



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 7, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. 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, Kathy Harter, Victoria Newell, Kim Way
Commission Members absent: Hilary Damaser, Dan Garvin
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Ms. Harter moved, Mr. Alexander seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the April 9 and April 16 Regular Meetings.

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

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 procedures for the evening, stating that the Commission would hear an update from staff and consultants on a pending code amendment as well as the West Innovation District Setback and Buffer Study. No determination would be made, but public comment would be accepted. He requested that anyone wishing to make public comment keep their remarks to 3 minutes or less and refrain from repeating information. He also asked the audience to refrain from side conversations, applause, or other audible reactions to protect the process.

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

CASE REVIEW

Case #26-001ADMC

Discussion and Feedback for Code Amendments to the City of Dublin Zoning Code Sections 153.002, 153.016, and 153.037-153.042 for the West Innovation District.

West Innovation District Setback and Buffer Study

Update on the setback and buffer study as it relates to the ID-6 district implementation.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch opened the presentation by providing an overview of the background and context for the proposed code amendments. She explained that this process originated from a previous rezoning application that came before the Commission in February 2025 and was subsequently tabled at City Council in August of that year. Council directed staff to develop targeted zoning amendments to address compatibility concerns that had been raised throughout that process. As a result, staff proceeded with the creation of a new zoning district, identified as ID-6, within the West Innovation District code framework. Ms. Rauch emphasized that the intent of the new district was to provide a sensitive transition to the existing residential uses, particularly those across Cosgray Road and within the Ballantrae neighborhood. She reiterated that no determination would be made at this meeting; rather, the goal was to present information, receive public comment, and gather feedback from the Commission with an aim toward bringing a final draft to the May 21st meeting for a potential recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the background of the planning process, noting that the draft code had been informed by the Envision Dublin Community Plan's recommendation for flex innovation land use, equivalent to the ID-2 district, which served as the starting point. She highlighted key elements incorporated into the draft in response to feedback received during the January Commission meeting and throughout the broader public engagement process. These included refinements to the advanced manufacturing definition, clarifications regarding building height reduction from 68 feet to 45 feet with the inclusion of rooftop mechanical screening, setback and buffering provisions, and the addition of environmental and operational intent language. She further summarized stakeholder feedback, noting that property owners and development professionals had expressed concerns about the cost burden imposed by the buffer requirements and its impact on buildable area, while also expressing support for the general approach and a willingness to be good neighbors. Ms. Rauch then summarized the key elements of the proposed code, which included the creation of the new ID-6 district focused on low-intensity development, removal of data centers as a permitted or conditional use throughout the entire West Innovation District, a 200-foot buffer, prohibition on standalone warehousing and distribution, a 45-foot building height limit inclusive of mechanical screening, operational limitations requiring all activity to occur within buildings, and restrictions on loading and service orientation toward Cosgray Road.

Consultant Presentation

Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way, Cincinnati, offered brief introductory remarks, contextualizing the zoning work within the broader planning hierarchy. He described Dublin's planning approach as methodical, beginning with the comprehensive plan, proceeding through the special area plan, the integrated implementation strategy, and culminating in the zoning code. He characterized this progression as an exemplary process, noting that the zoning code did not simply appear but was the product of a deliberate series of policy steps. He encouraged the Commission

to view the various elements of the proposed code as an integrated package, explaining that definitions, intent statements, permitted uses, and use-specific development standards all work in concert with one another. He acknowledged that a balance was being sought between the concerns of existing residents and the economic development objectives established in the comprehensive plan, and that the process remained open to continued refinement.

Keeghan Stitt-White, McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way, Cincinnati, presented the specifics of the proposed West Innovation District code update. He began by confirming that the only district-wide change proposed for the entire WID was the removal of data centers as a permitted or conditional use, based on community feedback and the incompatibility of data centers with the intended character of the innovation district.

Turning to the ID-6 Research Transition District specifically, Mr. Stitt-White reviewed the proposed intent statement, explaining that it was designed to clearly state the purpose and character of the district, guide the interpretation of regulations, and provide a policy basis for reviewing future applications. He noted that the intent statement emphasized support for cutting-edge economic development, fostering innovation, advancing research, providing a sensitive transition to established single-family residential neighborhoods, minimizing adverse impacts including noise, lighting, and other off-site effects, and encouraging sustainable practices utilizing nontoxic inputs to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Stitt-White then distinguished between principal and accessory uses, explaining that a principal use is the primary use for which a property is occupied, while an accessory use is secondary and cannot operate independently. In the ID-6 context, accessory uses would include parking areas, bicycle parking, internal storage, and loading areas.

