



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 11, 2025

### CALL TO ORDER

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Way led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

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

Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar, Sarah Holt, Tori Brubaker, Zachary Hounshell, Chris Will, Tina Wawskiewicsz, Cameron Burrell

### ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the November 6, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes and the November 6, 2025 Special Meeting Minutes.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Deschler, 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 meeting procedures: applicants present first, followed by staff analysis and recommendation, Commission questions, public comment, then Commission deliberation. No new agenda items would be introduced after 10:30 PM. Speakers were asked to use the microphone and keep comments to 3 minutes.

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

### CASE REVIEW

#### Case #25-099CP

## **Emerald Parkway Mixed-Use – Concept Plan**

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

### **Applicant Presentation**

Phil Rasey, Executive Vice President, VanTrust, 955 Yard Street, Ste 100, Columbus, began the applicant presentation. He explained that Van Trust is a family-owned national developer headquartered in Kansas City with offices in Columbus, Jacksonville, Dallas, Phoenix, and Salt Lake City. The company primarily started in office and industrial development but has done mixed-use projects including The Pointe at Polaris. He noted they purchased the Emerald Parkway site and Parkwood land from Duke Realty in 2016, did a land swap with the City of Dublin in 2022 for the Parkwood piece, and developed a speculative industrial building at Crosby Court that INEOS now occupies. Mr. Rasey explained they had created numerous concept plans over nine years of ownership, including one in 2024 that they held back to wait for the Envision Dublin plan. He believed they have now created a more thoughtful plan with a variety of uses responsive to Envision Dublin.

Anna Brown, Development Manager, VanTrust, 955 Yard Street, Ste 100, Columbus, then presented the details of their vision. She explained they initially submitted in early 2024 but pulled the plan back to let Envision Dublin be adopted, then took a fresh look to create something mirroring the Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan. Their focus was on a thoughtful mix of uses, variety of open spaces, walkability and connectivity, while creating amenities to support current and future office uses in the area. She showed how their plan closely resembled the building layout and distribution of uses recommended by the Special Area Plan, matching the landscaping, screening, and desire for streetscaped private drives connecting east to west.

Ms. Brown walked through their plan starting from the north side, highlighting a large open space intended to preserve the George Geary Run tree line and provide a large walking path and pond. She noted they would be open to dedicating this space as a public park. Adjacent would be amenities for residential uses including a clubhouse with fitness, lounge, coworking space, pool, and pickleball courts. On the western boundary along Emerald Parkway, they showed three-story townhomes instead of the one-to-two story commercial/office uses in the Special Area Plan. Ms. Brown explained this deviation was due to challenges with the office market and difficulties competing with existing properties across the street. She emphasized they added unique architectural characteristics and sidewalks with walk-up ground level entrances to establish a neighborhood feel.

The plan included 35 townhomes ranging from two to three bedrooms, with different products to achieve various price points. Ms. Brown explained another deviation from the Special Area Plan was not preserving the existing tree line running through the middle of the site due to varying grades that would make preservation challenging. She committed to a tree study and replacement program. The plan showed four-story multifamily buildings with approximately 210 units, with the character of each building designed to be different and broken up by landscaping. Amenities were sprinkled throughout to benefit residents and break up parking areas. Parking ratios were one spot per unit for studio/one-bedrooms, 1.5 for two-bedrooms, and two per townhome unit.

Ms. Brown detailed two private drives added based on staff feedback to create streetscaped entrances with sidewalks, parallel parking, and walk-ups to ground floor units. The retail plan has been modified based on market feedback from retail brokers about bringing quality tenants to

