



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 20, 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, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Victoria Newell, Kim Way.

Commission members absent: Hilary Damaser

Staff members present: Bassem Bitar, Thaddeus Boggs, Sarah Holt, Zachary Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the July 9 Regular PZC meeting and the July 16 Joint Work Session/Training.

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

CASE REVIEW

Case #26-041CP

Dublin Senior Living - Sentry

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, provided the concept plan presentation. He stated that the Commission had previously reviewed an earlier concept in December 2025 on a different parcel at the corner of Emerald Parkway and Bright Road, which was not well received. A subsequent informal review in April 2026 on the current 17.6-acre parcel to the west, directly east of Hopewell Elementary, received generally positive feedback, and the applicant proceeded to the formal concept plan stage.

The proposed project consists of approximately 175 senior living apartments within a single main structure, along with 19 single-story villas on the northern portion of the site. The mix within the main building includes assisted living and memory care licensed by the State of Ohio, as well as independent living. The building is designed at two stories along Emerald Parkway, with a three-story maximum in the central section, stepping down to single-story villas along Bright Road.

Mr. Dorsey described the architectural approach, which responded directly to Commission feedback from April. Key changes included the introduction of multiple porte cocheres along the eastern frontage, greater building undulation, a canted single-story pool and wellness structure at the northeast corner, and integration of back-of-house functions into the building mass. The use of color blocking and varied materials including stonework, board and batten, and lap siding is proposed to suggest multiple structures connected together. The garages along the western property line were simplified in design to blend into the adjacent tree row. The villas along Bright Road were reoriented to face the street, responding to earlier Commission feedback regarding residential character.

The site plan incorporates the ephemeral stream concept from the Emerald Corridor Illustrative Plan through a landscaped rock feature and network of sidewalks leading to a focal amenity adjacent to a natural-looking pond in the center of the site. Preserved tree stands on the eastern, western, and central portions of the site were highlighted. A large natural pond is proposed on the western portion of the site.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented the staff analysis. She noted that the project would require rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and that tonight's review constituted non-binding feedback at the concept plan stage, focusing on land use and density, site layout, general circulation, open space, and integration with surroundings. Two additional public steps would follow prior to any permits, during which detailed technical reports on traffic and stormwater would be analyzed.

Ms. Holt outlined the relevant planning policy context. The site is designated Neighborhood Office under Envision Dublin, which allows assisted living as a primary use if the design meets the intent of the designation. The Neighborhood Office designation envisions one-to-two story buildings at up to 9,500 square feet per acre with a residential character. The Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan shows single-family residential on the northern portion at up to four dwelling units per acre and Neighborhood Office on the southern portion. The plan also depicts an ephemeral stream/open space connection, tree row preservation, and special landscape treatment along both Emerald Parkway and Bright Road.

Ms. Holt noted that the proposed density on the southern (Neighborhood Office) portion of the site is approximately 18,000 square feet per acre, roughly double what Envision Dublin envisions. The

northern villa area at 19 units is within the allowable range of up to 21 units at four dwelling units per acre. She shared the staff-identified specific questions for Commission feedback: density, open space character relative to PUD expectations, architectural massing and articulation, and the appropriateness of the separate garage structures.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked about public access along the internal pathway system connecting Emerald Parkway to Bright Road. Mr. Dorsey indicated that while the preference was for the site to remain private, the design would accommodate connectivity consistent with city open space expectations. Mr. Chinnock also raised questions about the residential experience along Bright Road, noting that the berming and landscaping should be adequate without overwhelming residents with an overbearing berm. He further inquired about the focal amenity in the center of the site, and Mr. Dorsey described it as a seating area with stonework, a wood trellis, and natural landscaping elements overlooking the central pond. Mr. Chinnock noted that the southeast corner of the building appeared architecturally underdeveloped relative to its prominence as a corner element visible from Emerald Parkway, and Mr. Dorsey acknowledged this, indicating additional glazing could be explored.

