



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 15, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Way at 6:30 PM at 5555 Perimeter Drive. Mr. Way welcomed attendees and noted that the meeting could be joined in person or accessed via livestream on the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Way led the Pledge of Allegiance.

NEW MEMBER OATH OF OFFICE

Assistant Law Director Anthony Severyn administered the oath of office to new member Hilary Damaser.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Gary Alexander, Jamey Chinnock, Hilary Damaser, Jason Deschler, Kathy Harter, Kim Way

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Anthony Severyn, Heidi Rose

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Deschler moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the December 11, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Damaser, abstain; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, abstain; Mr. Deschler, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0-2.]

Mr. Way explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when platting and property rezoning is under consideration, with Council receiving recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has final decision-making responsibility.

He outlined the meeting procedures: applicants present first, followed by staff analysis and recommendation, Commission questions, public comment, then Commission deliberation. No new agenda items would be introduced after 10:30 PM. Speakers were asked to use the microphone and keep comments to 3 minutes.

Anyone intending to address the Commission was sworn in by Mr. Way.

CASE REVIEW

Case #25-090AFDP

Vista Church Pickleball Courts – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with text modifications to allow outdoor recreational courts. The 6.63-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Vista Community Church.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Damaser seconded to postpone Case #25-090AFDP to the February 5, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Case #25-115FDP

All In Dublin – Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan to accommodate 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 Bunker Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Jena Kessler, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, presented on behalf of the ownership team. She began by highlighting that the project was pursuing LEED Silver certification, noting that the location and site characteristics were particularly helpful for achieving this goal through points for transit access and walkability.

Ms. Kessler outlined four main categories of updates since the Preliminary Development Plan stage presented in September:

Regarding the open space updates, she explained how they had addressed feedback about the generator location in the pocket park to the north. The generator had been relocated and right-sized, and while kept in the general area, it would be enclosed along with other utilities to create separation and privacy for the pocket park from the street. The park design had evolved to a more organic shape incorporating seating, benches, a water feature, and a pollinator garden. She clarified that the generator would only run during power outages and weekly tests, with the water feature helping to mitigate any sound concerns.

For the gateway corner open space, Ms. Kessler described how they had removed the landscape buffer that previously prevented easy access, increased hardscape areas, and added more seating opportunities. The space had been reclassified from a pocket park to a plaza based on discussions with staff. The architectural feature at this corner had been updated from an angled design to a curved feature, making it more inviting and increasing transparency.

Ms. Kessler explained that while they still met the required 50,000 square feet of open space, some waivers were needed due to how the spaces were designated, particularly along the SR 161 frontage where future bus rapid transit (BRT) improvements would require dedication of approximately 19 feet of right-of-way.

Discussing architectural updates, she highlighted changes to the SR 161 facade where the entire first floor now featured lighter accent brick to differentiate it from upper floors and create a mixed-use feel. Awnings had been added along with updated storefront glazing for increased

transparency. The east facade, which previously featured a large art wall, had been significantly revised to include more transparency with the art wall becoming additive to the architecture rather than dominating the entire facade. Three locations for public art had been designated: under the covered plaza, at the building corner, and as a mural that could wrap the corner.

Regarding parking, Ms. Kessler confirmed they were providing one space per unit, explaining that the project's financing required a 30-year commitment with 25% of units set aside for people with disabilities, which influenced their parking approach. After studying potential pedestrian connections through the parking area, they had decided in consultation with staff to prioritize meeting landscaping requirements for a more attractive parking area.

She concluded by addressing rooftop equipment concerns raised at the previous meeting, showing that individual unit heat pumps would be naturally screened by the building's parapets based on sight-line studies from eye level.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar provided a comprehensive overview of the project's context within Dublin's planning framework. He began by explaining that this was a Final Development Plan, the last step in the three-step Bridge Street District approval process before the applicant could apply for site and building permits.

Mr. Bitar described the site's location at the northeast corner of West Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive, noting its complicated nature with three street frontages and its identification as a gateway location in previous planning efforts. He explained how the site had been split from a larger parcel specifically to allow for this type of development.

He outlined how the project aligned with various planning documents, including the Envision Dublin Community Plan which designated the area as Mixed Use Urban, encouraging active mixed uses including office, commercial, hotel, multi-family residential, and eating establishments. The project fell within the Bridge Street District Special Area Plan's East Bridge Street subarea, where the vision was to transform the current auto-oriented environment into a walkable one over time.

Mr. Bitar emphasized the site's position within the Sawmill Center Neighborhood of the Bridge Street District, where the intent is to promote an active, walkable destination with integrated mixed uses. He noted the plan for a greenway along Dublin Center Drive that would terminate just north of the site, making the pocket park a logical terminus with connectivity to the gateway at Sawmill Road.