serve both residents and surrounding office areas. The southeastern outlot of about 3,500 square feet was intended for elevated fast casual or coffee concepts, with inline retail in the middle and a 3,500 square foot restaurant space with outdoor seating and a pond. Two drive-throughs were included based on market feedback that they were necessary to attract quality national credit tenants. Ms. Brown emphasized the pedestrian connections throughout, maintaining the existing sidewalk loop while adding connections cutting through the project, and she highlighted the increased open space and imagery showing the neighborhood-friendly, walkable feel they aimed to achieve.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell presented the staff analysis, explaining this was a Concept Plan for non-binding feedback as the first step in a planned unit development process. He noted the purpose was for the Commission to provide feedback on alignment with the community plan, general layout, land uses, densities, streetscapes, and open space framework. The site is zoned Thomas Koehler Planned Development District, surrounded by Neighborhood Office to the west, the approved Sheehab Law Office to the southwest, corporate office buildings to the east and northeast, and retail/commercial to the south. Natural features include the Glen Geary ditch at the northern point and mature trees as called out in the community plan recommendations.

Mr. Hounshell explained the community plan recommends Mixed-Use Neighborhood designation for the site, with neighborhood services located near residential areas that are walkable and auto-accessible. Principal uses should be office, commercial, retail, eating and drinking, with single and multifamily residential as supporting uses. The Emerald Corridor Special Area Plan provides more site-specific recommendations including a mix of neighborhood-scale office, residential, and supporting commercial, with buildings fronting the street and shared parking to the rear. Massing is recommended at one-to-two stories along Emerald Parkway with a maximum of four stories along Parkwood Place to transition from existing neighborhood office to corporate office uses.

Staff's discussion questions focused on the three-story townhomes along Emerald Parkway exceeding recommendations; whether residential along Emerald Parkway was appropriate; the open space framework showing a new public park in the north; and the commercial space at the southern portion including drive-throughs at the gateway location.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Chinnock asked about the height of the three-story townhomes with peaked roofs, whether mounding along Emerald Parkway would be maintained, connectivity to adjacent properties, the breakout of space with the four-story multifamily building surrounded by retail, and architectural style. Ms. Brown responded they would provide appropriate setbacks rather than maintain mounding, had aligned connections with adjacent properties, separated uses for easier public access to retail, and aimed for a less modern aesthetic using natural materials.

Ms. Harter asked about pickleball court public access, parking arrangements for townhomes including garage spaces, sidewalk widths, drive-through stacking requirements, and bus service. Staff and the applicant clarified that appropriate landscaping would separate public/private amenities, parking counts included garage spaces, sidewalk widths could be explored, drive-through details would be determined at the Preliminary Development Plan stage, and a bus pull-off exists though no current route serves it.

Mr. Alexander asked about supporting versus principal uses, shared parking opportunities, the 100-foot right-of-way along Emerald Parkway, and how the number of units was determined. Ms. Brown

explained they chose the 30-foot setback shown in the Special Area Plan, aimed for around 200 units while being respectful of the community plan, and could explore shared parking to reduce lot sizes.

Mr. Deschler questioned evaluation of mature tree preservation, retail building architecture at the prominent corner, drive-through appropriateness, and open space distribution for families with children. The applicant responded the tree study was underway, they had not fully considered gateway features but would look at it, drive-throughs were necessary for quality tenants per market feedback, and they had distributed amenity areas throughout including a dog park, patios, and the main northern park.

Chair Way asked about the proposed streets' relationship to the Emerald Parkway median, stormwater management, whether the northern corner was considered for development rather than a park, the dog park's prominent corner location, service access for retail buildings, and the intensity of the unit layout. Ms. Wawskiewicz explained median modifications would be needed for left turn access. Ms. Brown stated that the northern area was driven by preserving the natural features, and service/trash access would need to be addressed in future submissions.

### **Public Comments**

No public comment.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Chinnock expressed appreciation for the presentation but had concerns about the heavy residential deviating from the Envision Dublin Community Plan, the drive-throughs not supporting walkability goals, needing more work on tree preservation, requesting a height study, and addressing the gateway corner treatment. He believes there was good thought in the architecture but work remained to make the proposal fully supportable.

Ms. Harter agreed it appears heavy and emphasized the importance of the 100-foot setback to match the opposite side's character. She liked the retail concept and reaching out to office neighbors but was concerned about fitting with the broader context. She questioned the lack of office use and felt the apartments in back did not create enough transition.