He presented the six proposed principal uses for the ID-6 district: office (general and medical), parks and open space, advanced manufacturing, construction and contract services, and research and development. He noted that of these, only advanced manufacturing was a new proposed use. He walked through the new definition for advanced manufacturing in detail, describing it as an industrial use designed to engage in the manufacturing of finished products or component parts from previously prepared materials, utilizing a high level of specialized skill and advanced technologies such as computer-controlled systems, robotics, and automation. He noted that the definition also included sample accessory activities such as quality control, internal storage, distribution, and on-site sales, provided they remain incidental and subordinate to the principal use.

Mr. Stitt-White then outlined the use-specific standards applicable to advanced manufacturing within ID-6. These standards required that the use operate entirely within a building, prohibited on-site outdoor storage, and imposed performance standards to minimize adverse impacts from odor, smoke, vibration, electromagnetic interference, and similar effects. He addressed construction and contract services, noting that while the definition would remain unchanged, new use-specific limits would require all activity within a building and restrict the outdoor storage of heavy equipment, with an exception carved out for fleet vehicles. He defined fleet vehicles as small-scale vehicles used for delivery, pickup, or service, such as a sprinter van for an HVAC company, and clarified that the definition explicitly excluded heavy machinery, semi-trucks, non-recreational trailers, and construction equipment.

Regarding research and development, Mr. Stitt-White explained that the definition would remain the same but that ID-6-specific limits would be added, including requirements that operations occur entirely within a building, prohibition on on-site outdoor storage, and a limitation that any fabrication, assembly, or processing be confined to prototype or pilot-scale development only. He noted that the intent was not to permit manufacturing under this use, but that incidental

manufacturing for prototype development would be allowable. On-site retail, wholesale distribution, and commercial sales would be prohibited.

With respect to accessory uses, Mr. Stitt-White reported that all existing accessory uses would remain as proposed, with one modification to the warehousing, wholesaling, and distribution accessory use. New limitations would require that the use function solely to support the principal use on site and would prohibit its operation as a standalone logistics, wholesale, or bulk storage facility. Most significantly, the warehousing, wholesaling, or distribution of goods not created by the principal use itself would be prohibited.

Mr. Stitt-White also addressed the similar use determination process, explaining that any use not listed in the code would need to meet all established criteria, including consistency with the district's intent statement, and could not be more intensive than any currently permitted use in ID-6.

Turning to development standards, Mr. Stitt-White confirmed that the building height would remain at 45 feet, inclusive of rooftop equipment and screening. He noted that a building of 35 feet in structural height would therefore have 10 feet available for mechanical installations. The 200-foot setback from Cosgray Road would remain. Outdoor storage and operations would not be permitted. Service areas including overhead garage doors would not be permitted on building elevations along Cosgray Road. Ground signs would not be permitted along Cosgray Road. New site lighting standards had been added in response to January meeting comments, including a zero-foot-candle allowance for light trespass across property lines adjacent to residential uses, and a requirement that parking lot lighting be reduced by 50 percent after 10:00 p.m. Landscape and buffering along streets would be regulated by the buffer and setback design manual. Screening from residential properties, aside from Cosgray Road, would require 90 percent opacity using a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and native understory shrubs.

Regarding architectural requirements, Mr. Stitt-White noted the addition of an architectural intent statement specific to ID-6 that emphasized smaller-scale buildings, high-quality detail-oriented design blending office aesthetics, and heightened architectural emphasis on facades for buildings directly adjacent to residential properties. Permitted building materials were not proposed to change.

Chris Hermann and Kymberly Ware, MKSK, 462 S. Ludlow Street, Columbus, presented the West Innovation District Setback and Buffer Study. Mr. Hermann introduced the presentation as an extension of Chapter 153.04, the site development requirements, specifically supplementing the setback, landscape, and design requirements for the ID-6 zone. He noted that setback distances applied to both buildings and pavement and were measured from the future right-of-way.

Mr. Hermann described the existing site conditions, identifying Cosgray Road along the east side of the ID-6 area, the intersection of Cosgray and Shier Rings at the northeast corner, and a future extension of Shier Rings along the north side. He noted the presence of two existing farmsteads as well as existing tree rows that were considered important for preservation. He also identified overhead transmission lines along the western property line, a park to the north, existing residential development to the east, and railroad tracks to the south.

Ms. Ware then described the design approach, organized around three conditions: primary streets (predominantly Cosgray Road and Shier Rings Road), local internal streets within the development, and the roundabout at the intersection of Cosgray and Shier Rings roads. She explained that primary streets would predominantly utilize mounding as the screening approach, internal streets would use dense planting, and the roundabout would be treated as a gateway moment celebrating entry into the district.