Mr. Chinnock also asked whether the applicant had explored additional architectural articulation on the garage structures, and Mr. Dorsey explained that an earlier, more detailed garage design had been simplified at staff's suggestion to reduce visual prominence.

Ms. Harter clarified that the current concept is the second review of this particular parcel, as the December 2025 review addressed a different site. She asked for clarification on the memory care drop-off arrangement and was advised that a covered drive-up area is included on the assisted living and memory care side of the building. She also raised concerns about the proportionality of stone on the villas relative to the main building, the treatment of the garage between units, and the materials used for driveways, which were confirmed as concrete. She asked whether the villa configurations could shift from triplexes to duplexes along portions of the frontage and was told that was feasible.

Mr. Alexander asked staff whether the resistance to the detached garage structures was code-based or simply a matter of recent Dublin practice. Ms. Holt confirmed it is not a code requirement but that detached garages have not been supported in more recent Dublin projects. Mr. Alexander also raised the concern that the berming treatment along Bright Road, as currently shown running parallel to the street, may conflict with the informal, natural character called for in the Emerald Corridor plan for that corridor. He noted that the density of the proposed project is less than what was approved for The Beacon. He also asked whether the north courtyard of the main building is open at its north end to facilitate connectivity with the villa residents, and Mr. Dorsey confirmed that it is.

Mr. Garvin asked about the origin of the ephemeral stream concept and whether it represented a functional drainage need or simply a green space vision. Ms. Holt explained that it is a conceptual green space suggestion at a very high planning level, intended to create an opportunity to connect to water features across Emerald Parkway at the Mount Carmel campus and anchor both ends of a green corridor.

Ms. Newell asked staff to clarify the recommended setbacks along Bright Road and Emerald Parkway. Ms. Holt confirmed 60 to 100 feet along Bright Road and 100 feet along Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Newell observed that the plan as drawn shows setbacks of approximately 48 to 51 feet from the building to the Bright Road right-of-way, while the Emerald Parkway setbacks appear to significantly exceed the 100-foot requirement. She suggested that setback adjustments—reducing the excess on the Emerald side and gaining additional buffer on the Bright Road side—would be appropriate. She also sought clarification on whether the central water feature is intended as a retention or detention pond, and Mr. Dorsey indicated the preference is for a wet basin. Ms. Newell further raised the possibility of underground detention for portions of the site where surface detention may conflict with open space goals, and Mr. Dorsey acknowledged that some underground detention is anticipated depending on engineering outcomes at the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) stage. Ms. Newell expressed general support for the garage structures given their position along the tree line buffering the school.

Mr. Way asked whether the Bright Road access could be gated and whether the fire department would permit a coded or keyed access gate on what would be a private road. Ms. Holt indicated that this could be explored at the PDP stage. Mr. Way expressed continued interest in the possibility of a gate, noting that it had been discussed at the April review. Mr. Way also asked whether the site would be expected to provide a stub connection to the parcel to the east. Ms. Holt confirmed that cross-connections are typically planned at platting and PDP. Mr. Way asked the applicant to consider a larger setback along Bright Road, suggesting that excess setback on the Emerald Parkway side could be redistributed northward to create a more appropriate buffer. Mr. Dorsey indicated this was feasible and would be explored.

Public Comment

Donna Keidel, 4170 Bright Road, Dublin, expressed concern that the project represents too large a commercial development for a rural residential area, stating that the design does not adequately bridge the gap between the luxury senior living concept and the neighborhood character of Bright Road. She raised concerns about site circulation connecting Emerald Parkway to Bright Road functioning as an unofficial cut-through, the traffic impacts of approximately 200 units on a road that is the sole access for adjacent residents, the scale and density of the villas relative to adjacent single-family homes, the visibility of the three-story element from Bright Road, and the lack of affordable senior living options in the market.