Mr. Alexander supported the project but expressed a desire to see buildings along Emerald Parkway be smaller with flexibility on setback. He was comfortable with heavily weighted residential given the area's need and thought shared parking could reduce lot sizes while allowing more integrated green spaces.

Mr. Deschler echoed concerns about the proposal's deviation from plans, suggested incorporating some office component, had reservations about drive-throughs at this gateway location, and felt the townhomes along Emerald Parkway needed reevaluation though the initial architectural drawings were appropriate.

Mr. Way viewed both plans as well-aligned on mixed-use balance but felt the current mix was out of balance. He wanted something other than residential fronting Emerald Parkway given its commercial business character. While the grid layout followed the area plan, uses were not in the right places. Open space was pushed to edges rather than integrated, the existing linear corridor could be studied harder for integration, and the corner drive-through was a lost gateway

opportunity. He wanted more effort on use distribution while noting the architectural concepts appeared aligned with area character.

The applicant indicated they had been provided sufficient feedback.

Mr. Deschler recused himself from the following case.

### **Case #25-108CP**

#### **Avery Crossing – Concept Plan**

**Request for review and non-binding feedback for a mixed-use development comprised of residential, commercial and open space. The 127-acre site is zoned R, Rural and located southwest of the Rings Road and Avery Road intersection and contains the Ponderosa Mobile Home Estates.**

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Gary Ogracki, Dimit Architects, 14725 Detroit Avenue #2210, Lakewood, presented for the applicant. He thanked the Commission for their feedback from their April visit and showed refinements made to the plan. He displayed the site location near Avery Road and future Tuttle Crossing Road, noting everything aligned with Dublin's Community Plan. The existing mobile home park in the middle would remain. He described the site as basically flat old farmland and explained they worked with the City on a curvilinear form for the future Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension meeting Envision Dublin Community Plan provisions.

Mr. Ogracki outlined four quadrants: F would be mostly residential, K commercial, H the existing mobile home park, and I multifamily. He noted the north has more single-family homes while the south has existing multifamily. The biggest refinements based on previous comments regarded open spaces, which had increased with water features for stormwater retention designed as amenities. They reduced density by one unit per acre in the southern multifamily area. The commercial zone showed three retail buildings and restaurant buildings. The site plan also showed mixed townhouses, single-family homes, cluster homes, and duplexes. The south envisioned three-story multifamily units with a clubhouse and pool bordering a water feature.

Drew Russell, Edge, 330 W. Spring Street, Columbus, presented open space refinements. Since April's Concept Plan review, they further defined open spaces to respond to the Commission's comments and align with the Envision Dublin Plan. Their process established an open space theme and guiding principles, examined existing adjacent features and destinations to activate parks appropriately, established paths consistent with Envision Dublin for pedestrian connections, and provided enlargement plans for specific areas. Their theme was integrating their open space into the larger network physically through pathways, locating areas close to adjacent spaces, and providing traditional Dublin character aesthetics.

Mr. Russell explained they identified seven unique park spaces after analyzing nearby Dalmore and Ted Kaltenbach parks to see what amenities might be missing. They provided a hierarchy of pathway systems with a commuter route along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard for regional movement, a north-south connector route through the site's midpoint, and local routes to internal parks. Enlargements showed the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard Greenway with naturalized grasses, tree canopy, and meandering paths; a central park with gathering spaces, playground, lawn, and enhanced pond edges; the Rings/Avery roads corner for community branding with potential bike hub; and the Tuttle/Avery roads corner with waterfront dining opportunities and pocket park.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Will presented staff's analysis, noting this was a Concept Plan for non-binding feedback. The 127-acre site contains the existing 170-lot Ponderosa Mobile Home Estates, tree rows, preserved woodlot, and is surrounded by single-family neighborhoods to the north and Columbus apartments/commercial to the southeast. The site lacks water/sewer utilities designed to extend with Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. He reviewed the Commission's April 2025 feedback recommending refinement of densities and transitions, improved connections, stormwater areas as usable amenities, and continued neighbor coordination.