Ms. Ware elaborated on the Cosgray Road corridor, describing it as the primary focus of the mounding and dense planting approach given its adjacency to residential uses on the east side and the requirement of the 200-foot setback. She stated that the intent was to maintain the rural character of the corridor and provide maximum screening of future development. She noted that the Cosgray Road corridor would be enhanced with two additional drive lanes and a planted center median. She described how a 14-foot mound between the sidewalk and the development area would substantially obstruct visual connections from the street right-of-way to any development at the 45-foot building height limit. Along Shier Rings Road, a smaller setback would limit the mound to approximately 8 feet in height but would still achieve the 90 percent screening standard, with commercial adjacency on the north side allowing for a somewhat less intensive treatment than Cosgray Road. For local internal streets, mounding would not be utilized and development would be positioned closer to the right-of-way, with dense planting used as the screening method. Where architectural features warranted it, more open planting could be employed to allow visual connectivity into the development.

Mr. Hermann described the kit-of-parts approach to the setback area, consisting of the right-of-way with shared-use path and street trees, a utility easement zone where applicable, mounding with a naturalized slope on the public side and a steeper slope on the private side to maximize developable area, stormwater management areas positioned behind the mounds and away from the public edge, and ultimately the building itself. He noted the intention for stormwater areas to be grouped behind the mounds.

Ms. Ware then addressed the approach to mound design, emphasizing that the intent was not to create continuous toothpaste berms but rather naturalized, undulating forms that varied in both vertical and horizontal dimensions. She described a maximum slope of 6-to-1 on the public side for a natural appearance, and a 3-to-1 slope on the private side to reduce depth and maximize usable area. This approach would create a rolling hills character along the Cosgray Road corridor.

With respect to planting, Ms. Ware described a layered approach using three to four layers of naturalized drifts with organic groupings of both evergreen and deciduous trees. Near the roundabout and Shier Rings Road, ornamental plantings with shrubs and grasses would be incorporated to celebrate those intersections. Tree spacing would be staggered, ranging from 6 to 10 feet on center to achieve a naturalized appearance. Tree installation sizes at the time of development would be 2-to-3-inch caliper, described as a middle ground between smaller whips that would provide no immediate screening and larger specimens that would be difficult to establish and cost-prohibitive. This size was selected to provide meaningful screening from day one while establishing the intended character.

Ms. Ware addressed the treatment of mounds at property boundaries, noting that where a mound reached the edge of a property, it would taper at a maximum slope of 4-to-1 toward its terminus, creating a naturalized rolling-hills appearance without a visual break in the screening as viewed from the corridor. Existing tree rows would be preserved in place, with new planting brought down to meet them to create a sense of continuous treatment.

Mr. Hermann stated that stormwater management areas would be grouped behind the mounds and away from the public edge. He described the desire for the shared-use path to meander through the mounding wherever possible to create a more interesting and varied pedestrian experience, potentially requiring easements in some locations. Ms. Ware emphasized that the screening areas were also intended to function as public space and habitat, contributing to the beautification of the corridor.

Mr. Hermann outlined three special conditions identified in the guidelines. The first was the roundabout, which would serve as a gateway and require careful coordination with city staff to determine how mounding and buffering would taper back at an appropriate distance—estimated at approximately 300 to 400 feet—to allow for a more celebrated entry feature before the mounding and plantings resumed. The second was the farmsteads, which were described as character-giving properties that would be preserved and incorporated into the corridor design to reinforce the rural aesthetic, with screening provided around their sides to create distinct spatial moments along the corridor. The third was the handling of entry drives through the mounding, where a curved drive design was recommended so that views from the public right-of-way into the site would be blocked even at entry points. Stone retaining walls would be required where the mounds flanked such drives, creating a refined feature between the street trees, median, and mounding. The utility easement condition along the western property line was also addressed, with a requirement for no-mow or low-mow grass at minimum, and a desire to maintain landscape character to the extent permitted by utility requirements.

Ms. Ware concluded the MKSK presentation with an overview of the landscape and planting guidelines. She noted that the species list and maintenance regime had been developed in close collaboration with city landscape and maintenance staff. The planting guidelines emphasized a naturalized rural appearance achieved through dense layering with variation in density and character based on adjacency. To encourage biodiversity and urban tree canopy resilience, the guidelines established limits of no more than 10 percent of any single species, no more than 20 percent of any single genus, and no more than 30 percent of any single family. Installation sizes of 2-to-3-inch caliper were confirmed, with no more than half of the trees installed at the smaller end of that range. Year-round opacity was a specific goal, achieved through the placement of evergreen trees behind deciduous trees in drift plantings so that screening would persist through the winter months.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the nature of the stakeholder concerns regarding the landscape buffer. Ms. Rauch clarified that the concerns centered on the reduction of buildable area, the significant cost of constructing large mounds requiring substantial earthwork, and the volume of landscape material necessary to meet the opacity requirements. Mr. Chinnock then directed a question to the MKSK team regarding whether, in their professional experience, the scope of landscape treatment being proposed was excessive. Mr. Hermann acknowledged that the scale of the proposed landscape was substantial, comparable in density to what would be typical of a park-making or placemaking project rather than a standard buffer. He explained that the dual objectives of creating a park-like environment along Cosgray Road and achieving adequate screening of the 45-foot buildings through large mounds together necessitated this level of treatment, and that simpler approaches could have been taken but were not aligned with the design intent.

