



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 22, 2026

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Way at 6:31 PM at 5555 Perimeter Drive. Mr. Way welcomed attendees and noted that the meeting could be joined in person or accessed via livestream on the City's website.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Way led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

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

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Jeremiah

Gracia, Tina Wawskiewicz, Christopher Will, Cameron Burell

Also present: Greg Dale and Keeghan White, McBride Dale Clarion and Chris Hermann and Tyler Clark, MKSK

### ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

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.

## **CASE REVIEW**

There were no cases for consideration before the Commission this evening.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Case #26-001ADMC**

#### **West Innovation District-ID-6 – Administrative Request – Code Amendment**

**Discussion and Feedback for Code Amendments to the City of Dublin Zoning Code Sections 153.016 and 153.037-153.042 for the creation of the ID-6, Research Transition District in 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**

Mr. Hounshell began the presentation by explaining that this was strictly for an update on work the City had been doing for the ID-6 district being proposed.

Mr. Hounshell explained that when the rezoning was seen by Planning and Zoning Commission in February of 2025, it included 370 acres of land consisting of 9 parcels. The proposal at the time was to rezone the east side of the railroad to ID-2 and the west side to ID-3. As of today, the scope had been limited for the purposes of the ID-6 discussion to approximately 144 acres and 5 parcels within the area east of the railroad. The goal was to focus on property fronting along Cosgray Road, as that was a sensitive area with existing single-family residential to the east. The other area was not included in the rezoning or code amendments but would be expected to be revisited in future planning phases.

Mr. Hounshell referenced the City's adoption of the Envision Dublin Community Plan update in 2024, noting that the focus area was recommended for Flex Innovation. The intent was to provide vibrant, modern development incorporating a variety of uses such as office research and development, flex office warehouse, and clean manufacturing. He emphasized this site was just a small piece of the larger West Innovation District (WID), which captured about 2,200 acres of land within the City of Dublin.

Specific recommendations from the Envision Dublin Plan included landscape buffers along Cosgray Road of 200 feet to transition and screen from existing single-family residential, preservation of the 1900s farmstead on the north side of the site, and leveraging economic development potential throughout the entire district.

Mr. Hounshell detailed the extensive community engagement that had occurred since the process began. The rezoning has been before Council four times. It was introduced in March 2025, then was heard again in April, June, and August before being tabled with a recommendation that staff look into creating an ID-6 district with new code amendments targeted at addressing public concerns. Separate engagement opportunities with the public were held throughout May, June, and July in various formats, including direct meetings with the homeowners' association (HOA) board and individuals, and community conversations where the public could discuss the community plan and rezoning process. In December and January, staff met with the Ballantrae HOA board and their planning and zoning committee to share proposed amendments.

The primary concerns heard from the community included: industrial uses not being compatible with adjacent single-family residential; concerns about negative environmental or physical impacts on the neighborhood; increased traffic volumes on Cosgray Road; increased utility needs and impacts on the neighborhood; larger building heights adjacent to single-family residential; potential negative impacts on private property values; and health and safety concerns for residents and their children. Mr. Hounshell emphasized that the code amendments being presented were aimed at targeting and limiting these concerns.

Staff also met with stakeholders and those within the development community focused on flex and research industry to understand both sides - resident concerns and developability of what was being proposed. Mr. Hounshell noted that the comments shared were recommendations from stakeholders, not what was being brought forward in the Code road map, but shows what has been heard to inform the process going forward.

He concluded by highlighting the extensive information added to a web page for the West Innovation District rezoning, including all communications provided to the community, frequently asked questions, and other materials to ensure transparency throughout the process.

### **Consultant Presentation - Road Map**

Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way, Cincinnati, introduced himself and explained their role was to write code that implements the policies of the City. He emphasized that they had not written the code yet - what they were presenting was a "road map," essentially an annotated outline of future code identifying intent without yet doing the detailed drafting.

Mr. Dale stressed that this was not just about writing a new district for this area, but implementing a whole series of efforts including Council's 2025 and 2026 goals and recommendations from the Envision Dublin Comprehensive Plan. He noted the Comprehensive Plan was not just about colors on a map but was a carefully constructed framework including land use, transportation, infrastructure, and fiscal modeling. This led to the West Innovation District Special Area Plan, followed by various initiatives including the Innovation District Integrated Implementation Study.