Eric Bringardner, 4200 Bright Road, Dublin, expressed that he would welcome the project if the villas were single-family homes rather than multi-unit structures. He expressed support for a larger berm and more screening rather than breaks in the landscaping, noting that the development feels commercial rather than residential in character from his vantage point directly across the street. He expressed disappointment that the applicant had not reached out to neighbors between the April review and this meeting, contrary to what was encouraged by the Commission, and reiterated concerns about emergency vehicle traffic, noise impacts, and the Bright Road entrance.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Newell stated that she does not have a strong objection to the overall density, but that the setbacks should be met, the water feature should be confirmed as a true amenity water feature rather than a detention basin, the proportion of cement board siding relative to stone on the main building could be improved, and she does not object to the garages given their position on the site and their design quality. She suggested that the elevation along Emerald Parkway could be enhanced by introducing a three-sided open structure at the center of the courtyard gate, which would read from the street as building mass rather than a gap in the facade.

Mr. Garvin expressed general support for the density and the step-down massing approach. He indicated support for the villa units along Bright Road if the scale and setbacks can be improved. He agreed with comments about the desirability of pedestrian access through the site. He stated that the garages, given their location and low visual prominence, are not a major concern for him.

Mr. Alexander expressed broad support for the project concept, stating that the massing connects well with Hopewell Elementary and that the building articulation picks up contextual elements of the school's architecture. He praised the elevations as among the best he had seen in his time on the board for their use of color and materials to create hierarchy with variety. He agreed with the simplified garage approach and expressed interest in exploring pedestrian connectivity through the site, particularly along the eastern entry and through the hedgerow.

Ms. Harter encouraged the applicant to consult the historic character of the Ferris Wright Park area nearby and to consider how that design language might inform elements of this project. She noted that significant work remains on the Bright Road edge and urged the applicant to have substantive conversations with neighboring residents before the next submittal. She expressed concern about the precedent of supporting density above what the community plan envisions.

Mr. Chinnock expressed general support for the project, characterizing it as a use that fits well with both the school and the adjacent residential neighborhood. He cautioned the Commission not to over-constrain the Bright Road setback at the expense of cramming the villas together, stating that the quality of the design along that edge is more important than achieving a specific setback figure. He encouraged pushing the building as far from Emerald Parkway as possible given the proximity of Interstate 270, and reiterated support for the use of high-quality materials and the current level of articulation on the main building.

Mr. Way expressed concern about density being set at twice the level envisioned by the community plan, noting the precedent implications for the adjacent parcel to the east. He stated general support for the open space concept and the architectural approach but asked that the roof heights be moderated to avoid an overly heroic roofline. He expressed a strong preference for greater setback along Bright Road, supported pedestrian connectivity in both directions through the site, and asked the applicant to consider options beyond triplexes for the villa configurations fronting Bright Road, including turning units perpendicular to the street.

Mr. Way summarized the Commission's general consensus as supportive of the density, the open space concept, the massing and height approach, the architecture, and the garage structures, with a clear focus of remaining concern on the Bright Road frontage, including the scale of the villa structures, the setback, the landscape buffer, and the relationship of the development to the adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Dorsey acknowledged all feedback, affirming that the Bright Road concerns are clearly heard and that the applicant will return with a more creative approach to the setback and villa configuration along that edge. He confirmed that the average resident age, even in the independent living wing, is in the mid-eighties, and that the facility provides full transportation services, resulting in a comparatively low vehicle trip generation.

Case #26-046CP

Emerald Parkway Mixed-Use

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 Real Estate, 955 Yard Street, Columbus, presented the updated concept plan, noting that this was the third time the project had been before the Commission at the concept plan stage, the most recent prior review having been in April 2026.