Mr. Chinnock then asked for clarification on the approximate distance between residential buildings in Ballantrae and the buildable edge of the ID-6 area. Ms. Ware explained that the 200-foot setback from the Cosgray Road right-of-way, combined with an approximately 60-foot road width that would result from the planned improvements to Cosgray Road including two additional drive lanes and a planted center median, would create a minimum distance of approximately 260 feet from the residential side of the right-of-way to any development. Adding the depth of the residential lots between the homes themselves and the right-of-way would further increase this separation to approximately 300 to 400 feet. Ms. Ware also noted the existence of an existing mound on the

residential side of Cosgray Road, which would provide an additional layer of screening between residences and the future development.

Mr. Chinnock raised a question about screening of fleet vehicles at side-yard loading areas. Mr. Hermann responded that the combination of the mounding and density of planting along Cosgray Road at 90 percent opacity, and heavily vegetated edges along internal streets, would effectively screen such vehicles from public view. Mr. Way noted that the code would not permit loading docks to be visible from Cosgray Road.

Mr. Chinnock asked for a definition of the term “pilot scale” as used in the research and development use standards. Mr. Stitt-White explained that while a specific definition was not currently in the code, the intent was that prototyping would refer to activities not producing goods for general public sale, and he acknowledged that a definition could be added to provide greater clarity.

Mr. Chinnock then raised the broader question of whether the cumulative restrictions being imposed in ID-6 might be too restrictive to attract the types of tenants the district was intended to serve. Mr. Stitt-White responded that while the restrictions would be excessive for a standard industrial district, given the site-sensitive context and proximity to residential uses, they represented an appropriate balance between developer flexibility and resident protection. Ms. Rauch further noted that staff had consulted with both property owners and development professionals familiar with similar products, and that those parties had expressed confidence that projects could be built consistent with the proposed standards.

Ms. Harter asked whether the development community was broadly comfortable with the buffering and landscaping requirements, acknowledging that clarity had been a consistent theme. Ms. Rauch responded that while developers naturally sought maximum flexibility, they understood the intent and the community plan's recommendations, and recognized that the 200-foot setback and the proposed treatment within it were established requirements. She noted that the intent of the code was to provide clarity so that developers would know from the outset whether or not they could meet the requirements.

Ms. Harter raised questions about tree installation size and the concern that 2-to-3-inch caliper trees would take many years to provide meaningful screening. Ms. Ware acknowledged this concern and noted the balance being struck between providing day-one screening and maintaining realistic establishment expectations and cost efficiency. She also addressed Ms. Harter's question about deer resistance, indicating that the species list developed in conjunction with City maintenance staff incorporated deer-resistant plantings.

Ms. Harter asked whether residents on the second floor of homes across Cosgray Road would be able to see the buildings from day one. Ms. Ware confirmed that this was a possibility, but noted that the existing mound on the residential side, combined with a five-layer system of screening including residential vegetation, a treed median as part of the Cosgray Road improvements, and the mounding and dense plantings on the development side, would substantially reduce visibility. Mr. Hermann elaborated that given the maximum 45-foot building height and the estimated 10-to-20-foot line of sight from a second-floor window, a resident would be looking through five layers of vegetation and across approximately 400 feet of separation.

Ms. Harter asked about the possibility of green roofs on development buildings as an additional visual treatment when viewed from upper floors of neighboring homes. Ms. Ware and Mr. Hermann noted that while green roofs were possible, the plantings involved were typically very low-growing due to structural weight constraints and would provide limited visual interest when viewed horizontally from neighboring properties. Mr. Hermann also advised that green roofs are most effective when viewed from above.

Ms. Harter asked about the cohesiveness of the east side of Cosgray Road from a landscaping standpoint. Ms. Ware indicated that the intent was to match the existing character already present on that side, including the existing rolling mound planting, though the mounding on the residential side would be less tall. Ms. Rauch noted that much of the significant landscape on the residential side was on private property within backyards, and that the City's beautification grant program could potentially be explored as a resource. Ms. Harter also asked about code enforcement, specifically whether it would involve proactive visits or only complaint-driven action. Ms. Rauch confirmed that both approaches were employed, with staff conducting proactive driving surveys of the city and also responding to complaints.

