



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 9, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Way at 6:30 PM at 5555 Perimeter Drive. He 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.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Gary Alexander, Jamey Chinnock, Hilary Damaser, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way.

Staff members present: Bassem Bitar, Phil Hartmann, Christopher Will, Zachary Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Way noted that Mr. Garvin's name was erroneously omitted from the roll call of the March 12 meeting minutes.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Alexander seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the Minutes of the March 12 (as amended) and March 19, 2026 Regular Meetings.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

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.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Way stated that there is one case eligible for the consent agenda.

Case #26-005AFDP

Mount Carmel Dublin Signage – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the installation of three building- mounted blue “H” signs to aid in emergency wayfinding. Signs are oriented to face west toward Emerald Parkway, south toward Interstate 270, and east toward Sawmill Road. The 35 acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located northwest of the Interstate 270 and Sawmill Road intersection.

Mr. Way asked if any member wished to have a case removed from the consent agenda. No Commission members requested to pull the case from the consent agenda.

Mr. Way asked if any member of the public wished to comment on the consent agenda. There was no public comment.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the consent agenda.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

CASE REVIEW

Case #26-010CP

Emerald Parkway Mixed-Use Development – Concept Plan

Request for review and non-binding feedback for the construction of a new mixed-use development. The 16-acre site is currently zoned PCD-Thomas Kohler and is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Woerner Temple Road.

Applicant Presentation

Anna Brown, VanTrust, 955 Yard Street, Columbus, presented the proposal, explaining this was their second appearance before the Commission. She stated they had incorporated feedback from their presentation at the December 2025 PZC meeting and believed they had developed a better site plan. The proposal included 228 residential units in two four-story multifamily buildings and eight three-story townhomes, plus just under 20,000 square feet of commercial space in one inline property and two outlots.

Ms. Brown detailed the site layout, explaining the main residential entrance would be off Emerald Parkway leading to a clubhouse at the center. She described how they had clustered the townhomes differently than before, creating three clusters in U-shapes rather than street-facing rows. The retail properties were pulled to Woerner Temple Road to create the desired commercial cluster called for in the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan.

She walked through the site as though viewing it from a vehicle, highlighting the gateway feature added at the southwest corner per Commission feedback. Ms. Brown explained they had eliminated

the drive-through at this prominent corner location based on Commission comments, instead making it more inviting as the front door of the development.

The presentation included detailed views of the townhome design along Emerald Parkway, showing a 42-foot setback from the right-of-way and 60 feet from the curb. Each townhome would have a first-floor walkout with communal pedestrian outlets rather than direct access to Emerald Parkway, providing privacy and creating a more natural transition.

Ms. Brown described the amenities, including a clubhouse with leasing, fitness, and co-working spaces, plus pool and outdoor amenities. The pool would be heavily landscaped and positioned with a pool house structure for privacy. Two pickleball courts would be private for residents but add to the neighborhood feel.

She outlined major changes from the previous plan, including increased perimeter landscaping and screening with doubled setbacks on Parkwood Place to 60 feet and increased setbacks on Emerald Parkway to 42 feet. They had reduced residential density by eliminating the third southeast four-story building and relocating amenities to the site's core based on Commission feedback about scattered, unintentional green spaces.

The townhomes were redesigned in an inward-facing configuration rather than a row along Emerald Parkway, which Ms. Brown believed organized them more thoughtfully and better contained parking. This allowed creation of a long private boulevard connecting north to south, providing the streetscaping feature emphasized in the Special Area Plan.

They had redesigned the retail portion, eliminating one drive-through while maintaining another on the east side of the inline building, which Ms. Brown stated was necessary to attract quality tenants. The retail cluster was intended as an amenity for surrounding office areas, which brokers had indicated lacked adequate amenities.

Ms. Brown noted they had not incorporated the Signature Trail along Emerald Parkway in their plans but were 60 feet from the curb, exceeding the recommended 33-foot setback, and were open to integration. She explained they had completed a tree study and were preserving the George Geary Run tree cluster to the north and saving trees throughout the center where possible, though some areas presented challenges due to grade differences.