Alex Camponeschi, POD Design, LLC, 100 Northwoods Boulevard, Columbus, described the site plan organization, working from north to south. The northern portion of the site is the subject of an office capacity study, with the intent of preserving the existing mature tree stand and developing a park space to serve as an amenity and transition zone between the office and the residential uses. The central residential component includes a mix of townhomes organized to create a neighborhood block character, with frontages addressing internal streetscape, the mature tree line, and Emerald Parkway. The private boulevard running north to south through the residential area was widened to accommodate parallel parking, improving the streetscape character and reducing the appearance of large surface parking areas. A pedestrian east-west connection has been strengthened at the center of the site in place of the previously proposed vehicular connection between Emerald Parkway and Parkwood Place. On the southern portion, two park spaces are proposed—one in the north associated with the tree stand and one in the southeast corner anchored by a stormwater retention feature and walking loop. A drive-through pad site is located at the southeast corner, with the Warner Temple and Parkwood intersection developed as a gateway feature.

Ms. Brown identified four major changes since the April submittal. First, the introduction of a potential office building on the northern portion of the site, with a capacity study underway and planning conducted for both a day-one built scenario and a phased future scenario if the office does not materialize immediately. To accommodate the office area, two townhomes were removed, reducing the overall unit count from approximately 250 at the first submittal to 218 units currently. Second, the private boulevard was widened and enhanced with parallel parking. Third, pedestrian connection corridors were strengthened and green spaces reorganized, including the removal of a pickleball amenity and the addition of a larger dog park in the northern section and a smaller dog park at the center of the site. Fourth, the retail component was reduced from three independent buildings to two, with one 3,500-square-foot pad site eliminated and the inline building reduced by approximately 3,000 square feet, resulting in approximately 14,000 square feet of total retail. This reduction allowed for more green space and the introduction of the walking trail and retention feature.

Ms. Brown also presented a massing study illustrating the relationship between the adjacent one-to-two story Camden Professional Center offices to the west and the proposed townhomes, which reach 32 to 36 feet at their peak—less than a 10-foot difference from the adjacent office buildings, with 240 feet of separation between the frontages. She invited feedback on whether berming along Emerald Parkway should screen the signature trail from the development or vary in treatment.

On architecture, Ms. Brown stated that the design was substantially revised in response to the Commission's April feedback requesting a more distinctive character. The updated design employs varied materials, roof heights, and roof pitches across the product types. Townhome end elevations facing Emerald Parkway were specifically redesigned to include porches as an architectural feature. The clubhouse was fully redesigned as a more prominent feature with extensive glazing on the public-facing side and operable garage-style doors opening to the pool deck.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell provided the staff report. He confirmed that this is the third concept plan review, and that the next step for the applicant, if supported by the Commission, would be to submit a rezoning application for a Planned Unit Development district. He described the site's context situated between one-to-two story neighborhood office to the west, suburban corporate office to the east along Interstate 270, and commercial activity to the south, and its designation as Mixed Use Neighborhood under Envision Dublin and the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan.

Mr. Hounshell noted that the Special Area Plan envisions a mix of neighborhood-scale office, residential, and supporting commercial uses; shared parking to the rear; a transition in building height from one to two stories along Emerald Parkway up to four stories along Parkwood Place; preservation of existing tree stands; a gateway at the Emerald Parkway and Woerner Temple intersection; and activation of Parkwood Place. He also noted that the Signature Trail, adopted by City Council in December 2025, runs along Emerald Parkway through this site, and that the applicant has accommodated space for it.

Mr. Hounshell summarized the Commission's April feedback, which included general support for the site layout and use mix, concerns about reduced open space relative to the December 2025 submittal, concern that remaining green spaces functioned more as setbacks than gathering areas, questions about whether the proposal truly achieved mixed-use intent, mixed views on residential frontage along Emerald Parkway, concern about surface parking appearance, a request for stronger architectural expression, and emphasis on maintaining connections to future development to the east.