Mr. Dale explained they had made their best good faith effort at trying to balance citizen concerns with the City's policies for implementing this important economic development strategy. He noted that Keeghan Stitt-White had read everything available in the public record and watched every meeting and public comment to inform their work. While not everything citizens asked for could be included, they tried their best to balance concerns about setbacks, building heights, landscaping, and buffering.

Keeghan Stitt-White, McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way, Cincinnati, presented the specifics of the road map. He began by proposing one district-wide change: removing data centers as a conditional use in ID-1, 2, and 3 districts, and not permitting them in ID-6 either.

The proposed ID-6 Research Transition District is intended to create context-sensitive development integrated into both the built and natural environment. This means uses of lower intensity located solely within buildings with no outdoor operation and limited traffic impacts. Buildings would be of lower footprint and height.

Mr. Stitt-White explained the difference between principal uses (predominant on the lot) and accessory uses (incidental and subordinate to a principal structure). The basis for the district was ID-2, but based on public comment, uses were whittled down to six that meet the district's intent:

- Office (general and medical)
- Parks and open space
- Construction and contract services (with proposed use-specific standards limiting outdoor use - no outdoor storage or uses if included in ID-6)
- Advanced manufacturing (a new use created specifically for this district)

- Research and development (with propositions to further limit this use)

Advanced manufacturing was explained as industrial in nature but with specific protections regulating structure use and limiting nuisances beyond property lines. It would have to be fully contained within a building, minimize environmental impacts, emissions, and waste, and specifically not create any noise, vibration, odor, or hazardous byproducts detectable beyond the property line. The intent is to attract businesses with high skill training specific to a company, commonly involving processes more advanced than typical manufacturing.

For research and development, the proposal was to specifically list what is and is not permitted within this use, clarifying it does not include manufacturing and assembly or direct retail as a principal use.

Accessory uses would include bicycle facilities, community activity, construction trailer and office, parking structures, utilities, essential services, renewable energy, and vehicle charging stations. Warehousing, wholesaling, and distribution would be allowed as an accessory use, recognizing that businesses would need incidental and subordinate storage areas for products. This is not intended for large-scale distribution centers but solely for incidental use supporting the principal structure. The similar use determination process already existing in code would remain unchanged, requiring any use not listed in ID-6 to go through this process and follow established criteria.

Development standards were based on ID-2 with several familiar elements: 2-acre minimum lot size and 75% maximum lot coverage. However, significant changes included:

- Building height reduced from 68 feet in other ID districts to 45 feet maximum (including any screening on top)
- Variable side and rear setbacks for properties not adjacent to residential based on building height (45-foot building would have 35-foot setback)
- Codification of 200-foot buffer along Cosgray Road
- 150-foot buffer for residential properties not along Cosgray Road
- Prohibition of outdoor operations (all uses to be inside buildings)
- Outdoor storage prohibited along Cosgray Road
- Service areas prohibited along Cosgray Road
- Signs prohibited along Cosgray Road

Architectural requirements would be similar to ID-2 but with higher attention to quality of detail and design given the focus on smaller building footprints. Greater architectural emphasis would be required along Cosgray Road, with 80% of building facades required to be constructed of high-quality primary materials.

The development review process would remain the same as currently used for projects in other ID districts.

### **Consultant Presentation - Buffer Study**

Tyler Clark, MKSK, 462 S Ludlow Street, Columbus, presented the setback and buffer study. He explained the intent was to look at an updated approach for screening views of future buildings within the WID, including buildings, service areas, and parking from public right-of-way and existing residences. The study aimed to establish a desired character for the public realm within the West Innovation District and work through methods for implementing screening requirements through zoning code updates.

Three key objectives guided the study: applying sustainability practices, protecting economic viability and development potential of properties, and establishing clarity and predictability in expectations for screening and buffering.

Mr. Clark reviewed existing conditions, noting current setback requirements are based on street typology with maximum front setback of 50 feet for arterial streets, 35 feet for collectors, and 30

feet for local streets. He showed examples of developments built under current requirements, demonstrating that existing setbacks and screening primarily screen parking lots while keeping views of office buildings visible.