Updated renderings showed townhomes with modified peak structures based on feedback that the previous peaked roofs were too residential in character for a commercial area. The four-story building remained largely the same with balconies and first-floor walkouts to green space. The clubhouse rendering showed an inviting structure for visitors and residents, and the retail rendering used natural materials and lighter colors to fit the existing area character.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell provided an overview of the Concept Plan process, explaining they were looking at high-level elements like land use, densities, site layout, circulation, open space framework, and integration with surrounding areas. He described the 16-acre site bounded by Parkwood Place, Emerald Parkway, and Woerner Temple Road, currently zoned PCD (Planned Commercial Development) within the Thomas Kohler development.

Mr. Hounshell summarized Commission comments from December 2025, which included discussion about concentration and balance of uses, appropriateness of residential along Emerald Parkway given existing commercial character, recommendations about the gateway location at Woerner Temple Road and Emerald Parkway intersection, concerns about drive-through impacts on walkability, tree preservation, landscaping setbacks, and better integration of open space.

He reviewed the Community Plan designation of mixed use neighborhood and the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan, which provided specific recommendations for the Parkwood mixed use area. The plan called for neighborhood scale office, residential uses, and supporting commercial with shared

parking, building height transitions from one to two stories along Emerald Parkway to maximum four stories along Parkwood Place, tree preservation, gateway features, and activation of Parkwood Place.

Mr. Hounshell described the recently adopted Signature Trail Study, showing a shared use path extending across the city with a specific section planned for the east side of Emerald Parkway and north side of Woerner Temple Road. This would require right-of-way but was accommodated by the proposed 60-foot buffer.

He outlined the primary updates since December, including site layout changes, removal of residential buildings, addition of northern townhomes, removal of direct east-west connecting streets, elimination of one drive-through facility, and increased landscape buffering. The questions for Commission consideration focused on support for the general layout, distribution of uses including residential along Emerald Parkway, conceptual architectural character and massing, and the proposed open space network.

Commission Questions

Ms. Damaser questioned the three-story height along Emerald when the plan called for one story. Ms. Brown explained it was only six feet higher than the two-story office across the street, and three-story residential scaled differently than office, while being necessary for economic feasibility. Ms. Damaser also expressed concern about the loss of the northern park area. Ms. Brown explained this change was driven by feedback to activate the site rather than have unused park space, and by the need to maintain feasible unit counts after removing other residential buildings.

Mr. Chinnock asked about townhome parking arrangements and the balance of uses, noting the site remained residential-heavy without achieving true mixed-use integration. Ms. Brown explained that the market is not currently supportive of office development. She also noted the operational challenges of integrating retail below residential units.

Ms. Harter asked about creating connections between the turned-in townhomes and whether there were opportunities for front patios or gathering spaces. Ms. Brown indicated they would be happy to explore such features and had discussed smaller amenity spaces for different uses.

Mr. Alexander inquired about office vacancy rates in the area, which staff acknowledged tracking but could not provide specific numbers. He also asked about Community Plan connectivity features, with staff confirming the goal of connecting Emerald Parkway to Parkwood Place to activate the area.

Mr. Garvin asked about the December feedback regarding activating the northern park area. Mr. Way clarified that the feedback had been about distributing open space more evenly rather than concentrating it all in one location. Mr. Alexander noted that the spine concept was responsive to Commission comments about landscape connectivity.

Mr. Way explored the relationship between retail buildings and streets, the potential for live-work units, and opportunities for more distributed mixed-use throughout the development rather than concentrated commercial areas. He also questioned staff about defining green space boundaries along the former stream corridor and the clarity of the private boulevard through the commercial parking area.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Damaser stated that she supported the general layout improvement while expressing concerns about connectivity to potential future development to the east. She liked the townhouse U-shape configuration and separation of uses for safety reasons.