He shared the staff-identified primary discussion questions for this evening: whether the use distribution meets the Mixed Use Neighborhood designation; whether residential along Emerald Parkway is appropriate; whether the drive-through is appropriate in this context; and whether the revised architecture meets the Commission's expectations.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin asked how the density compared to what the Special Area Plan envisions and was told it is generally consistent with the plan's illustrative layout. He asked whether the applicant had considered vertical mixed-use integration of retail into the residential buildings, and Ms. Brown responded that while it had been considered, the Special Area Plan calls for a retail cluster arrangement and the market dynamics of this area are better suited to horizontal separation. She confirmed that the reduction in retail was driven by a desire to reduce required parking and increase green space rather than a reduction in market demand. Mr. Garvin asked about the intended tenant for the drive-through and was told a fast-casual concept or coffee use would be preferred; the applicant stated openness to eliminating the drive-through if a tenant did not require it.

Mr. Alexander asked whether the development is intended to be built entirely by Van Trust or phased among multiple parties and was told Van Trust intends to develop the entire site. He observed that the project reads as three distinctly themed sections and asked whether that was intentional. Ms. Brown explained that the separation of uses emerged partly from the block

organization of the residential component and partly from the siting of the office on the northern end consistent with the Special Area Plan's guidance. Mr. Alexander inquired whether the four-story multifamily buildings along Parkwood Place could incorporate ground-floor active uses to animate the street, and Ms. Brown acknowledged that this had been discussed internally and could be explored further, though it would come at the cost of some residential density.

Mr. Chinnock asked about building heights, confirming the office is proposed as a single story, the townhomes are 32 to 36 feet, and the retail building with an expressed two-story architectural character is functionally a single-story structure with high ceiling heights. He asked staff whether a development with such distinct architectural characters across its buildings had precedent in Dublin, and Mr. Hounshell indicated it likely did not. Mr. Chinnock asked staff for their perspective on berming along Emerald Parkway in the context of the Signature Trail, and Mr. Hounshell acknowledged that the introduction of the trail will significantly alter the character of that corridor frontage compared to the natural, pastoral condition on the west side of the road, and that this relationship has not yet been fully resolved. Mr. Chinnock raised concern that the drive-through lane, in its current configuration, appears more prominent than in earlier submittals due to the widening of the loop, and asked the applicant to consider alternative presentations of that element.

Mr. Way inquired about the stormwater ponds, asking whether they represent amenity features or functional engineering requirements. Ms. Brown acknowledged that full stormwater engineering has not been completed and that the intent is for the ponds to serve dual purposes, but noted that whatever volume cannot be accommodated at the surface will need to be handled underground. Mr. Way expressed concern that at this stage the pond sizing and configuration are driven by design intent rather than engineering calculations, and observed that the outcome could change significantly at the PDP stage. Mr. Way also raised concern that the north-south pedestrian corridor reads primarily as a road with walkways through parking areas rather than a connected sequence of meaningful open spaces with gathering potential, and encouraged the applicant to explore how small pockets of green could be distributed along that spine to create more activation. He noted that a prior iteration of the plan had more pedestrian-scaled gathering spaces distributed across the site and that the current clustering approach, while addressing earlier feedback, may have overcorrected. Finally, Mr. Way asked about the proposed office building and its relationship to the drainage ditch running through the northern portion of the site, noting that a prior plan had oriented the building to preserve more of that feature, and suggested the parking arrangement adjacent to the office be studied further.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Newell stated that in her view the project remains primarily residential in character and does not sufficiently achieve the mixed-use vision intended for the site. She expressed concern that the retail component which could consist of a coffee drive-through and a restaurant serving primarily the residential population resembles what she described as a typical suburban residential complex amenity rather than a true mixed-use neighborhood. She also stated that the four-story multifamily buildings present very long, flat facades with minimal depth of articulation. She also noted that material variation does not substitute for three-dimensional relief in the façade and that the renderings, which are heavy with vegetation, do not accurately represent the appearance of the buildings at ground level.