Key takeaways from the existing conditions analysis showed that original setbacks were established with traditional Dublin landscape treatments intended to screen parking while maintaining building views. Additional setbacks would likely be needed to achieve proper screening with mounding heights and planting density. Landscape and planting strategies need consideration, particularly for year-round screening rather than just when trees are in bloom. Larger setbacks could provide opportunities for placemaking and Dublin character innovation while preserving rural character.

The recommended approach focused on preserving the rural character of the WID landscape, which is primarily agricultural. This included preserving tree rows and stands of trees, native grasslands and prairie, open canopies, periodic small structures typical of farmsteads, and strategic preservation of periodic vistas and long views into fields and pastures.

Chris Hermann, MKSK, 462 S. Ludlow Street, Columbus, interjected to emphasize that when thinking about setbacks and screening, they were considering both how to screen buildings and create character on the corridor. He noted that often what people experience of a community is what they see from the public right-of-way, making that experience crucial. Rural character means vistas framed by tree rows rather than continuous mounds with evenly spaced trees; it involves clusters of trees and occasional structures close to the road.

Mr. Clark detailed specific design approaches including slope specifications (6:1 slope on public-facing sides for natural appearance, 3:1 on private side), overlapping undulating mounds rather than uniform "toothpaste mounds," varying heights and breaks in mounding, and consideration of drainage, drives, parking, stormwater, and underground utilities in setback calculations.

For planting strategy, the focus was on year-round screening with mixed plant types and species, naturalized groupings rather than evenly spaced plantings, evergreen trees on mound backsides for year-round screening, deciduous trees on public side as street trees, and shrubs and taller grasses along mounds.

Three different approaches were proposed depending on property type and location:

- Enhanced buffering (150-200 foot setback) - for fully screening buildings, parking, and service areas with taller mounds and denser plantings
- Traditional landscape - for areas with limited setback where properties don't allow 150-200 foot setbacks
- Iconic moments - gateway opportunities at roundabouts and transition zones

For the ID-6 area specifically along Cosgray Road, the proposal included the 200-foot setback (starting at the right-of-way line, not the curb), 14-foot mounds with dense plantings for year-round screening, and consideration of the 45-foot maximum building height. Mr. Clark emphasized that with the expanded street right-of-way, the total distance from existing buildings to potential new buildings could be 400-500 feet.

Ground-level renderings showed what this could look like from Cosgray Road, with new streetscape including sidewalks, street trees, planted median, and new berms with buildings hidden behind. Mr. Hermann reiterated that using prairie plantings rather than turf on mounds would help achieve the rural character.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Garvin asked Mr. Hounshell about buildable area calculations with the 200-foot setback, seeking confirmation that in the example shown, 28 of 40 acres would remain buildable. He questioned whether the 75% minimum lot coverage requirement would need adjustment given the reduced buildable area. Ms. Rauch clarified that the graphic was intended to show how setbacks reduce

developable acreage, with the 75% lot coverage being a separate element calculated on total acreage. Mr. Garvin also confirmed that permitted high-quality materials would include fiber cement and EFIS siding, and raised questions about construction and contract services restrictions on outdoor storage and how that would affect contractor vehicles and equipment storage.

Mr. Deschler asked Ms. Wawszkiewicz from Transportation & Mobility about plans for Cosgray Road, inquiring if it was envisioned as a 4-lane divided boulevard from Route 161 to Hayden Run (with a small village character section remaining 1 lane each direction). Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that while a study was beginning with proposals due next week, no timeline for funding or construction existed. Mr. Deschler expressed concern about how road expansion would impact buildings and buffers, with Ms. Wawszkiewicz clarifying that setbacks would start at the proposed right-of-way line.

Mr. Deschler discussed the City's position on residential use, noting public comments strongly favored residential development. Mr. Hounshell explained that a residential proposal in 2023-2024 was denied by the Commission as it was not aligned with the Community Plan, which designated the area for flex innovation. The current proposal intends to align with Council's approved Community Plan. Ms. Rauch added that City Council's motion to table included direction to abide with the policy direction adopted in the Plan while allowing code amendments to address concerns raised.