Mr. Chinnock appreciated the presentations but struggled with losing the park space, feeling the new plan seemed over-parked despite similar parking counts. He supported the retail repositioning but emphasized the need for well-designed town home facades along Emerald Parkway and suggested more integration around the clubhouse area. He supported pedestrian rather than vehicular connectivity to potential future park space to the east.

Ms. Harter appreciated the development team's efforts but also lamented the loss of green space and amenities. She emphasized the importance of the gateway connection to businesses across the street and the sustainability aspects of walkable development. She requested information about bus stop locations for future consideration.

Mr. Alexander supported the site layout and spine connection, finding the distribution of uses acceptable given extensive office space in the area. He noted the project created a mixed-use neighborhood by adding residential to existing office uses. He supported three stories along Emerald Parkway due to tucked-under parking reducing pavement. He suggested the four-story apartment building needed work to be uniquely Dublin and recommended refinements to architectural details.

Mr. Garvin was less supportive of residential along Emerald Parkway but acknowledged the Signature Trail could provide additional buffering. He agreed the distribution was a reaction to current market conditions but was concerned about the residential-heavy nature. He echoed concerns about extensive surface parking and emphasized his biggest issue was the loss of open space, feeling it looked like standard building yards rather than usable community green space.

Mr. Way supported the evolving layout and retail positioning along Woerner Temple, though he noted this created a sea of parking behind it. He continued to struggle with the mixed-use designation not being met according to community plan intent, calling for more use integration. He emphasized the need for innovative architecture and better open space distribution, suggesting the former creek area could anchor the north end while sprinkling more green space throughout the site.

Ms. Brown indicated they had received necessary feedback.

Case #26-015INF

Dublin Senior Living – Informal Review

Request for review and non-binding feedback for construction of a continuum of care facility and associated site improvements. The 17.6-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located 820 feet southwest of the corner of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.

Applicant Presentation

Jordan Dorsey, Sentry Land Company, 8620 Neely Lane, Evansville, Illinois, presented the proposal, explaining this was a different location from their presentation to the Commission at their December 2025 meeting. After receiving feedback that the previous site was inappropriate based on the Envision Dublin Plan regarding primary versus supplementary uses, building height, and layout, they had engaged extensively with city staff and held multiple neighborhood meetings, including a virtual session with 16 area representatives.

Mr. Dorsey described their company as specializing in luxury seniors housing communities providing a continuum of care across the Midwest, with a wellness focus including independent living, assisted living, and memory care. He cited Dublin's housing study indicating over 1,000 senior rental units would be needed by 2030, with their projections suggesting even higher demand.

The proposal involved a 16-acre parcel adjacent to Hopewell Elementary School, featuring a single structure with 160-170 senior housing units plus 16 single-story villas along the northern portion. The development would employ 70-80 people and include extensive amenities. Mr. Dorsey clarified they did not control an abandoned house on Bright Road that appeared in concept plans but hoped to obtain control if moving forward.

He described the site as outlined in the Envision Dublin Future Land Use Plan as neighborhood office, with the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan showing single-family residential on the northern portion and neighborhood office for the remainder. Mr. Dorsey stated that the project preserved the wellness corridor concept along Emerald Parkway, starting with Lifetime Fitness and continuing to Mount Carmel, with senior housing bookending the corridor.

The site plan showed 100-foot setbacks along Emerald Parkway, transitioning from two stories along Emerald Parkway to three-story maximum height, then down to single-story villas on the northern portion designated for residential use. Tree buffers would be preserved on east and west boundaries, with integration of a riverway feature similar to Mount Carmel's design through the center where additional trees would be preserved.

Mr. Dorsey emphasized they had reduced building height from four to three stories maximum based on Commission feedback, relocated senior housing from primary frontage to preserve office space potential, and maintained extensive setbacks and tree preservation. While acknowledging the proposed density exceeded neighborhood office recommendations, he noted precedent for this use type and significantly less square footage per acre than the northeast Beacon project.

Regarding Bright Road preservation, Mr. Dorsey described plans to enhance rural character through increased buffering, equestrian fencing, significant landscape features, and single-story structures representing single-family character with age-restricted, limited traffic use. They had reduced the villa count from 26 to 16 based on staff and neighbor recommendations, achieving three units per acre compared to the four per acre allowable for single family.