Mr. Will explained the applicant hosted virtual meetings with neighborhood associations and Ponderosa residents, with public comments provided to the Commission. The Community Plan recommends mixed-use neighborhood along Avery Road with residential mixed density for the balance. The Southwest Special Area Plan recommends transitioning from lower density near northern neighborhoods to more intense development south toward Columbus's built areas, incorporating natural features, protecting stream corridors, and extending Tuttle Crossing Boulevard as a green parkway.

The proposal's sub-areas included: Area 1 with 53 acres of single-family residential with modified streets/open space for stormwater; Area 2 maintaining existing Ponderosa Estates with no major changes; Area 3's mixed-use area consistent with recommendations for walkable character; and Area 4's multifamily decreased from 13 to 12 units per acre (the maximum recommended). Changes included increased open space (though largely stormwater ponds needing thoughtful amenitization), maintained street network with Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension, and added bike tunnel at Rings/Avery roads intersection.

### **Commission Questions**

Discussion questions focused on the April feedback regarding residential types/transitions, connectivity adequacy, and density transitions.

Kolby Turnock, CASTO, 250 Civic Center Drivve, Suite 500, Columbus, confirmed total units were approximately 660 (down from previous 807/719). The applicants would look at incorporating residential above commercial, though it might be challenging at that scale. They had met with homeowners' association representatives via Zoom and would do an open house next, and Ponderosa would get public utilities replacing private. Tree preservation would be studied, structures like water/sewage plants must remain until conversion, and densities were maximum ceilings not final layouts. Stormwater challenges on the flat site drove unit count shifts.

Mr. Way asked about tree line analysis and integration, noting the north-south greenway pattern that could be reinforced. He stated that he felt the unit layout remained intense and asked about softening it, with the applicant acknowledging tightening resulted from creating larger central green areas. He also noted the apartment's rigid angularity conflicting with Tuttle Crossing's curvilinear feel.

### **Public Comments**

Barbara Wright, 6244 Cartwright Lane North, Dublin, asked about the property behind her house and stated that she preferred green space over picnic areas there.

Christian Cooney, 5835 Baronscourt Way, Dublin, raised four major unaddressed points: maintaining Rings Road's country lane feel needed wooded pathways and homes facing rather than backing to Rings; density should follow Envision Dublin's gradual transitions; traffic flow concerns

especially north-south connections invited problems; and the southwest park in the Envision Dublin Community Plan has been replaced by apartments.

Kathy Gates, 5733, Stockton Way, Dublin, shared that she worried about density, traffic on Avery Road despite expansion, being forced through Ballantrae, impacts on neighbors/Ponderosa Estates affordability, effects on schools, and questioned what retail was needed given existing options within 3-5 miles. She also noted illegal dog parks are not pleasant behind residences.

Mr. Will stated that if this project proceeds, a traffic impact study (TIS) would be required.

Kevin Griffin, 5559 Kinvarra Lane, Dublin, stated the western residential plan is too congested with units not resembling neighborhoods across Rings Road. Looking from the bike path, he would see apartments, Tuttle Crossing, cluster homes, green space, 4-6 townhome rows, then single-family which is not the Dublin he wanted. He compared it to Ballantrae's 88 single-family homes in similar acreage versus this proposal's 170 townhomes, 16 cluster homes, 23 duplexes, and 14 single-family homes.

Victoria McDonald, 5642 Tynecastle Loop, Dublin, voiced concerns about high-density development not preserving rural character or quality of life, especially for Ponderosa seniors who value peace, privacy, and nature connection. High density would introduce traffic, noise, and light pollution. She noted even Casto acknowledged in 2023 that single-family homes were most sympathetic to maintaining the mobile home park's character, yet current plans reduced buffers, completely engulfing it.