Regarding the street network, he explained that the site was surrounded by a district connector street (Dublin Center Drive) and a corridor connector street (SR 161), with future neighborhood streets envisioned to create proper blocks. While the site didn't currently meet technical block and lot requirements, it was consistent with the area's vision, and the proposed site access off Bunker Drive aligned almost exactly with where future access was envisioned.

Mr. Bitar detailed the streetscape requirements, noting that while SR 161 frontage would remain unchanged pending future BRT improvements (with the applicant providing 19 feet of right-of-way dedication), Dublin Center Drive and Bunker Drive would receive standard streetscape treatments including on-street parking with granite curbs. These improvements would be implemented by the applicant but weren't part of the commission's review as details would continue to be worked out with engineering and transportation staff.

He then addressed how the applicant had responded to the seven conditions of approval from the Preliminary Development Plan stage. Key site plan elements requiring action included:

- A waiver for the mechanical equipment enclosure's north wall being outside the required building zone
- A waiver for property line coverage falling short along SR 161 due to open spaces

- A waiver for impervious lot coverage at 79% (maximum allowed is 70%), largely due to hard surfaces for urban public spaces and the right-of-way dedication

The parking plan showed a technical requirement of 88 spaces (accounting for transit proximity bonuses), with 75 spaces proposed. Mr. Bitar noted that comparable uses in Central Ohio often had less parking, and the applicant had conservatively not counted available on-street parking spaces. Staff supported the parking plan believing it would be sufficient.

Regarding the building itself, Mr. Bitar detailed numerous technical requirements and requested waivers:

- Parapet heights ranging from 1-5 feet (code requires 2-6 feet)
- Entrance design requirements for glass in doors (water meter room entrance excepted)
- Minimum finished floor elevation requirements for privacy (two units wouldn't meet due to existing grading)
- Transparency requirements with minor deviations on some facades
- Minimum entrance requirements per street frontage
- Vertical increment requirements (north elevation slightly exceeded 40-foot maximum)
- Primary building materials at the corner feature where fiber cement panels were proposed instead of required brick, stone, or glass

Staff recommended conditions included working with applicants on storm water management, streetscape elements, access drive details, open space edge definition, landscaping conflicts with storm water chambers, architectural details including window trim and door detailing, lighting calculations, and coordination with Dublin Arts Council on public art installations.

Mr. Bitar concluded by stating that with the proposed administrative departures, waivers, and conditions, staff believed the plan met all applicable criteria for a Final Development Plan.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin opened the questioning by seeking clarification about the 30-year commitment for 25% of units for people with disabilities and how that related to parking needs. He inquired about the impact of the SR 161 right-of-way dedication on open space calculations and waivers. He also expressed concern about the generator enclosure's proximity to the sidewalk and asked if any treatments had been considered to lessen its impact. Ms. Kessler responded that the 7-foot height was necessary to screen the generator, though they felt the buffer provided privacy for the pocket park. She acknowledged they were limited by existing utility locations but agreed that additional landscaping could help.

Mr. Deschler clarified that despite updated narratives mentioning "business," the project included only internal offices, not commercial businesses. When asked about alternatives to the awnings on the south elevation, Ms. Kessler mentioned possibilities including sunshades, traditional canopies, or various fabric options with different light filtering capabilities.

Mr. Deschler asked for details about underground parking feasibility. Ms. Kessler explained they had studied it but found the building width could not accommodate double-loaded parking, would still require surface parking and a ramp, and would create vertical accessibility challenges for the intended population.

Mr. Deschler asked about the resident population mix.

Dan Scheinman, TFG Housing Resources, 685 S. Front Street, Columbus, clarified that their goal was a mixed-age, mixed-ability community, not one exclusively for seniors and people with disabilities. He stated that 25% of units would be set aside for people with disabilities (required by funding), 30-35% would have senior preference, and the remainder would be general workforce housing.

Mark Dunham, All Inclusive Living, 215 N. Front Street, Columbus, confirmed this had always been the intent - an intergenerational, inclusive community rather than one segregated by age or ability. Mr. Deschler expressed concern about the lack of private outdoor space for residents, particularly if families with children lived there, given that the public open spaces were on busy streets. He worried about safety and the absence of protected areas for children to play.

Mr. Alexander questioned whether lot coverage calculations included the SR 161 dedication area. Staff indicated that they did not. He also asked whether the various waivers requested were comparable to other Bridge Street District projects. Mr. Bitar confirmed they were. He asked if the applicant was comfortable with all 13 proposed conditions, which Ms. Kessler confirmed.

Ms. Harter inquired about coordination of refuse collection areas with the adjacent bank property, bus stop locations relative to the project, and the potential to lower speed limits on surrounding streets. She emphasized the importance of certified installers for materials and windows, which Ms. Kessler assured would be specified in construction documents.