The Emerald Parkway frontage would feature appropriate 100-foot setbacks with significant landscaping, transitioning building height from two stories at Emerald Parkway to three stories centered on the parcel, then back to single story along Bright Road. All parking would be masked behind building facades and heavily landscaped to eliminate vehicle visibility from Emerald Parkway.

Connectivity plans included a private roundabout at the building center, with future connectivity anticipated to the Mount Carmel site as adjacent parcels developed. Open space would feature riverway landscaping similar to Mount Carmel's integrated design, utilizing green space between the main structure and villas for this feature with heavy landscaping and tree preservation.

Mr. Dorsey concluded with a representative architectural image, emphasizing their primary hope was feedback on land use, building height, and densities, with commitment to work intensively on appropriate architecture for the site.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar provided staff analysis, noting this was an Informal Review in a multi-step process that would require rezoning and planned unit development designation. The proposal required evaluation of land use and densities, general layout, and high-level details, with no determination required.

Mr. Bitar described the site location along Emerald Parkway extending to Bright Road, immediately east of Hopewell School. The future land use designation was neighborhood office, envisioned as one- to two-story offices potentially integrated with smaller scale developments, with principal uses being office, medical office, and institutional uses, and supporting uses including specifically referenced assisted living.

The Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan separated the site into a residential sub-area to the north and mixed use office to the south, using natural features as demarcation. The plan specified 100-foot minimum setbacks from Emerald Parkway, density matching the future land use designation, and residential density at four units per acre on the north side.

Mr. Bitar noted Emerald Parkway's designation as a corridor of significance requiring heightened treatment, and Bright Road's classification as a river character corridor with more natural, rural design. He reviewed the previous December proposal on the adjacent eastern site, where concerns included building height up to four stories, proximity to single-family homes, balance of principal versus secondary uses, layout suggestions, and questions about office market timing.

The current proposal showed density at about 17,000 square feet per acre compared to the recommended 9,500, though the Beacon project was approved at 26,000 square feet per acre with taller buildings much further from roads and residential uses. The proposed villa density was three dwelling units per acre. The main building would transition from two stories in front to three stories in the middle to one story along Bright Road.

Regarding natural features, most tree lines along edges would be preserved, though an existing tree line through the development would not be accommodated. The existing stream bed highlighted in the community plan as a potential amenity would be developed into a design feature at its western terminus.

Access would be via one point from Emerald Parkway and potentially one from Bright Road. Mr. Bitar noted concerns about proximity to the planned Bridge Park bridge roundabout, requiring coordination on access point positioning. The Bright Road access was proposed as potentially gated, subject to studies and fire department approval.

Site features included freestanding garage structures not typically supported in Dublin, requiring integration discussion, dumpster enclosure placement needing review, and circulation system flexibility for future connectivity. Architecture remained at character image level requiring adjustment as development progressed.

Mr. Bitar noted the building's relationship to adjacent Hopewell School, which had a two-story flat roof with gable ends, compared to the proposed building with main portions recessed, raising questions about street presence and relationship.

Staff questions focused on whether proposed uses and density adequately responded to Envision Dublin and site context, whether heightened massing responded appropriately to the site and adjacent structures, whether site layout complied with corridor special area plan, and architectural character approaches.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin questioned the reaction to density being much higher than recommended and whether buildings could be broken up and spread out more. Mr. Dorsey explained operational needs for

seniors housing required connected structures for different care levels, but expressed confidence in architectural design to create the appearance of multiple buildings rather than one long structure. Mr. Garvin asked about inverting the memory care and independent living locations to reduce the security fencing facing Emerald Parkway. Mr. Dorsey explained their courtyard treatment approach using attractive metal fencing with heavy landscaping and building material integration rather than solid screening.

Ms. Harter inquired about distances between the villas and the main amenities, noting potential challenges for seniors walking in winter conditions. Mr. Dorsey explained meal delivery services, golf cart transportation options, and staff shuttle services between areas.