Tim Myers, 5845 Glendalevent Court, Dublin, stated that he believes more depth went into Emerald than Avery Crossing presentations. Green space responses seemed transactional just dropping things in corners. Sketches resemble Columbus not Dublin. The huge cluster in the middle brought density/traffic/congestion concerns. He feared Rings Road becoming a cut-through when Tuttle traffic increased, forcing road widening. He worried about developer engagement with Ponderosa and believes Dublin could do better.

Tamara Cain, 5456 Desert Lane, Dublin, stated that she is worried about crime coming to their 55+ no-crime community when surrounded by development. She is concerned for 90-year-old neighbors. She noted plans showed entrances from apartments/homes into Ponderosa despite promises otherwise, bringing traffic through their 10-mph neighborhood. She mentioned an 8-inch high-pressure gas main crossing the field, low water pressure with 90% of residents not drinking it, property tax increases, lot fee increases of \$85 for 2026 (never that much in 9 years), questioning where extra money comes from for residents on fixed Social Security incomes. She wanted answers on keeping them safe and their homes affordable.

Sandy McIntosh, 5792 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, thanked Casto for their outreach. The Southwest Area Plan notes preserving Rings Road's rural character with development mimicking established character, but this plan does neither in density or design. The plan calls for traditional single-family/attached/missing middle housing, not apartments, as are already plentiful in nearby Columbus. Housing for aging residents like patio homes/condos would be consistent and appropriate. With Tuttle extension not in the City's 5-year capital plan and Casto unprepared to fund it, access primarily uses Rings Road (two lanes not widening) with right-in/right-out only on

Avery forcing northbound traffic through Rings. The plan shows no safe pedestrian access to Washington Elementary for children.

Don and Anessa Davis, 6527 Royal Dublin Court, Dublin, noted their 23-year blessed farm field view they were originally told would be single-family when purchased from Edwards/Ballantrae developers. Multi-family housing brought concrete jungle concerns like Hayden Run/Cosgray behind Giant Eagle. Royal Dublin Court appeared to extend into townhomes with nothing but parking behind, forcing neighbors into Ponderosa yards seeking green space. Avery Road floods constantly; the new roundabout is already difficult; Rings Road backs up past Eitermann when Cosgray Road closed. Thirteen homes backing to Rings Road face 50-60 mph traffic accident risks. Two people were killed on Avery Road two years ago. The area is not walkable despite Dublin's sidewalk efforts. The change would impact everyone, invading Ponderosa Estates residents. This density is unexpected, changing the whole area vibe. Traffic will be disastrous regardless of studies.

Tara Rowe, 5749 Trafalgar Lane, Dublin, agreed with traffic, density, and character concerns, additionally wanting price point information for comparison.

Martin Lynch, 5509 Tayside Circle, Dublin, agreed the apartments intent to blend into Columbus was wrong for Dublin. Their Washington Elementary children need safe routes. Single-family homes should maintain Ballantrae/Cramers/Ponderosa culture. A northern throughway connecting to Royal Dublin would cause traffic problems with south neighborhood crossovers. They need thoughtfulness not just density maximization.

Wayne Wu, 5549 Tayside Circle, hoped everyone considered collective area development including unknown Parkwood, Riggins development outside Dublin but affecting traffic in the same radius. Apartments were not designed for this area with plenty apartments vacant down Avery Road. The large natural wildlife habitat elimination has nowhere to go, relating to density. Southwest Dublin sometimes seems treated differently.

Fred Still, 6250 Cartwright Lane North, Dublin, cited an October 5, 2023 Dispatch article about Casto maintaining Ponderosa's unique affordable housing, but January 1 brings \$20 lot rent increase plus new \$65 monthly water/trash charge previously included, seemingly pricing out residents. Connector streets off Ponderosa's main entrance and southwest corner would create a racetrack through their sidewalk-less community where residents walk for exercise.

Cheryl Cook, 5483 Bonanza Lane, Dublin, stated that she felt forced from their safe, quiet community her son bought thinking they would be safe. She asked for cameras knowing people would surround them. Her son asked Casto if they felt good about 44% rent increase in two years. Too much building would end their quiet safety. Retail already exists nearby.