Mr. Alexander followed up on Mr. Chinnock's earlier comments and asked whether properties in the ID-6 district with the 200-foot setback burden could qualify for the existing 5 percent buildable area increase available under the code for sustainable practices, given the significant landscape investment involved. Ms. Rauch indicated that this had not been considered in that framing but that staff would explore it.

Mr. Alexander noted that the use table on page 10 of the memo showed that renewable wind equipment, which was a conditional use in other WID districts, had no entry for ID-6, and asked whether this meant wind energy equipment was not permitted. Ms. Rauch confirmed this was correct and explained that the intent was to limit what could be seen and used on this particular site. She noted that solar and geothermal were addressed separately. Mr. Alexander expressed concern that this prohibition might be based on an assumption that all wind turbines resembled large-scale utility turbines seen along Interstate 270, when in fact many small-scale rooftop wind installations existed. He suggested that if the intent was to prohibit large-scale turbines, the language should be more specific to what was being regulated rather than broadly excluding all wind-related equipment.

Mr. Alexander also asked about a reference in the memo to the exclusion of additional renewable energy sources on individual sites, citing the notation that wind, nuclear, and natural gas were excluded. He asked why natural gas was excluded. Mr. Boggs clarified that natural gas could be used for building heating rather than electricity generation and was therefore addressed differently. Mr. Alexander expressed appreciation for the shared-use path curving concept, likening it to the varied pedestrian experience along Dublin Road north of the historic district. He asked how the meandering path would be ensured across multiple property owners. Mr. Hermann explained that each developer would work with city staff, and that opportunities would arise naturally at property lines, entry drives, and areas where mounds varied, allowing staff to guide the path design toward undulation and interest rather than a straight line along the roadway.

Mr. Alexander asked whether the code clearly defined how 90 percent opacity was to be measured, at what time of year, and whether it accounted for seasonal variation. Mr. Hermann acknowledged that this was an important question and indicated that the calculation was intended to account for the combination of mounds, evergreens, and plantings, but that staff should verify the City's specific methodology for measuring opacity and confirm whether seasonality was addressed. Ms. Ware agreed that this should be further defined.

Ms. Newell acknowledged that this was her first time reviewing the materials and noted the extensive effort reflected in the presentation. She asked whether the buffer maintenance responsibility would rest entirely with developers rather than the city. Ms. Rauch confirmed that maintenance would be the developer's responsibility at this stage. Ms. Newell then raised a concern about cohesiveness of the buffer when properties were developed at different times by different owners. She noted that the presentation depicted a highly cohesive design and asked how the city envisioned ensuring continuity across property boundaries. Ms. Rauch acknowledged the challenge and explained that the manual would guide each developer through the requirements, and that

the City's goal was to manage each site as it came forward with the ultimate objective of a cohesive corridor. Ms. Ware noted that the species list, planting palette, and property edge guidance contained in the manual were all designed to create inherent consistency even when properties were developed separately. Mr. Hermann observed that the first development through the process would likely receive the most intensive design scrutiny and could serve as the established precedent that subsequent developments would be expected to match and continue.

Mr. Way noted that the buffer's minimum 200-foot measurement was to the building or pavement edge, meaning the actual building setback could be greater in practice, for example where fire lanes, parking areas, and circulation drives existed. He suggested that the graphics in the presentation represented a near-worst case scenario in terms of proximity. Mr. Hermann and Ms. Rauch confirmed this interpretation. Mr. Way also affirmed his support for the naturalized tree row preservation approach while asking whether grading constraints around tree roots could create challenges for stormwater management design. Mr. Hermann agreed that grading would be a significant issue and that the guidance documents would be used to press applicants to demonstrate how existing trees would be preserved.

Mr. Way expressed general support for the direction of the code revisions, noting that the language appeared to effectively reinforce the intended district character, and that remaining items such as definitional tweaks and clarifications about outputs could be addressed before the May 21st meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Way opened public comment, reminding attendees that the Commission had received and reviewed all previous public comments, and noted that each speaker would be permitted up to three minutes.

Jerry Hultin, 6665 Bantry Court, Dublin, addressed the Commission and described the proposed development as a missed opportunity, contrasting what he characterized as the lively, walkable character of the Muirfield Drive area with what he viewed as an isolated commercial district on the west side of Dublin. He stated that the land in and around the WID area could instead be developed into a vibrant, walkable 15-minute neighborhood with bike paths, retail, and housing. He expressed the view that advanced manufacturing and research uses in this location would result in an area that was empty on weekends and inactive at night, and urged the Commission to reconsider the entire direction of the West Innovation District rather than continuing what he described as a process driven by inertia.

