management in order to maximize the buildable area.

Ms. Fox inquired if the stormwater would flow out to the creek.

Mr. Supelak responded that it would slowly release. There is no other option for this site. FEMA will have strict requirements on the side nearest the creek. Due to the impervious surface that will be added to the site, there is a need to accommodate the pace of the stormwater that will be draining from the site. Although much of it eventually will reach the creek, it must be accommodated on site, not just dumped into the ditch.

Ms. Call noted that she would be interested in having the applicant address this question.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the City has any plans to connect this portion of Rings Road to the other section of Rings Road or Woerner-Temple.

Ms. Husak responded that is actually the previously existing right-of-way; therefore, there is no such plan.

Mr. Fishman observed that it is preferable to have only one ingress/egress for a daycare facility. In the past, ability has been provided for the additional adjacent connection to be made if the use should change.

Ms. Husak stated that Emerald Town Center is twice the size of this site, yet it has only one right in/right out and one full access point. The City has no intent to extend Rings Road farther to the east. For the developable area of this site, a single point of access has been determined appropriate by Washington Township Fire and Emergency Services and by City Engineering.

Mr. Supelak inquired what was the reason for the recommendation to relocate the dumpster.

Mr. Hounshell responded that with the current site layout, the proposed dumpster enclosure would be on the front façade facing Emerald Parkway. Typically, they are required to be to the side or rear of the lot. The building has three road frontages, so the most aesthetically acceptable location would be the bottom right corner of the lot.

Ms. Call inquired if there were any concerns about its being located near the proposed transformer.

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff's intent was that there would be one enclosure for both the trash and transformer.

Ms. Fox stated that infants and toddlers will be cared for in this facility, so she would recommend the dumpster be located where its contents are not offensive to the children and teachers in the outside play area on a windy day.

Applicant Presentation

Scott Curtis, owner and CEO of Mango's Place, 5601 Woerner-Temple Road, Dublin, Ohio stated they have attempted to match their current building in Emerald Town Center. In regard to the suggested connection, there is a six-foot grade drop between the Emerald Town Center site and this property, approximately 20 feet north of the ditch. Their current playground is located immediately next to their dumpster, and that has not been an issue. The stone enclosure is typical in Dublin. Their current dumpster is not co-located with the transformer.

Matthew Poindexter, EMH&T Project Engineer, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, Ohio stated that a question was asked about the underground stormwater management. There is no room for a retention basin on this site, and the stream cannot be used for stormwater management. Due to the impervious/pervious ratio, there is a need to slow down the release of water draining through the site. To accomplish this, an underground chamber is created to retain the stormwater and release it slowly to the stream, which will then move it away from the site. In regard to locating the dumpster in the bottom right corner – initially, that attempt was made. However, next to the right corner of the parking lot, there is a sanitary manhole. Placing the dumpster in that location would require either building it on top of the manhole or sacrificing ten parking spaces. Another issue with that location is that the garbage truck would have no place to turn around.

Mr. Curtis stated that in regard to the suggestion regarding parking spaces, at their current location in Emerald Town Center, staff parks at the side of the building, and clients park in the area directly in front of the facility door. This daycare has flexible hours, so traffic ebbs and flows throughout the day. They have never needed all of their existing parking spaces. Typically, special events are held off site, so no additional guest parking is ever needed. They do not anticipate ever needing the additional parking spaces depicted in the proposed space to the side of the facility. That area could remain grass until there is future need for additional parking.

Ms. Call stated that according to the Code, the Commission has the flexibility not to require the additional parking extension with 12 spaces. If the use should change, would the Commission review a full site plan for that future use, so additional parking spaces could be added, or could the approval of this application include a provision to permit an adjustment in parking spaces based upon the use?

Ms. Husak responded that if the use were to change, the Commission would not review that application. A change in use is reviewed in Building Standards, and an analysis of sufficient parking spaces for the proposed use is made. If the new use did not meet Code requirements,

the applicant would be required to add the additional spaces. Depending on the magnitude of that adjustment, there is a threshold for potential Commission review.

Ms. Call stated that in the case where an existing Dublin tenant has demonstrated that their use does not have a need for all the spaces required by Code, she would agree that the space should remain as open space until a future need for parking spaces.

Mr. Curtis clarified that although they do not need all of the additional parking in the west wing, they do need some of the spaces. There have been changes in the State regulations regarding staffing ratios.