Molly Khay, 6236 Rings Road, Dublin, stated that she lives across from planned tall towers overlooking ranch homes. She appreciated updates and green space but concurred with all concerns expressed twice before. She wondered about preservation and animal displacement. The Riggins development a mile away with McDonald's and apartments looks identical, just changes facades. Speed signs were added after roundabout traffic increased. People constantly ask if she will move, but she loves Dublin's safety, police, neighbors and does not want to leave. They are fighting to preserve their neighborhood.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Chinnock noted that the process was working with improvements from 2023, reduced units, increased green space, and emerging uniqueness. He felt they were making progress with the applicant expected to return with additional improvements based on public comments.

Ms. Harter had not been certain from the beginning if this was the right place as it does not fit. Despite time spent reducing, density remains difficult. She is uncomfortable with homeowners looking at apartments without good answers on minimizing impact. More home types including duplexes could work but not apartments. Rings Road precedent of houses set far back has not been matched. Stormwater presents opportunities but they haven't hit pedestrian/bike connectivity for this car-dependent area. Buffers and transitions between uses need work. The needle has not moved despite much work.

Mr. Alexander sympathized with neighbor concerns about change but stated that he would struggle to not support something corresponding to all adopted plans - mixed-use neighborhood on Avery, various residential densities, walkable design, character features, housing diversity solving community problems. Logical distribution made sense to him. The Ponderosa community buffering needs more density/prominence. Transportation plan potential with Tuttle extension taking traffic to 270 could mitigate concerns. Shared parking could reduce lots, heat island effect, stormwater needs while integrating requested green spaces. He would support the proposal with revisions to Emerald Parkway frontage.

Mr. Way agreed the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension changes the site's character with capacity for more density creating mixed uses. Uses proposed were consistent with community and area plans. The plan evolved positively with good open space additions, though perhaps not all in one place but woven through scaling down development character. North-south greenways could break down scale. Transitions from single-family along Rings need work - perhaps estate lots facing Rings, better transitions through duplexes before townhouses. Using open space creatively could reduce intensity even if not density. Uses shown with organization were mostly consistent with the community plan.

The applicant indicated they had heard sufficient feedback. Mr. Way thanked them and indicated the Commission looks forward to seeing them again.

With no objection from the Commission, the meeting was recessed for 10 minutes with members returning to the dais and the meeting reconvening at 9:29 p.m.

### **Case #25-111INF**

#### **Sentry Senior – Informal Review**

**Request for review and non-binding feedback for construction of a continuum of care facility, a medical office building, and associated site improvements. The 18-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located at the southwest corner of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.**

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Jordan Dorsey, Sentry Development, 8620 Nearly Lane, Edwardsville, IL, stated that he appreciated the opportunity for early feedback, explaining they proposed senior housing at Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. He noted Dublin's rapid aging population growth with the City's housing study

indicating need for over 1,000 units by 2030. Sentry builds high-end senior housing across the Midwest with a full continuum of care.

The project would anchor with independent living (lower acuity), where residents receive full-service dining, wellness programs, indoor pool, and in-house therapy. The same structure would include assisted living and memory care, plus independent living villas receiving the same amenities. He showed an initial concept using a building currently under construction in Zionsville, Indiana, testing how it fits this site. The main northeast structure's four-story southern portion (independent living) would transition to two-story assisted living/memory care abutting residential. Amenities including dining, bistros, wine bar, pool, and therapy would be centrally located for all residents.

Approximately 30 single-story independent living villas on the western boundary would be age-restricted rentals receiving the same services. Primary access would be off the new hospital roundabout with limited gate access on Bright Road for emergency and potentially villa residents only. Phase 2's conceptual medical office building to the south would align with city plans, understanding potential future overpass plans. They sought feedback on medical office/retail desires, showing one-story multi-tenant concepts likely for medical users ancillary to seniors housing, though neighborhood feedback suggested a desire for coffee shops serving seniors and coming density.