Mr. Deschler questioned whether discussions had occurred with the Ballantrae community about the City's position that residential would not be included, and whether property owners felt restricted in their ability to sell. Ms. Rauch explained that staff had individual meetings with property owners about the code road map, acknowledging it was more restrictive than ID-2 but had received feedback that owners understood the need for investment in buffering as good neighbors. Concerns about setbacks, buffering, and reduced developability were acknowledged.

Mr. Boggs clarified the Commission's purpose was to collect feedback on the ID-6 road map and buffer study, not to reconsider the rezoning already recommended to Council.

Mr. Deschler asked about the City's satisfaction with land purchased for the sports park component. Mr. Will confirmed that through a visioning process for the premier athletic and recreation campus, it was determined the City conceptually has enough property within Darree Fields and Sports Ohio to achieve identified program elements.

Mr. Alexander asked about revisions to dimensional standards, with Mr. Hounshell explaining most revisions were adding the zoning district to code as cross-references. Mr. Alexander noted that while residential districts typically have 35-foot height caps, the proposed 45-foot buildings would only be 10 feet taller. He expressed concern about construction and contract services restrictions, particularly regarding storage of company vehicles versus equipment. Regarding buffering, Mr. Alexander asked if the landscape consultant saw their district-wide approach as giving the district a distinct character, which Mr. Clark confirmed was the intent with a similar planting palette and approach throughout.

Ms. Harter raised questions about noise, wondering if there could be restrictions on when trucks arrive and depart. Mr. Boggs noted that Council was already addressing vehicular noise with legislation at first reading covering operation, sound amplification, and land uses. Site development requirements were designed to minimize traffic interaction with residences. Mr. Dale added that the 200-foot setback would prevent any vehicular parking, circulation, or trucks in that area.

Ms. Harter asked about industry responsibility for maintaining landscaping over time, whether companies might request the City take over maintenance burdens like some HOAs have done. Mr. Boggs explained that with ID codes spelling out rules in advance rather than negotiating through

the Planned Unit Development (PUD) processes, property owners would be signing up for known requirements. The City would be unlikely to take over maintenance, and property maintenance obligations would be enforceable through various means including citations, environmental court, injunctions, and fines.

Ms. Harter also asked about screening between properties and Darree Fields for safety considerations. Mr. Hounshell noted the implementation plan shown was a draft and could change, emphasizing they were looking at this globally across the district for consistency. She inquired if mounds could be used by the public for walking or recreation. Mr. Hermann and Mr. Boggs clarified it would be private property, so public use would require property owner agreement and raise maintenance and liability issues. The objective was to buffer uses, not create conditions attracting people to cross Cosgray Road.

Mr. Chinnock followed up on screening accessory uses and the substantial investment being asked of property owners with buffering and screening. He questioned whether they were being too restrictive for development with the 200-foot setback. Mr. Dale responded that while the 200-foot setback was robust compared to typical 150-foot setbacks in similar situations, it was actually City policy from the Comprehensive Plan and reasonable given single-family homes come right up to the property line. As a local example, Mr. Clark added that New Albany had implemented similar approaches.

Ms. Damaser pointed out apparent contradictions in the road map regarding outdoor storage and service areas in setback requirements when storage and service were supposed to be inside structures. Mr. Hounshell acknowledged this as a carryover requirement needing refinement. She asked about addressing residents' environmental concerns about advanced manufacturing, with Mr. Hounshell explaining the intent was to include use-specific standards controlling environmental impacts, though work remained on defining those controls. Enforcement would fall to code enforcement.

Ms. Damaser asked about landscaping tree size minimums to ensure immediate screening rather than waiting 20 years for growth. Mr. Clark acknowledged this important consideration had not been decided yet but would need to be addressed, especially given renderings showing full-grown trees blocking views.

Mr. Way raised concerns about loading docks, noting that while they were prohibited along Cosgray Roas, they could be on sides or rear of buildings, potentially creating visibility issues if facing each other across property lines. Mr. Hounshell noted existing requirements for screening loading bays and service areas but indicated they would look at this further.