Mr. Garvin expressed support for the updated site landscaping improvements and the reduction of large parking areas, but agreed with Ms. Newell that the project is disproportionately residential. He stated that approximately 300,000 square feet of residential against 14,000 square feet of retail and a yet-to-be-determined office does not constitute a meaningful mixed-use project. He indicated that the four-story multifamily buildings on the eastern side of the site present a monolithic, dense character that does not align well with the mixed-use goals of the designation. He expressed skepticism that a suitable drive-through tenant could be found that would feel integrated with the mixed-use design intent. He also noted that the three distinct sections of the development do not appear integrated with one another.

Mr. Alexander acknowledged that the surrounding neighborhood is, in a broader sense, already mixed use by virtue of the overbuilt office inventory adjacent to the site. He stated he could accept a more residential emphasis on this particular parcel given that context, and expressed interest in seeing more retail and stronger linkages between the parts of the development. He noted that the site plan breaks down into three internally organized clusters, but that these clusters do not connect to one another or to the surrounding context through shared spaces. He used the Bridge Park development as an example of how different building types can successfully define and activate a shared space. He expressed that the proposed north-south pedestrian connection would be strengthened if it terminated in meaningful spaces at both ends, and that the commercial area at the gateway corner could be improved by organizing buildings to front and define that corner more deliberately. He expressed conditional support for townhomes along Emerald Parkway if sufficient berming could be maintained to preserve the green corridor character of the street.

Ms. Harter emphasized the value of the Signature Trail as an organizing element that could connect the residential uses to the surrounding community and to the existing businesses across Woerner Temple Road. She noted that without more intentional activity generation, the development lacks the connective energy that would draw people in from the surrounding area. She expressed concern about the sea of parking visible from Interstate 270. She stated that she has not historically supported drive-throughs and would need to be convinced the proposed use is appropriate to the context.

Mr. Chinnock expressed support for the direction the project is taking, stating that the Commission has repeatedly indicated to the applicant that a predominantly residential program on this site is acceptable, and that it would be unfair to significantly redirect the applicant at this stage. He noted that the surrounding area contains underoccupied office and retail space, and that adding more of those uses to this site would be counterproductive. He characterized the site as part of a mixed-use area rather than requiring a mixed-use site in isolation. He stated that the architecture went perhaps too far in attempting to be distinctive, and encouraged the applicant to return with more specificity about materials and design intent so that the Commission can more thoroughly evaluate what is being proposed.

Mr. Way stated that he cannot support the current use distribution on the site. He expressed that townhouses along Emerald Parkway are inconsistent with the historic character of that corridor, which was designed to spur economic development, and suggested that if residential is to be included along Emerald Parkway, it should take the form of mixed-use structures with commercial or active uses at the ground floor. He acknowledged the applicant is following the special area plan in terms of site organization and form but stated that the uses within the buildings need to more faithfully reflect the mixed-use intent. He agreed with concerns raised by other members about the

north-south pedestrian spine, the commercial area needing to function as a cohesive place, and the importance of anchoring both street corners. He noted that the aggregate residential square footage is approximately 25 times the retail square footage, and stated that this ratio is out of balance for a site designated as Mixed Use Neighborhood.

Ms. Newell added that a predominantly residential development in this location risks foreclosing on the catalytic potential that the mixed-use designation is intended to generate for the broader Emerald Corridor area.

Ms. Brown acknowledged the architectural feedback, expressed agreement that the design went too far in attempting to be unique, and stated the applicant would revisit the architecture with more attention to specificity and coherence. She noted some ambiguity in the Commission's feedback on the mix of uses, given that different members expressed different views, and indicated she would work with staff to determine the most appropriate response.

Case #26-0044CU

COTA Park and Ride – Temp Location

Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for a temporary relocation of a park and ride facility. The 0.77-acre site is zoned BSD, SRN and is located northwest of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

Applicant Presentation

James Peltier, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, presented the application on behalf of the development team. Mr. Peltier explained that this request is part of the larger Block J development, for which a permanent park-and-ride facility within the Block J parking garage has already been approved through the Final Development Plan and Preliminary Development Plan process. The temporary facility is needed because COTA will be vacating its current location on Dale Drive at the beginning of September 2026. The temporary use of the Block G garage is anticipated to continue until approximately June 2027, at which point the Block J garage is expected to receive occupancy.