Mr. Dorsey showed concept images from Franklin, Tennessee with natural stone, wood-look siding, masonry and Hardie plank with pitched roofs, wanting residential rather than institutional appearance. Alternative architecture from Zionsville showed more traditional looks, emphasizing ability to tailor appearance to surroundings. He differentiated from the recently approved Beacon facility, noting their month-to-month rental model with no buy-in provides more flexibility, single-phase completion adding 160-170 units over two years including villas.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt presented staff analysis for this Informal Review, an optional PUD step seeking non-binding feedback on appropriateness relative to the Envision Dublin Community Plan. The site is surrounded by R-1 except Mount Carmel and Beacon PUDs. Future land use recommends neighborhood office with office/medical/institutional principal uses and assisted living as supporting use, envisioning one-to-two story buildings up to 9,500 square feet per acre with residential character.

The Special Area Plan shows the I-270 bridge location, green stream/open space connection through the property, tree row preservation, and special Emerald Parkway landscape treatment. Key concepts include the Emerald Parkway character preservation, transitioning to single-family in the north/west, incorporating tree stands, stream protection, 100-foot Emerald Parkway setback, rear/side parking, and 9,500 square feet per acre density. Alternative considerations include recent Mount Carmel Hospital and Beacon developments potentially adjusting community plan considerations.

Emerald Parkway is a commuter boulevard with traditional character corridor of significance requiring 100-foot setbacks, formal landscaping, ponds/water features, and variable berthing. Bright Road has a river character with 60–100-foot setbacks, natural woodland plantings, stone walls/wood fences, and informal water features. Previous 2019 and 2023 proposals were made under the previous community plan allowing 12,500 square feet per acre. The Commission noted in 2023 that residential in this area was not appropriate.

Ms. Holt highlighted the main entry at the Mount Carmel roundabout conflicting with the future I-270 bridge/roundabout needs addressing. The drainage location differs from shown stormwater features with the City expecting public access enhancement. Staff has concerns about the two-to

four story main building's size/massing adjacent to residential (even at two stories), with parking on three sides including along Emerald Parkway. Future phase shows one-to-four stories medical/retail with strip center feel parking. Ms. Holt noted retail is not Envision Dublin supported and this focal bridge/roundabout terminus location has enhanced architecture/design potential. One-story villas buffer western residential but should wrap north for Bright Road. Staff questions use/massing at approximately 18,900 square feet per acre versus 9,500 square feet recommended, whether adjacent uses mitigate this, and architecture feedback.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Deschler asked about conversations with the City regarding failures to meet expectations. Ms. Holt explained the applicant approached through office hours where Envision Dublin and Special Area Plan concerns were raised consistently with tonight's message.

Mr. Dorsey explained multiple conversations including East Dublin Civic Association and Council members. They viewed Beacon's similar rezoning deeming four-story use acceptable within similar parameters. This seemed a textbook transitional housing location with adjacent healthcare, fitting the medical use narrative as residential and employing 80 people providing healthcare. They allocated future medical office to make expectations manageable. Mr. Deschler pressed on considerations beyond assisted living, with Mr. Dorsey explaining they viewed it similarly to Beacon's phased plan but with higher acuity healthcare in phase one. Building height/massing took cues from City's Beacon approval.

Mr. Deschler asked about analysis of other Dublin retirement communities like Friendship Village's ownership model. Mr. Dorsey explained his 15-year experience showed nonprofit continuing care retirement communities with buy-ins were common, but he had never seen for-profit buy-in models, speculating they don't work. Their monthly rental model works successfully across similar Midwest communities with great demand in Zionsville. This would have the same amenities and care levels as Friendship but simpler financially with monthly fees plus care fees.

Mr. Alexander asked if Beacon had the same 9,500 square foot parameters. Mr. Bitar explained Beacon started in 2019 under the previous plan, evolving through final approvals after Envision Dublin adoption. The Commission and Council accepted that medical office synergies made sense, and though exceeding density, residential senior use intensity was acceptable. Beacon's luxury was distance between larger buildings and neighbors/streets, with taller buildings north near Lifetime Fitness and one-story along Bright Road.