Mindy Patrick, 6674 Traquair Place, Dublin, identified herself as a homeowner and former school board member. She expressed appreciation for the landscape presentation and acknowledged the value of nonresidential development for tax base diversification. However, she stated that she came to the meeting as a homeowner with specific concerns about proximity to high-voltage power lines and significant truck or vocational traffic, noting that both factors informed her original decision to purchase her home. She expressed concern that the process was moving forward without sufficient studies on traffic, environmental impacts, and fiscal impacts across various development scenarios. She asked the Commission to proceed with caution, ensure that strong conditions were in place, retain Commission oversight rather than delegating to administrative review, and uphold at minimum the proposed code amendments.

Sandy McIntosh, 5792 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, stated that the neighborhood of nearly 1,000 homes was directly across Cosgray Road from the ID-6 area. She challenged the estimated distances

presented in the staff materials, noting that her own property line extended to approximately the midpoint of the shared-use path behind her home, making the separation closer to 300 feet than 400 feet. She also stated that she could currently see cars on Cosgray Road from her patio and expressed skepticism that the existing mound on the residential side would provide meaningful shielding from 45-foot buildings. She expressed astonishment at the volume of discussion devoted to visual screening compared to what she described as a relative paucity of discussion about what would be occurring inside the buildings. She urged the Commission to consider removing advanced manufacturing and research and development from the list of permitted uses, or at minimum reclassifying them as conditional uses requiring a more rigorous review process for each application. She noted that there was little substantive difference between the proposed definition of advanced manufacturing in ID-6 and the definition of manufacturing and assembly in ID-2 and ID-3. She also raised concerns about the absence of a standalone definition for clean manufacturing despite its use in intent language for other districts, and asked for clarification. She further noted that the definition of accessory use lacked measurable standards and asked whether warehousing and distribution could occupy up to 49 percent of a building's square footage. She also identified a potential inconsistency in the setback language, noting that the prior roadmap referenced the future right-of-way while the current draft referenced the existing property line, which she argued would be a significant distinction given plans to substantially widen Cosgray Road.

Tim Myers, 5845 Glendavon Court, Dublin, expressed concern that the meeting had again focused predominantly on landscaping and buffering rather than on what would occur inside the buildings. He stated that while the intent language referenced minimizing toxic inputs, it did not address byproducts, waste streams, or outputs of manufacturing processes. He called for the code to incorporate a definition of clean manufacturing and to distinguish between advanced manufacturing, which he characterized as treating pollution after it is created, and clean manufacturing, which prevents pollution at the source. He stated that he had submitted detailed comments to staff listing specific characteristics of each. He also questioned how the code would prevent a facility from producing hazardous byproducts, expressing concern that the City lacked the internal expertise to evaluate such risks. He referenced proposed changes to EPA risk assessment frameworks and suggested that the absence of clear regulatory protections could expose residents to harm. He urged the Commission to ask staff for further clarity on these issues before the code was advanced.

Amy Schiebel, 5884 Baronscourt Way, Dublin, expressed concern that the proposed code relied on vague intent language rather than clear, enforceable standards. She noted the absence of measurable limits on noise, delivery frequency, or vehicle counts. She stated that without numeric caps or location rules for fleet vehicles, a site could function like a dispatch yard. She described the lack of enforceable traffic standards, including trip caps, time-of-day restrictions, and delivery limits, as a significant gap. She argued that vague language shifted risk from the code to residents, and asked staff to strengthen the ID-6 code by adding enforceable standards, a clear definition of clean manufacturing, numerical limits or location rules for fleet vehicles, and objective traffic controls at the residential interface.

Angela Griffin, 5559 Kinvarra Lane, Dublin, thanked the Commission and stated that she was present to ask for advanced manufacturing and research and development uses to be reclassified as conditional rather than permitted uses, arguing that doing so would add a needed layer of protection for Dublin residents. She expressed appreciation for the exclusion of data centers from the WID and noted the concern that Ballantrae was surrounded by proposed development on

multiple sides. She referenced a nearby situation in Hilliard involving controversial fuel cell technology near an elementary school, as well as a previously approved data center across Cosgray Road, as examples of developments that had negative impacts that were not fully anticipated at the time of approval. She urged the Commission to use its authority to add protections and make advanced manufacturing and research and development conditional uses.