Ms. Husak stated that staff would work with the applicant to identify the most efficient way in which to include extra parking spaces. Staff's concern was that numerous drive aisles would be created on this site to locate the parking in the available spaces. There is extra pavement that could potentially be avoided with a more efficient layout.

Ms. Fox stated that from Emerald Parkway, it appears that the site is circled with parking, which creates a visual impact. Dublin attempts to make all street frontage visually attractive. There appears to be sufficient space behind the dumpster to create double-bank parking, eliminating the length of the wing and creating a more condensed parking area. Has that been considered?

Mr. Poindexter stated that in part of the site, they are encroaching into the floodplain. With that, Dublin requires a compensatory cut. The area behind the dumpster is a low-lying area and is the most efficient area in which to place the compensatory cut. When they fill inside the floodplain, they have to remove dirt elsewhere to make sure that the same area is allowed there. The width of that space does not permit having additional parking there. Although they considered double-sided parking, a west parking wing was the only way in which to meet the zoning requirements.

Ms. Call inquired what would have been the parking space count if the parking wing were to be eliminated and the double parking continued.

Mr. Poindexter responded that it would have been 39 spaces.

Ms. Call inquired what their needs are.

Mr. Poindexter responded that they need 43 spaces.

Ms. Call stated that their needs match the zoning requirements, so there is no need to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Ms. Fox inquired if their needs meet the zoning requirements, did staff have a more efficient parking design in mind?

Ms. Rauch inquired if Ms. Fox was suggesting that the building be located more to the corner and additional parking placed to the rear.

Ms. Fox stated that she was not suggesting the building be moved. She was referring to the comment in the staff report that staff was interested in identifying a more efficient use of the parking. Due to the floodplain, the needed compensatory cuts and the topography, are there any other options?

Mr. Hounshell stated that he believes there may have been a miscommunication between staff and the applicant in terms of the parking needs. Staff's belief that the applicant needed less parking spaces than the Code required was the reason for their recommendation.

Ms. Husak stated that this is the smallest daycare facility in the City, but it has the highest parking ratio. Staff recommended reevaluating the needed spaces, in view of the fact that the northern-most spaces are unlikely to be used due to the distance from the entrance.

Ms. Fox stated that she assumes the expectation would be that employees park in those spaces, and families with children would park near the entrance. Is there any consideration about the ease of dropoff? Is it their expectation that all the double-bank parking and all of the parking spaces in front would be utilized by their clients? If the parking spaces were reduced by half in the west wing, would their clients be able to easily access the front of the building for dropoff and not experience unavailable parking due to employee parking needs?

Mr. Curtis responded that the 22 parking spaces on the south front façade are sufficient for their clients.

Ms. Call noted that it is her understanding that 43 parking spaces are needed for both clients and staff, so only two parking spaces could be eliminated.

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that at this time, staff does not know what depth brick was used in Emerald Town Center. Could staff obtain that information so that a future structure could match what exists?

Ms. Husak responded that staff would check into that issue; however, she is confident that the brick veneers that exists on the majority of buildings in Dublin are full brick.

Ms. Fox inquired if Commission members have comments in response to staff's proposed discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed site design reflective of the established character of sites along Emerald Parkway?

Commission members indicated that they had no concerns with the design.

2. Does the Commission support a reduced parking requirement for the site?

Ms. Call stated that is not the applicant's request, so she would not support a reduction of any more than two spaces, as it would not meet the applicant's needs.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Code requires 43 parking spaces. Does the applicant also need them?

Mr. Curtis responded that they need 43 parking spaces, which is consistent with the Code's requirements. The current design shows 45 parking spaces.

Ms. Fox stated that although the reduction is minimal, she would be supportive of reducing it to 43 spaces. Her preference would be that be that the parking be condensed and the long parking wing be eliminated, but that might be very difficult to do. In that case, landscaping in the final design will be very important to reduce the visual impact from the street.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission would review the landscaping plan in the final site plan.

3. Does the proposed architectural architecture sufficiently complement the established character of the Thomas Kohler planned district including the adjacent Emerald Town Center?

Ms. Call stated that she had no concerns.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes some enhancements with use of stone are possible. Emerald Town Center shows variety in the detailing over entrances, use of arches and by combining stone in the porticos and use of lighting. She would encourage enhancements on the front and west facades. Perhaps more window framing could be used on the other sides of the building, creating a balanced improvement on all four sides. The Emerald Town Center buildings have more architectural interest.