Regarding the buffer study, Mr. Way questioned accessibility of the space and whether passive recreation mentioned could lead to park-like conditions similar to other Dublin examples. He was concerned about implementation of the beautiful berm and landscaping incrementally while keeping it cohesive, suggesting it should be infrastructure installed upfront to set the tone. Mr. Hounshell acknowledged staff having the same conversations about avoiding piecemeal implementation.

Mr. Way noted the buffer study addressed the whole WID with different land uses, questioning whether mixed-use center areas near the Ohio University campus should have different street character than industrial areas. He also encouraged reconsideration of plant material mix, suggesting drifts of mixed evergreen and deciduous plantings rather than strict separation to create a softer edge.

## Public Comment

Mr. Way opened public comment, reminding attendees that the Commission had received and reviewed all previous public comments, and encouraged specific comments on the presentations heard tonight.

Gene Bostic, 7143 Carlton Road, Dublin, thanked the City Council and staff for working with residents regarding their concerns during the nearly year-long process.

Victoria McDonald, 5642 Tynecastle Loop, Dublin, addressed Mr. Deschler's question about residential use, explaining the application denied in June 2024 was because it was not part of the Envision Dublin Plan, but had been reproposed several times including last month. She noted the developer still wanted residential, and owners opposed rezoning to ID-6, having sent an email that day. She emphasized the Envision Dublin Plan could be changed, quoting page 242 stating it is not a static document and should be revised if community attitudes change. She referenced Mr. Boggs' article about municipalities balancing fiscal needs with community expectations. Ms. McDonald stated parcels subject to ID-6 zoning were changed at the eleventh hour without public comment, having always been intended as residential. She questioned whether zoning changes fit the existing landscape, whether industrial manufacturing with health risks was appropriate next to homes and sports complexes, and whether anyone had visited the neighborhood to understand how disjointed the plan appeared. She asked the commission not to support the code direction and work toward balance, meeting resident expectations while achieving positive fiscal outcomes.

Jim Martinson, 7074 Cormac Way, Dublin, acknowledged the journey from broad, loosely defined language to shaping an ID-6 district after strong community input. As a member of Ballantrae's planning and zoning committee, he thanked staff for productive meetings in December and January and looked forward to continued review opportunities. He had analyzed community feedback using AI to identify top concerns, highlighting loss of neighborhood character and potential decrease in property values. Building heights at 45 feet remained concerning as a stark contrast from the residential side despite buffering. He suggested tapering heights as a lead-in to 25 feet or less. While appreciating consideration for seasonality in mounding, he noted Ohio's "skeletal winters" when deciduous trees drop leaves. Definitions still needed tightening - while data centers were removed, the language still left openings. Principal versus auxiliary uses remained unclear. Other concerns included quiet zones around railroad crossings (long overdue), no Cosgray widening eastward, light pollution, and noise pollution. He reiterated residential remained the predominant preference for residents. Regarding landscaping maintenance, he referenced Turkey Hill at Shier Rings and Avery roads as an example of where they had struggled with landscaping maintenance.

Tim Myers, 5845 Glendovan Court, Dublin, identified himself as "the advanced manufacturing guy," appreciating progress made from initial fears but not yet comfortable. With experience in advanced manufacturing, he understood the risks and challenges including exotic chemicals, unique materials, and constant rapid changes to meet customer demand and remain competitive. Managing complex change points within complex systems was difficult even for Honda's best and brightest employees, and issues occurred despite best efforts. He expressed disappointment that discussion focused extensively on landscaping while missing significant impacts of business types, products, raw materials, processes, and byproducts. While landscaping hides development, the real issue was the content going into the area. He raised concerns about trailer storage and potential leaks affecting groundwater, noting residents west of the development would be first to notice air and water quality issues given west-to-east winds. He called missing this point irresponsible and

inconsistent with Envision Dublin's sustainability goals, noting PFAS "forever chemicals" do not align with sustainability. He emphasized needing only one person's mistake to create big problems, and while EPA requires self-reporting, damage would already be done. He asked consultants to dig deeper into advanced manufacturing risks.