Ms. Harter asked about Bright Road buffering, which Mr. Dorsey confirmed would include significant buffering with tall berms, landscaping, and evergreens, plus equestrian fencing to continue the rural theme. Primary signage would be on Emerald Parkway rather than Bright Road, with limited or emergency-only access from Bright Road via key fob for villa residents only.

Mr. Chinnock complimented the applicant for following the process and making improvements, noting this as proof the process worked. He raised concerns about building height with pitched roofs potentially being even taller than stated, asking about flat roof alternatives. Mr. Dorsey indicated willingness to consider flat roofs mixed with other roof types to address height concerns while maintaining residential character.

Mr. Chinnock asked about moving the memory care courtyard away from Emerald Parkway to reduce prominence on the main road. Mr. Dorsey explained they could study enclosing the courtyard completely and putting significant effort into making the building ends interesting architectural features rather than afterthoughts.

Mr. Chinnock questioned whether the roundabout would still function with only three-way access if the eastern parcel did not develop connectivity. Dorsey explained they envisioned building it as shown initially with future connectivity provisions, creating a focal point with artwork or landscaping while serving as the front entrance.

Ms. Damaser asked about timeline for the roundabout construction and sought clarification on the Bridge Park bridge location and connection plans. She questioned parking visibility from Emerald Parkway, noting it was beside rather than behind the building. Mr. Dorsey clarified their interpretation of behind the building facade and their intention to heavily landscape parking areas while preserving tree stands on both sides.

Ms. Damaser confirmed they had met with neighbors, which Mr. Dorsey affirmed, noting multiple conversations and a virtual session with 16 participants focused on preserving Bright Road's rural character through villa positioning and design.

She asked about land reservation for medical offices. Mr. Dorsey clarified that they referred to supporting future medical office development on the adjacent 18-acre parcel rather than within their site.

Ms. Damaser asked staff whether it was an oversight for Envision Dublin not to include senior institutional care as a primary use. Mr. Bitar explained the complexity of categorizing senior housing between institutional and residential uses.

Mr. Way asked about road connection requirements between Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. Mr. Bitar explained that no requirement existed but fire access needs would need evaluation. Mr. Way asked whether alternative circulation through parking lots could meet fire requirements while reducing pavement needs.

Mr. Way suggested to the applicant that villas could have separate access from Bright Road without connection to the main building, served by service pathways rather than full roads. Mr. Dorsey found this concept interesting and worth further study, as operational vehicle traffic between areas was not critical.

Public Comment

Mr. Bitar noted that feedback from the East Dublin Civic Association was included in packet materials.

Eric Bringardner, 4200 Bright Road, Dublin, expressed strong opposition, citing concerns about degradation of neighborhood character, his property being directly across from the development, and impacts on his family's quality of life. He described the area as having distinctive rural residential character with sparse population and quiet streets that drew their family to this unique Dublin neighborhood.

He detailed concerns about a gated entrance creating noise from emergency vehicles activating sirens at all hours near his children's bedrooms, frequent medical staff visits characteristic of such facilities, and changes to promises made during neighborhood meetings. He emphasized loss of peaceful outdoor space and property values, with his biggest concern being quality of life impacts for his family and neighbors.

Donna Keidel, 4170 Bright Road, Dublin, described purchasing her home 20 years ago for the unique rural setting coupled with city conveniences. She had trusted the city to stick to plans showing single-home residential across from her property and felt the three-story height exceeded the planned one to two stories. She was concerned about looking out at the backside of villas and requested maintaining the residential buffer between commercial and residential uses.

Ms. Keidel suggested siren gate requirements would necessitate emergency vehicles running sirens for certain periods before approaching, creating noise concerns. She proposed alternative development thinking outside property lines to put residential along Bright Road with commercial having all of Emerald frontage, using the natural stream buffer. She also suggested community projects like a third city pool, particularly an indoor pool lacking in Dublin that could bring competition revenue.