Tara Roe, 5749 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, stated that she would look up at 45-foot buildings from her front bedroom window. She expressed concern about language changes in the current draft that she characterized as weakening protections compared to prior versions, specifically noting that tree height minimums had been removed, that the screening of rooftop equipment was now described differently from the prior draft, and that ground signs were now only prohibited within the 200-foot setback rather than along Cosgray Road generally. She questioned why the building height remained at 45 feet when she understood that Dublin building systems had indicated buildings could be constructed at lower heights, and suggested that a graduated height transition—lower near Cosgray Road and increasing further into the district—could be considered, as had been suggested for apartment buildings in the Emerald Parkway context. She concluded by urging the Commission to help ensure the safety and property values of existing residents.

Todd Hemmert, 5824 Houchard Road, Dublin, spoke to the situation of residents along Houchard Road who he argued had been largely ignored throughout the WID planning process. He expressed frustration that the code amendments and the buffer study focused extensively on Cosgray Road and the Ballantrae neighborhood while the ID-3 district, which bordered Houchard Road residential properties, remained unchanged and permitted heavy industrial uses including large substations, manufacturing facilities, and potentially large warehousing at setbacks as close as 150 feet from homes. He stated that residents on Houchard Road had attended numerous meetings and sought to engage with staff and city council members without success, and that nothing had been done to address the ID-3 context other than the removal of data centers. He asked the Commission to direct staff to address the needs of Houchard Road residents and to recommend to City Council that additional transition measures be implemented.

Richard Weeks, 5826 Houchard Road, Dublin, echoed the concerns of Mr. Hemmert and asked when residents of Houchard Road would receive the same level of consideration and process that had been extended to the Ballantrae neighborhood. Mr. Boggs clarified that the purpose of the meeting was limited to the ID-6 code amendment and the buffering study, and that the ordinance relating to properties east of Houchard Road and west of the railroad tracks had already been forwarded to City Council and remained on the table. Mr. Weeks acknowledged the improvements represented in the ID-6 proposal but again pressed for a timeline for similar engagement on the Houchard Road context.

Jennifer Hamill, 5725 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, identified herself as a former employee of the Ohio Legislative Service Commission with professional experience in drafting code. She raised the issue of research and development emissions, describing conversations she had had with Honda engineers who indicated that research and development at their facilities included running engines on test stands until failure, with emissions discharged through smokestacks. She expressed concern that the code, as written, did not address smokestacks or the external discharge of process byproducts. She further argued that the code language was insufficiently precise and that the ambiguity created legal exposure for the City. She also raised the issue of the ID-3 context and stated that property owners in the WID area had on at least two occasions submitted residential

development proposals prior to the ID-2 designation, and that those proposals had not been acknowledged. She asked the Commission to exercise independent judgment and bring concerns back to City Council if appropriate.

Kurt Smith, 6692 Roundstone Loop, Dublin, echoed the calls from multiple residents for more objective, measurable standards addressing adverse impacts on the neighborhood. He stated that while the Commission had heard a great deal about buffers and what residents would be unable to see, the more fundamental concern was about what would be occurring behind the buffers in terms of particulate matter, noise, and similar impacts. He asked staff to add more substantive standards addressing these operational impacts and expressed appreciation for the work done to date while asking for further refinement.

Commission Discussion

Seeing no additional members of the public wishing to offer comments, Mr. Way closed public comment and invited the Commission to respond to the evening's discussion questions and provide direction to staff.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the discussion had been helpful and confirmed his focus on ID-6 specifically. He expressed appreciation for the mounding and screening investment and acknowledged the need for additional clarification on the advanced manufacturing definition, particularly regarding sustainability provisions such as addressing wind turbine language, and byproduct and clean manufacturing distinctions. He expressed support for adding language relating to outputs. He stated that overall the process was working and that the direction was appropriate, but that some further clarification was warranted. He also expressed appreciation for the inclusion of rooftop screening within the building height limit, noting that this would prevent the issue from recurring in future case discussions.

Ms. Harter thanked the public and the presenters and affirmed that the public engagement was making a difference. She expressed general support for the landscape approach and the progress made since the January meeting. She stated that clarity remained her primary concern, and that code language should be understandable to both developers and the general public. She expressed a view that conditional use classification for advanced manufacturing warranted consideration, adding that it would bring applications back before the Commission for additional review. She also noted the need for clearer language on operating hours and truck timing. She again raised the issue of tree size, expressing the view that 2-to-3-inch caliper installations were still small relative to what she would prefer. She stated that she saw a significant improvement since the previous meeting and appreciated the 45-foot height limit and 200-foot setback.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would offer a dissenting opinion on the question of conditional use classification, expressing opposition to reclassifying advanced manufacturing as a conditional use. He stated that promoting advanced manufacturing was the core purpose of the ID-6 district and that requiring conditional use approval would create a disincentive that was contrary to the entire policy effort that had led to the district's creation. He expressed support for the buffer study, describing it as outstanding, while acknowledging that it would place a significant burden on developers. He reiterated his earlier comments regarding toxic outputs and expressed hope that language could be added to address what is produced and emitted, not merely what is used as input.