Todd Hemmert, 5824 Houchard Road, Dublin, referenced three emails sent to commissioners and thanked Mr. Deschler for acknowledging receipt. Working at Honda R&D for 28 years, he echoed Mr. Myer's comments about no discussion of content and commissioners not understanding development realities - it's messy, dirty, and complicated. He stated the root cause was that Envision Dublin didn't think deeply about community impact, calling it completely wrong to think they had considered these impacts. He characterized it as a concept, not a binding goal guaranteeing outcomes, calling it irresponsible to shut down discussions thinking industrial use was definite. He noted Houchard Road residences were wiped out in the Envision Dublin Plan with no transition after 40+ years of large properties. Land use could include residential such as senior citizen homes providing economic benefits, but this was being dismissed. He stated commissioners should ask tough questions and get data, which was not there to support these items. The community had pulled data themselves showing poor return on investment - \$1.3 billion investment for only 0.3-0.5% return (\$600 million), calling this irresponsible for Dublin's reputation and resident livelihood. He expressed deep disappointment that only "window dressing" was accomplished, saying they needed to stop and go back completely.

Richard Weeks, 5826 Houchard Road, Dublin, introduced himself as a pilot with 20 years Air Force and 22 years NetJets experience who had never crashed because he follows procedures and examines everything going into his airplane. He raised awareness that EPA had just provided a permit for the data center north of them for 95 diesel generators for backup power. Each gallon of diesel burned produces 0.284 pounds of pollutants and 0.149 pounds of carbon monoxide. Nitrogen oxides can cause respiratory irritants, skin burns, eye burns, coughing, shortness of breath, worsening asthma, high levels leading to bronchitis and COPD. They harm ecosystems through acid rain, haze, and nutrient pollution. Carbon monoxide is odorless and colorless, causing flu-like symptoms potentially leading to brain damage, coma, or death. With 95 generators, that's 41-plus pounds when operating, going into the area around the Darree Fields sports complex. In November, Monitoring Analytics (independent marketing monitor for PJM grid) filed a complaint with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission recognizing insufficient capacity to serve data centers, leading to mandatory curtailment (brownouts) due to insufficient capacity. This would cause generators to turn on, though frequency and duration were unknown. While unable to stop the already-permitted data center, he cautioned this important issue needed consideration for future development.

Jennifer Hammill, 5725 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, quoted Thaddeus Boggs about municipalities balancing fiscal needs with community expectations. She referenced comments from Sandy McIntosh about how land south of Shier Rings Road west of Cosgray Road got included in the WID, calling it suspect that it was not originally part of the WID in Envision Dublin. The City remained unable to quantify income tax revenue expected from expanding this area into the WID. She questioned why this information was not important for determining ROI or balancing financial gain against resident concerns, asking if it should not be important given Mr. Boggs' statement about considering such things. Regarding the Cosgray Road expansion going west instead of east, she noted her legislative and ODOT consulting experience with right-of-way expansion, pointing out

utility poles would need to move. She questioned who would pay, whether they would go underground as they should, or if giant poles would be needed for industrial electricity needs. She disputed that property owners were aware residential was impossible, noting they submitted new residential plans in December and sent an email today planning to fight ID-6. She urged considering time and value rather than trying to fit a square peg in a round hole following unnamed city staff advice to shove it into the WID, suggesting they step back and consider residential uses between Houchard Road residences and Ballantrae, as the Envision Dublin studies called for.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Garvin expressed support for the changes from ID-2 to ID-6, believing they showed honest reaction to resident concerns about building intensity and size. The buffering was a big move in the right direction. While understanding logistical challenges, he would like to see buffer zone utilization creating a park-like buffer, agreeing with consistency across buffering zones. He noted areas requiring the most space for overlay buffering were where residents would want the shortest buildings, presenting challenges for development with smaller buildings using less space. For recommendations on ID-6 revisions, he emphasized need to drill down on defining advanced manufacturing and broadly defining manufacturing impacts respectfully to the surrounding area. He supported the 200-foot setback over 150 feet as an effective transition buffer. He expressed concern about minimum lot coverage potentially being problematic for creating space integrating into natural and built environments, needing more vacant land and considering spacing between industrial buildings versus residential sides.