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, Dublin, spoke both as a 40-year neighborhood resident and professionally as a criminologist at The Ohio State University. He described the evolution of community plan designations from all single family to commercial to the current four-acre request, emphasizing original intentions for owner-occupied family homes matching the north side of the street.

Mr. Roth detailed serious security concerns about drug dealing activity in the neighborhood, particularly around Hopewell Elementary's north parking lot, connected to the area's vulnerability as an interstate interchange location. He described witnessing drug transactions and finding a deceased body recently, emphasizing the need for bright, owner-occupied single-family homes with children to create proper surveillance and deter criminal activity. He stressed the neighborhood was being targeted due to its proximity to the interchange and relative isolation.

Gage Brunswick, 4284 Macduff Place, Dublin, stated that as a resident since age nine, he laments nature loss but supports the proposal over office alternatives. He suggested building taller with underground parking and expressed hope the development would encourage older residents to move to such facilities, freeing single-family housing for younger families. He anticipated increased

foot traffic at Bridge Park and local park usage but requested more environmental protection features.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin appreciated the improvements and density considerations but emphasized the importance of addressing heightened massing on the Emerald Parkway side. He supported the one-story villa transition but suggested adjusting building angles to better connect with the neighborhood across the street rather than hiding behind complete landscaping. He wanted emergency vehicle access primarily directed to Emerald Parkway and emphasized the need to make buildings react more to Bright Road residents.

Mr. Alexander found the supporting use covered by the Special Area Plan and believed eliminating office requirements made sense given the site context and existing office vacancy challenges. He supported the two to three to two story transition, finding it compatible with the adjacent school's scale. He suggested villas should face Bright Road with rear entries like common house types to preserve character. He appreciated stone materials as characteristic of the community and supported the demand-driven nature of senior housing benefiting the community by freeing up single-family housing stock.

Ms. Harter thanked the applicant for listening to neighbors but expressed height concerns given existing school visibility in neighborhood backyards. She emphasized Bright Road's importance after recent changes eliminating cut-through traffic, noting new development pressure. She wanted villas set back further with enhanced landscaping maintaining rural character, expressing concerns about emergency vehicle routing and access points.

Mr. Chinnock praised the applicant's responsiveness and process following. He highlighted potential positive interactions between seniors and students. He countered concerns about villa proximity, noting their smaller size than typical single family homes, quiet nature without children, and high-end architecture creating positive neighborhood impacts. He supported the larger facility development as inevitable given zoning, preferring this thoughtful approach. He suggested separating villa access to mitigate traffic and emergency concerns while supporting overall facility quality.

Ms. Damaser liked the villa transition and Mr. Alexander's front door concept, finding the natural stream transition appropriate. She noted the larger building's setback similar to the school making it less visible from Bright Road. She recommended consulting Washington Township about emergency vehicle preferences and investigating siren entrance requirements.

Mr. Way supported the use as transitional from school to other development, urging focus on Bright Road character, quality, and placement. He encouraged continued resident engagement and suggested circulation options might reinforce rural character preservation.

Additional commissioner comments included Mr. Garvin suggesting incorporating Hopewell Elementary's interesting angles and Ms. Harter noting 25 homes backing up to the development requiring consideration.

Mr. Dorsey indicated he had received necessary feedback.

With no objection from the Commission, Mr. Way called for a 5 minute break. The meeting was reconvened with all members present.

Case #26-017INF

Dublin 18 Lot Split – Informal Review

Request for review and non-binding feedback on a proposed lot split creating a new 1.08-acre parcel for a future commercial development. The existing 5.08-acre parcel is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located at 3800 W. Dublin Granville Road.

Applicant Presentation

Dan O'Hara, Lawyers Development, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, representing the applicant, provided background history on the property. He explained owner Bob Myers had purchased a full 6.7-acre lot, then requested a lot split in 2021 that facilitated All Inclusive's purchase and development of the western portion. They were receiving similar feedback requesting lot splits in advance of development for this remaining property.