Mr. Peltier noted that several alternative locations were evaluated, including a location outside the Block C garage on Mooney Street (insufficient space without blocking garage entrances), and a location on Winder Street adjacent to Block F (a private street not designed for bus turning movements). The Block G garage was selected based on proximity to the current and permanent park-and-ride locations, ADA accessibility for riders, and compatibility with COTA's route and turning movement requirements.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell confirmed that the conditional use process is required for approval of the park-and-ride activity within the private parking garage. He noted that the bus stop itself is located within the public right-of-way at the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, and that this component has been reviewed and approved by city staff independently of this application. The existing COTA route will be rerouted to serve the temporary location while continuing through Dublin and Bridge Park. Staff reviewed the application against applicable criteria and is recommending approval, with a condition that the applicant work with staff to finalize the bench and sign details subject to staff approval.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin confirmed that all parties, including COTA, are in agreement with the proposed solution.

Mr. Way expressed concern about traffic safety at the proposed bus stop location, noting that a bus stopping in the travel lane at what is already a challenging intersection could create hazardous conditions if drivers attempt to pass the stopped bus. He asked whether alternative stop locations had been considered and whether placing the stop on the far side of Bridge Park Avenue had been evaluated. Mr. Peltier summarized the alternatives considered and the factors that led to the selection of the current location.

Amber Boyd, Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA), 33 N. High Street, Columbus, explained that COTA generally prefers far-side stops, but that in this specific configuration using the Block G garage, a near-side stop on Dale Drive is preferable to a far-side stop. She noted that the route serving this location is the Route 73, which operates only during morning and evening peak hours, as well as the seasonal Zoobus on weekends through Halloween. The bus would stop for approximately one to two minutes at the peak hour stop, as it would be the end of the line before deadheading. The Zoobus might stop for approximately 10 to 15 minutes for boarding.

Devayani Puranik, Director of Planning for COTA, 3 N. High Street, Columbus, clarified that COTA was not actively seeking to move its park-and-ride but is doing so in support of the city's economic development goals. She noted that the City's traffic engineering team has reviewed and approved the proposed bus stop location, and that COTA relies on city staff expertise for traffic operational decisions. She also noted that the route alignment is already loaded into COTA's systems and operators have been trained for the new location, as service is set to begin September 7th, making last-minute location changes impractical.

Mr. Boggs noted for the record that the conditional use before the Commission pertains specifically to the park-and-ride activity occurring on the private property within the garage, and that the bus stop activity within the public right-of-way is a separate matter.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Ms. Newell moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the conditional use with the following condition:

- The applicant work with Staff to finalize the details of the bench and sign subject to staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 5-1.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Deputy Director Bassem Bitar advised the Commission of several upcoming items. He noted that proposed updates to the Planning and Zoning Commission Rules and Regulations were included in the meeting packet. The updates are intended to align the written rules with current practices and to reflect the department's updated name. These updates will also be applied to the other planning boards and will be forwarded to City Council and the Administrative Committee later in the year. No objections were raised.

Mr. Bitar reminded members of the upcoming joint work session with City Council scheduled for September 1st, which will focus primarily on the mixed-use district and its integration into the new zoning code, with a presentation from the city's consultants. He noted that dinner would be served at 5:30 PM with the program beginning at 6:00 PM. Members Chinnock and Garvin indicated they may not be in attendance.

Mr. Bitar announced that the September 3rd meeting would be canceled due to no applications being scheduled.

He also announced that the September 17th meeting would be devoted to a work session on the Metro Center planning effort, focusing on design guidelines and the zoning approach being developed. An open house for the general community and area property owners is planned for September 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council