Ms. Newell began with the landscaping, stating that it represented the most comprehensive buffer approach she had seen in Dublin's planning history and that she supported it, with the caveat that cohesiveness across properties remained a concern. She stated that she had read the code three times and remained uncertain about the distinction between advanced manufacturing and clean manufacturing. She acknowledged that her consideration of conditional use classification was tied to this uncertainty rather than a settled policy position. She added that fleet vehicle parking needed to be addressed, noting that companies frequently used fleet vehicles as de facto signage, and that Dublin had previously required certain businesses to confine fleet vehicles behind structures and away from street frontage. She also expressed support for revisiting the wind turbine language.

Mr. Way offered his perspective that the intent of the ID-6 district—economic development, fostering innovation, sensitive residential transition, lower intensity, minimized adverse impacts, sustainable practices, and nontoxic inputs and possibly outputs—represented the correct policy framework, and that the code language was evolving to reinforce those objectives. He stated that the Commission was approaching a code that would support the community planning exercise. He indicated that refinements to fleet vehicle parking and visibility, opacity measurement, and clean manufacturing and output language were the remaining areas needing attention. He confirmed that the setback graphics showed a near-worst case and that the actual building separation in most scenarios would be greater.

Ms. Rauch invited Mr. Dale to respond to the discussion about conditional use classification and to articulate the structure by which the current code framework allowed staff to evaluate environmental performance. Mr. Dale explained that the current approach required applicants to demonstrate compliance with the intent statement, definition, and performance standards, with staff having the authority to require documentation and seek specialized expertise. He expressed concern about the alternative of drafting numeric standards for particulate matter, materials inputs, and similar technical parameters, noting that such an approach would be both a drafting and an enforcement challenge and could inadvertently create compliance thresholds that were gamed rather than genuinely met. He argued that the burden-of-proof framework as written was preferable and expressed willingness to sharpen the code language to more clearly state that staff would apply this framework and could deny applications that failed to demonstrate compliance.

Mr. Boggs added that conditional uses in the WID districts generally were reserved for uses that would pull the districts away from their intended light industrial and research flex character, and that advanced manufacturing was in keeping with the WID's overall theme. He characterized making advanced manufacturing a conditional use as generally out of character with the WID districts.

Mr. Dale noted that the language in the performance standards referenced inputs but not outputs, and agreed that adding language to address outputs and clean manufacturing distinctions would be a constructive refinement. Ms. Rauch confirmed that staff would revisit this and that the intent had always been for a narrower and cleaner version of manufacturing than permitted in other WID districts. Mr. Dale indicated that staff could also sharpen the language describing the burden-of-proof mechanism for evaluating applications.

Mr. Way asked whether there was consensus on making the sustainability bonus applicable to developments in the ID-6 district that constructed the required buffer, given the significant landscape investment involved. Mr. Alexander indicated that this was already available under the

existing code and could be addressed administratively on a project-by-project basis, and that it may not need to be explicitly written into the district code. Ms. Rauch confirmed that it could be addressed through the Administrative Review Team (ART) process.

Mr. Way raised the issue of fleet vehicle visibility upon entry to the site, noting that even with significant mounding, a visitor driving in could potentially view parking areas directly before reaching the building. He asked whether language could be added requiring screening of parking areas visible from entry drives. Ms. Rauch indicated that staff would look at this, acknowledging the legitimate concern while noting the need to balance site functionality. She confirmed that limiting the number of fleet vehicles was not pursued in the draft due to concerns about over-restricting site operations, but that location and additional screening requirements were more appropriate approaches. Ms. Newell agreed, emphasizing that the concern was not the existence of fleet vehicles but rather their potential visibility and use as signage. Mr. Boggs noted that fleet vehicle placement on specific sites could be addressed through the existing ART review process when site plans were submitted.

Ms. Rauch summarized the direction received from the Commission and indicated that staff would incorporate feedback regarding clean manufacturing and output language, sharpening the burden-of-proof mechanism for applicant demonstration, fleet vehicle screening and location, the opacity measurement and seasonality definition, and the wind turbine language, and would aim to bring a refined final draft back for the May 21st meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch announced that City Council had scheduled a work session on June 15th from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at which two topics would be discussed: the West Bridge Street streetscape study and the zoning code audit. She stated that City Council had extended an invitation to Commission members to attend and participate in that work session, with approximately one hour allocated to each topic. She indicated that calendar invitations would be distributed through the OnBoard platform and that packet materials, as well as a recording of the West Bridge Street presentation by Jeff Speck, would be provided in advance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council