Mr. O'Hara described the proposal for approximately 6,000 square feet of one-story commercial space pulled toward the road to provide buffering from the adjacent Speedway gas station. The building would step up in height progression from one story at Speedway to two stories at the bank building to three or four stories at All Inclusive, with the triangle location blocking unsightly back portions of Sawmill site buildings.

The proposal was not presenting architecture since their goal was developing interest and facilitating property development by working with potential owner-occupants rather than developers. Interest had come from people wanting to own rather than rent buildings, typical for 6,000 square foot spaces.

The site plan showed the building pulled toward the road with 39 parking spaces positioned on the side and rear with minimal visibility from Route 161. Utilities were available on north and east sides. An existing easement through the property for storm sewer and utilities would be maintained in the lot split.

Mr. O'Hara characterized this as commercial rather than food service given size and parking limitations, with restaurant requirements exceeding their 39-space capacity. Their goal was facilitating opportunities and advancing development since prospective owner-operators preferred avoiding lengthy discussions about small properties.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar explained this was an Informal Review for a Bridge Street District property with a process similar to previous cases but confined to Planning and Zoning Commission authority, not requiring Council approval except for the lot split itself. The intent was providing feedback with no determinations required.

Mr. Bitar noted the whole parcel had previously included the Fifth Third Bank building and All Inclusive site, with a 2021 replot splitting off the All Inclusive parcel under more favorable circumstances with streets on three sides and larger size.

He described the future land use as mixed use urban, intended for transitioning auto-oriented uses to more walkable environments with three to six story buildings. The Bridge Street District Special Area Plan's East Bridge Street sub area had similar intent, emphasizing the Route 161 corridor as a future Bus Rapid Transit corridor.

The site fell within the Sawmill Center Neighborhood in the Bridge Street Code, where commercial center building types were only permitted along Sawmill Center Road frontage and part of Bridge

Park Avenue. Commercial center buildings were typically one story but could range up to three, while this site was technically outside that permitted area.

Mr. Bitar explained Bridge Street District requirements for eventual neighborhood streets serving as organizing features for blocks, showing a planned neighborhood street connecting Banker Drive to State Route 161. State Route 161 was designated a principal frontage street with access restrictions and heightened character requirements.

He noted the bus rapid transit study indicating eventual State Route 161 improvements requiring additional right of way, potentially up to 20 feet at the property frontage. The conceptual building location appeared to work with site geometry, easements, and utilities, with parking to side and rear. The challenge involved the one-story building acceptance and access consolidation needs.

Currently two access points served the Fifth Third Bank site. With State Route 161 being a principal frontage street, the intent was eventual consolidation to just the neighborhood street with other access through the grid system.

There was opportunity for northern connectivity where the existing site previously had access from Sawmill Road via a service drive to Banker Drive, which was modified to cut through traffic but could potentially be reopened for better connectivity consistent with service drive or alley character. Mr. Bitar noted development standards depended on actual building type since each had different lot coverage requirements and building zones. Commercial center building types allowed parking to the side while loft building types would require minimum two stories with no side parking.

Discussion questions focused on building type acceptability, general site layout and circulation, possible access point consolidation, and commission comfort with lot splitting before having defined use and site layout.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin noted the building type issue with the site being outside the zone permitting single-story commercial buildings. Mr. O'Hara explained cost obstacles of two-story buildings requiring elevators for small square footage, making one-story buildings more marketable for 5,000-6,000 square foot users.

Mr. Garvin questioned whether potential partners should come with development plans before acquiring lots. Mr. O'Hara cited their experience with the adjacent lot split facilitating discussions and reducing obstacles, with brokers indicating the smaller project size made lot split timing important for interested parties.

Mr. Alexander asked about timeline and standards, confirming Bridge Street standards predated the lot split. Mr. Bitar confirmed all standards were in place before 2021. Mr. Alexander sought clarification about access point relocation when the street grid completed, with Mr. Bitar explaining the principle frontage street would only intersect where neighborhood streets were located.