Mr. Chinnock focused on technical aspects including RTU screening and parapet heights. He expressed concern that changes in mechanical unit locations or sizes might compromise the parapet screening, and suggested a condition be added to address this. He also questioned the aesthetics of the awnings, feeling they appeared "gimmicky" as they were not actual storefronts, and asked about security measures for the increasingly public southeast corner plaza. Ms. Kessler explained that doors would be badge-access controlled while still allowing the space to function for both residents and community when appropriate.

Ms. Damaser asked about parking overflow concerns given only one space per unit was provided. Mr. Bitar responded that similar projects typically required less parking than code requirements, and the examples provided showed some with nearly half as many spaces being successful.

Mr. Way raised several detailed points including the screen wall height for parking lot screening, questioning whether 36 inches would adequately block vehicle headlights. He suggested relocating parking lot light poles from the middle of drive aisles to landscape islands for protection from vehicles. He also emphasized the importance of year-round visual interest at the pocket park terminus of the greenway, suggesting evergreen plantings might be more appropriate than seasonal pollinator gardens in such a visible location.

Public Comment

One comment was received and distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock expressed strong support, stating the long process had shown the system working effectively. He appreciated all concessions made by the applicant and the hard work by staff. He supported leaving the generator fully screened but wanted to see alternatives to the awnings. He was generally in favor of the project with conditions. He expressed interest in adding language about parapet heights if mechanical units changed.

Ms. Damaser stated that while she lacked the historical context of other commissioners, she really liked the project and was impressed with the use for that corner location.

Ms. Harter praised the collaborative effort between the applicant and City, particularly highlighting the sustainable building approach and excellent location for walkability and independence for residents of all ages. She agreed the awnings could be redesigned and emphasized the importance of ensuring quality installation and public art integration. She encouraged consideration of including high school students in the art selection process.

Mr. Alexander expressed strong support while noting his only reluctance concerned the corner entry treatment. He stated that the building breaks into two pieces without proper continuity, unlike previous submissions where brick wrapped around. However, he specifically supported keeping the awnings as a good urban gesture that diminishes the scale of the building.

Mr. Deschler stated he liked the project and its appropriateness for the location. He appreciated the front design updates and the team's responsiveness to previous feedback. However, he remained concerned about parking and the lack of private outdoor space for residents, feeling the public spaces along busy streets were inadequate especially for potential families with children. He indicated he would not support the project due to these concerns.

Mr. Garvin expressed support for the changes made, particularly agreeing that the corner material should be of the highest quality. He supported the awnings despite their somewhat artificial nature given the lack of actual retail uses. His primary concern remained the parking count, calculating that with multi-bedroom units potentially having families with multiple drivers plus guests, 75 spaces seemed insufficient for a 30-year commitment. He struggled with this issue though acknowledged the district's goal of density with reduced parking.

Mr. Way provided context about changing parking perspectives, noting that during 2020 the Commission had focused on reducing excess parking due to remote work trends. He emphasized that the site was located on a proposed BRT line representing significant regional investment in non-car transportation. He characterized the project as groundbreaking for the Bridge Street/SR 161 corridor and felt comfortable with the parking plan given the expected resident demographics and transit options. He argued against underground parking that would erode the site's open space achievements.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the parking plan.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Garvin, no; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, no; Ms. Harter yes.

[Motion carried 5-2]

Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the following administrative departures:

Apartment Building Type

- 1) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(2) – Non-Street Façade Transparency (East Façade, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Floors) to allow 14% transparency on each of the upper three floors on the east façade (facing Pocket Park B).
- 2) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials (South and West Facades) to allow 77% primary building materials on each of the building's south and west facades.

Open Space Types

- 3) 153.064(G)(1)(a) – Minimum Size (Pocket Park B) to allow Pocket Park B to be 4,110 square feet in area.

- 4) 153.064(G)(1)(a) – Minimum Width (Plaza A) to allow Plaza A to be 55 feet in width.

Vote: Mr. Deschler, abstain; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes.

[Motion carried 6-0-1]

Mr. Chinnock moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the following waivers:

Building Types

- 1) 153.062(D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height to allow parapet heights ranging from 1' to 5'.
- 2) 153.062(F)(3)(c) – Entrance Design (Water Meter Room Door) to allow a flush door with no glazing at the entrance to the water meter room.