Mr. Fishman concurred. The intent is to have an architectural design consistent with the Emerald Town Center. Perhaps dry-laid stone walls could add interest in the parking lots.

Ms. Call stated that she believes the applicant has provided good architectural relief, using columns, stone on the bottom, and brick on the top. The stripe two-thirds of the way up the building gives dimension. She believes the design does complement the other buildings. If there is additional opportunity for enhancements, however, that is always encouraged.

Mr. Supelak stated that only sides 3 and 4 are lacking in architectural character.

Mary Frances Curtis, applicant, 5601 Woerner-Temple Road, Dublin, Ohio stated that the rear of the building backs up to the wooded area. There is very limited visibility of that side.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees that side would not require the same level of architectural articulation as the other sides. In the Emerald Town Center, interesting framing of windows through use of molding gives a more finished appearance. The Commission is interested in avoiding flat-faced buildings having only stone veneer sides and windows. In the future, the landscaping could change, and the viewshed would be open and visual; therefore, the Commission prefers to have finishing on all sides of the building.

Ms. Call stated that she does not see how the backside of this lot could ever be landscaped differently, because of the natural features and the steep grade change.

Mr. Fox stated that the Code requires visual interest on all sides of the buildings, although expectations should be less on sides with no visual impact. On another point, it was noted that the sidewalks do not extend to the rear of the building. Wherever there are doorways, there should also be sidewalk connectivity.

Mr. Fishman stated that four-sided architecture is required in residential areas, even where there is a backyard that is not visible. The architectural design is fine, but perhaps some enhancements could occur when the application comes before the Commission.

Mr. Supelak stated that the design is very close, but perhaps adding a dormer in the roofline or a couple of columns could improve it.

Ms. Fox stated that she is hopeful that a location can be identified for the dumpster that is not on the west elevation. Due to the site limitations, landscaping will be very important in mitigating the sight impact on the street frontages. There is a need to create a beautiful street front to frame the entrances and elevations. The constraints should not become a disadvantage to the community's view.

~~2. OhioHealth Primary Care Physicians, 250 W. Bridge Street, 19-098MSP, Master Sign Plan~~

~~Ms. Fox stated that this application is a request for a Master Sign Plan that includes a canopy sign, ground sign, and directional signage for an existing office building. The 2.2-acre site is northwest of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Shawan Falls Drive and zoned Bridge Street District - Indian Run Neighborhood.~~

~~Ms. Fox swore in staff and members of the public who intended to address the Commission on this case.~~

Case Presentation

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a Master Sign Plan for OhioHealth Primary Care Physicians. Upon approval, the applicant would be able to proceed to Building Permit Review. The location of the site is within the Bridge Street District - Indian Run Neighborhood (BSD-IRN) District, north of the Dublin Plaza, where Kroger is located, and south of the U.S. Postal Service site. The South Fork Indian Run Creek runs along the west and south boundaries of the property. Access to the site is provided from Shawan Falls Drive. In September 2019, the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed and approved an application for a Minor Project Review (MPR) to permit minor exterior and site modifications. The approval included a 336-square-foot building entrance addition to an existing medical office building. The sign package application includes a building-mounted sign, which would be the awning sign; the building address numerals; and the ground sign replacement on the south side fronting West Bridge Street.~~

Building-Mounted Signs

~~The building-mounted sign is an approximately 16-square-foot sign mounted to the entrance canopy. Three-inch aluminum channel letters, painted Akzo Nobel Silver Satin with one-inch trim, capped with blue translucent vinyl. The "donut raceway" for the logo located to the left is one-inch deep aluminum, as well. The address identification sign is approximately three square feet located in the top right corner of the front façade of the building. The numbers will be four-inch aluminum channel letters painted Akzo Nobel Satin Silver with one-inch aluminum trim caps painted white.~~

Ground Sign

~~The existing ground sign, which fronts West Bridge Street, will be replaced with a monument sign of the same size. The sign face is approximately 43 square feet per side. The entire sign would be 10.5 feet in height. The sign face is approximately 3 feet, 9 inches in height; 9 feet, 6 inches in width; and 2 feet in depth, painted Akzo Nobel Blue Satin, with 1/2-inch, push through logo and lettering that is white translucent. The base of the sign will contain the 250 numerals for address identification, which will not be lit. The base of the sign is clad in brick to match the building. The sign will be located just west of the existing ground sign, which will be removed.~~