Mr. Deschler struggled with being instructed residential was no longer supported. He stated that he was unsure what to do. He found public comments about R&D and advanced manufacturing very good, noting that while he had not asked questions, he was personally concerned. The language was too vague and needed significant overhaul regarding what goes in, byproducts, and potentially an approval process for building contents. He requested consultant input on similarly situated cities with advanced manufacturing/R&D adjacent to significant residences. He supported Ms. Damaser's comment about screening tree size minimums, though acknowledged the burden on property owners and uncertainty about city participation. Light pollution had not been discussed but was prominent in comments, suggesting need for road map components addressing security lighting, possibly with movement triggers rather than constant blue lighting. He felt the 200-foot setback sounded reasonable based on feedback but remained unsure about residential reintroduction, and is planning to abstain from that component.

Mr. Alexander expressed general support for the code direction, noting multiple approved uses beyond advanced manufacturing. However, he shared concerns about byproducts, processes, and environmental impacts, wanting code tightened to address these issues. He emphasized the actual distance between houses and structures exceeded a football field at over 400 feet with three isolation levels: existing plantings and mounds at Ballantrae, road median, and enormous 14-foot mounds twice human height. He had never seen mounds like this locally except New Albany. The additional trees would provide carbon sequestration meeting environmental standards. He was impressed with the innovative mounding approach and supported it.

Ms. Harter thanked everyone for participation, appreciating the City meeting with neighbors and building rapport. She was generally supportive of the code direction, emphasizing that moving forward would require attention to particulars. Height reduction from 68 to 45 feet was helpful, and enclosed structures provided opportunities for different office space including medical

possibilities. Setbacks were substantial, and seasonal planting considerations were key. No large data centers was quite important. Proximity of residents should be first consideration, including Darree Fields users' experience. Regarding the road map, she appreciated City Council examining noise in-depth with recourse for odd noises established prior. Storage limits made sense, but leak concerns were important. For landscaping, consistency with mature area landscaping was important, incorporating existing stones and features. Public interaction opportunities would be beneficial. She encouraged neighbors to participate in city inspections ensuring precise completion. Darree Fields' proximity needed consideration to ensure appropriate experience.

Mr. Chinnock echoed appreciation and noted criticism of Envision Dublin as just a guide showed the process was working - the fact they were discussing ID-6 showed Envision Dublin's flexibility. This unprecedented effort by the city to hire consultants and create extensive road maps based on public input proved public engagement, City, and consultants were working together to develop the property. He noted ID-6 would apply to other locations beyond this first one, so they needed to think bigger scale about future use requirements. Limits on advanced manufacturing was a consideration, with language about not creating noise, odor, vibration, or hazardous byproducts - though clarification was needed. Other services were also proposed beyond manufacturing. The boulevard creation on Cosgray Road would enhance residential feel with landscaping, mounding, and reduced building heights, creating the boulevard character that might not happen with other high-density uses without this level of character investment. He challenged them to consider the additional effort going into boulevard streetscaping and what shared-use paths creating active landscape areas could mean. He was generally supportive while echoing needs for further development of raised concerns, emphasizing they were doing a lot and asking future owners for significant commitment that could result in nice development with the right approach.

Ms. Damaser expressed appreciation for all participants including the City, residents, and expert consultants. Echoing others' comments, she believes it is a good road map (not just a start given a year's work) although it needs tightening on advanced manufacturing and tree specifics. She suggested considering lighter uses toward Cosgray Road with heavier uses in back if possible, and endorsed everything others had said.

Mr. Way provided final thoughts, appreciating the comments and discussion. The road map was a work in progress toward text development. Advanced manufacturing as a new use type might have similar activities already occurring in Dublin, suggesting understanding how current activities are managed would be helpful. When reading current language, it seemed innocuous and needed precision to avoid dangerous situations. He was totally supportive of the buffer concept but imagined it as linear open space contributing to community rather than keeping community out. Such an important district element should be thought of holistically and done in totality. Integration possibilities could include hidden fencing within buffers keeping people contained while allowing broader recreational use, requiring exploration of public/private arrangements and potential easements. The setback should be a contributing element to the district rather than individual business buffering requirements. His comments echoed the Commission's support for the process with the road map as a good conversation starter, emphasizing tighter use definitions and thinking of setbacks as contributing district elements rather than just requirements.

Staff confirmed they had received sufficient feedback from the Commission.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Staff shared no communications.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 pm.

  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
Deputy Clerk of Council