Apartment Building Type

- 3) 153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage (W. Dublin Granville Road) to allow 66% front property line coverage along W. Dublin Granville Road.
- 4) 153.062(O)(3)(a)(1) – Corner Side Required Building Zone (Mechanical Equipment Enclosure) to allow the mechanical equipment enclosure to be approximately 2' 3" from the Bunker Drive right-of-way line.
- 5) 153.062(O)(3)(a)(2) – Impervious Lot Coverage to allow 79% impervious lot coverage.
- 6) 153.062(O)(3)(b) – Minimum Finished Floor Elevation to allow 2 of the 5 ground-story dwelling units along Dublin Center Drive to be less than 2.5 feet above the sidewalk elevation.
- 7) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(1) – Street Façade Transparency (West Façade, 1st Floor) to allow 17% first story transparency on the west façade.
- 8) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(2) – Non-Street Façade Transparency (East Façade, 1st Floor) to allow 13% transparency on the first floor of the east façade (facing Pocket Park B).
- 9) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(3) – Street Façade Number of Entrances to allow 2.5 entrances along each of W. Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive and no entrances along Bunker Drive.
- 10) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments Required (North Façade) to allow vertical divisions of 46.50' and 46.67' along the north façade (facing the parking lot).
- 11) 153.062(O)(3)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials (Southwest Façade) to allow 25% primary building materials on the southwest façade (corner feature), 72% on the north façade, and 53% on the east façade (facing Pocket Park B).

Open Space Types

- 12) 153.064(G)(1)(a) – Minimum Size (Plaza A) to allow Plaza A to be 2.645 square feet in area.
- 13) 153.064(G)(1)(b) – Open Space Proportion (Pocket Plaza B) to allow Pocket Plaza B to have a length to width ratio of 3.06:1.
- 14) 153.064(G)(2)(a) – Minimum Percentage of Street Right-of-Way Frontage (Pocket Park B) to allow Pocket Park B to have 13% of its perimeter along the W. Dublin Granville Road right-of-way.

15) 153.064(G)(4)(f) – Maximum Impervious and Semi-Pervious Surface (Pocket Park B) to allow 36% imperious surface coverage for Pocket Park B.

Vote: Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Deschler, abstain; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried 6-0-1]

The Commission then discussed adding a 14th condition regarding parapet heights and mechanical equipment screening. After Mr. Bitar displayed proposed language stating that if mechanical equipment size or location changed such that parapets would not provide screening, the parapet height should be reconsidered, the commission agreed to this addition.

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall continue to work with the City's Engineering staff to ensure the proposed development is consistent with all City engineering requirements, including the City's stormwater management requirements.
- 2) The applicant shall continue to work with the City's Transportation and Mobility staff to define the transitional area between the existing and proposed right-of-way along W. Dublin Granville Road.
- 3) The applicant shall continue to coordinate with the City's Engineering and Transportation & Mobility staff to finalize and incorporate the required design elements from the City's Bridge Street District Streetscape Character Guidelines and Bridge Street District Code. These elements will include, but not be limited to, on-street parking on both Dublin Center Drive and Bunker Drive, sidewalk widths that support the use, street trees, lighting, and access drive width and turning radii details. Approval of construction plans for the development shall be contingent on the incorporation of these elements.
- 4) The planting plan and plant selection for the southern strip of Pocket Park A shall be modified to create a defined edge along the walkway north of the building, consistent with the pocket park's other edges.
- 5) The open space details shall be updated to include the required number of waste receptacles and verify compliance with the outdoor seating requirements.
- 6) The underground stormwater chamber shall be designed so as to accommodate the trees in the parking lot islands as shown in the landscape plan.
- 7) The building's southwest corner shall be refined to include a higher quality material and refined panel/banding design to better complement the proportions of the adjacent building elements, potentially including additional flanking canopies to staff's satisfaction.
- 8) The building's architectural details shall be refined to include trim around windows in areas where fiber cement panels are used, relief detail on the water meter room door, updated porch column/entablature details, and more defined headers above the upper floor windows to the satisfaction of staff.
- 9) Additional window, awning and lighting (building and site) details shall be provided to verify consistency with the BSD code to the satisfaction of staff.
- 10) Further detailing, relief and landscaping shall be added to the northern wall of the mechanical equipment enclosure to mitigate its height and proximity to the public sidewalk along Bunker Drive, and a weather-resistant material shall be used for the mechanical enclosure and refuse enclosure gates.

- 11) The height of the street wall along the Banker Drive frontage shall be reduced to 36" to meet the BSD standards, and information shall be provided at the time of permitting to verify that the wall will be outside of the sight visibility triangle.
- 12) Signage shall be subject to separate review and approval.
- 13) All public art details shall be coordinated with the Dublin Art's Council's Public Art Board.
- 14) If the size or location of the rooftop mechanical changes, modifications to the parapet height shall be made to ensure proper screening.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, no; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.

[Motion carried 6-1]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch shared the following:

- The Commission's next meeting will be Thursday, January 22, 2026 with materials available Friday, January 16, 2026.
- The City is doing an audit of the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations. A survey has been sent out for feedback and additional virtual meeting opportunities will be scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Jayne Maxwell
Deputy Clerk of Council