Ms. Harter asked about room for adjacent property improvements like fencing or landscaping. Mr. O'Hara explained the existing easement could accommodate landscaping in front of the proposed building to further block views of adjacent properties.

Mr. Chinnock asked whether larger building footprints were considered. Mr. O'Hara stated that parking constraints and awkward shapes were created by the bank and drive-through requirements. Mr. Chinnock also asked about access agreements and curb cut consolidation. Mr. Bitar explained the potential challenges of not knowing exactly where future development would occur.

Ms. Damaser asked about parking requirements for envisioned two-story mixed-use buildings. Mr. Bitar explained that Bridge Street District parking formulas included various bonuses and proximity considerations similar to All Inclusive's approval. She asked for more detail about two-story building feasibility. Mr. O'Hara reiterated elevator costs and market feedback about size constraints. Mr. Way asked whether the lot split would preclude development following the planned road and building frontage concept shown in area plans. Mr. Bitar explained it might not necessarily preclude it but could make it more challenging without certainty about achieving the Envision Dublin Community Plan's goals.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin expressed lack of support for the building type not matching the forward vision of dense, walkable development. His concern was supporting the split before the development plan could result in developers claiming inability to follow Envision Dublin due to lot shape constraints, creating circular logic about what should come first.

Mr. Alexander cited fairness concerns, noting they had denied a similar one-story proposal on this corridor previously, making it inappropriate to support this when they told another applicant they could not support similar proposals. He also noted they typically required seeing development plans rather than supporting lot splits without knowing the specific use.

Ms. Harter agreed with colleagues about precedent concerns, noting their consistent position about knowing the development outcome before approval.

Mr. Chinnock appreciated the willingness to work with the Commission but felt there were too many unknowns, including potential two- or three-story options, access points, and bigger picture considerations including Fifth Third Bank's eventual plans.

Ms. Damaser noted their charge to stick with the relatively new Envision Dublin Community Plan, which the current proposal did not meet as described.

Mr. Way noted the Commission had approved one-story buildings on State Route 161 previously but before Envision Dublin, which doubled down on density in this area. He found the site plan logical but worried about implications for the rest of the parcel and the area plans' vision for a new connecting road creating frontage for development.

Property owner Bob Myers addressed the Commission, explaining he had not viewed this as a development plan but rather a straightforward lot split. His goals were productive use providing employment and value, plus aesthetic improvement by shielding unattractive rear portions of Sawmill Road lots. He noted practical considerations that smaller buildings attracted owner-occupants preferring to avoid extensive approval processes.

Mr. Myers expressed willingness to withdraw the request if Commissioners were uncomfortable, noting he could maintain existing entrance points. He complimented the Commission's preparation and questioning, offering openness to alternative approaches.

Mr. Way recused himself from discussion of the following item and left the room.

Case #26-006Z-PDP (Informal)

**Cosgray Commons – Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan (Informal)
Request for review and non-binding feedback for a mixed-use development
comprised of office, residential, commercial and open space. The 43.3-acre site is
zoned ID-2, Research Flex District consists of two parcels and is located southwest of
the roundabout at Post Road/State Route 161 (SR-161) and University Boulevard.**

The applicant requested to postpone to the next meeting due to the late hour.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Harter seconded to postpone Case #26-006Z-PDP to the next meeting.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Bitar announced that Council was expected to appoint a new commission member on Monday, April 13, who would hopefully join by the following week's meeting. He noted the next meeting would include the postponed Cosgray Commons case and a text modification for Dublin Coffman High School regarding a scoreboard, which should be brief.

Mr. Bitar stated that staff intends to provide data on administrative approvals, which have been expanded through recent code amendments but not regularly reported to the Commission. He also reminded commissioners about a walkability presentation by nationally recognized expert Jeff Speck the following week. Mr. Speck was part of a team retained by the City to examine the West Bridge Street corridor and refine East Bridge Street recommendations, with expectations for firmer proposals by June and a plan later in the year.

Mr. Way announced he would not be present for the following week's meeting, so Mr. Alexander would serve as chair.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 pm.


Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission


Deputy Clerk of Council