Mr. Alexander asked about the drainage feature public access, with staff showing the focal node traversing from Mount Carmel west to school and trees, wonderful to organize buildings around. The applicant noted the riverway location was new to them based on informal public services staff review. Mr. Alexander asked about incorporating it through the parking lot, with Mr. Dorsey saying it is possible though challenging after moving villas to Bright Road and pushing the main structure south, but could be a nice feature.

Ms. Harter asked about East Dublin Civic Association conversations. Initial feedback was minimal with one positive transitional use comment. Additional comments in the staff report addressed building height, appreciated limiting Bright Road access, and transitioning height lower toward residential. A traffic study would be required with rezoning. Villas differed from Beacon, being highly desirable when amenitized. Buffers from the vacant boarded house to the west were adequate. No hospital affiliation required with in-house therapy company providing PT/OT/speech/wellness, though resident physicians would affiliate locally. Parking seemed minimal

but typical 0.9 spaces for main building plus 1.5-2 car garages per villa. Medical building would be set aside for partner development based on brokerage community input.

Mr. Chinnock asked if four-story independent living could be three stories. Mr. Dorsey indicated he had done three before, but the riverway discussion might require four stories for extra green space. Site layout would need major revision from this test fit for connectivity with walking paths and clubhouse/bistro adjacent to villas. He confirmed 100% flexibility to adapt building design to City preferences while maintaining land use, continuum of care, and approximate unit counts.

Mr. Way asked about property line/Bright Road alignment, with Ms. Wawszkiewicz confirming old county parcels extending into pavement would be cleaned up with dedicated right-of-way. Primary roundabout access spacing would not work as shown. The I-270 bridge would likely have another roundabout at Emerald creating another major access point significantly altering the plan framework. The riparian corridor was not currently visible on the agricultural site but would be created with flexibility. Stormwater from Mount Carmel comes overland north of the roundabout feeding drainage continuing west through trees to Scioto River. Mr. Dorsey confirmed complete flexibility beyond the test fit to create site-specific buildings addressing all discussions.

### **Public Comment**

Randy Roth, 6987 Grandee Cliffs Drive, Dublin, stated that he has been the East Dublin Civic Association Vice President since its 1988 founding. He thanked the applicant for contacting president Amy Kramb though meetings had not occurred yet. Initial feedback wanted adherence to community plan as this deviates significantly. The association never opposed height, supporting Bridge Street and four-story assisted living north of Bright that steps down toward Emerald. They would prefer two-story maximum here. Density at twice envisioned square footage concerned them. Traffic circulation originally envisioned 18 acres plus 20 acres west with internal circulation and one Bright Road curb cut - impossible with this design forcing more curb cuts. Medical office business park with internal circulation would be best. They need to preserve Bright Road's rural character with thin tree screening and minimal setback.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Chinnock appreciated the presentation but was not in favor of the proposal due to significant Envision Dublin deviation, though he acknowledged many ancillary items would affect layout. He liked blending Mount Carmel's modern prominence with residential aspects rather than pure traditional architecture, but had concerns about deviating beyond Envision Dublin's provisions approval.

Ms. Harter agreed it deviated wrongly from the Community Plan. Density and villas did not fit well. Traffic study would be important. Uncertainty about medical office timing concerned her given past issues with reserved spaces.

Mr. Alexander saw Envision Dublin calling for neighborhood office/medical with supporting institutional/assisted living uses - exactly what is proposed, though not one-to-two stories compliant. He supported the use as responsive and stated that he thought it would be unfair to impose different standards than the Beacon when their density was less. The four-story building could landmark the Bright/roundabout point. Natural features were important and stone imagery responded to community character with quarry heritage.

Mr. Deschler wanted clarity on principal versus supporting/secondary uses controlling the site. He wasn't in favor of assisted living of this magnitude as primary use. He understood area need but this location with previous approvals created a first-to-market situation. The exposure difference from Sawmill made this more visible for city access. Memory care or components with one-to-two story offices at reduced density per city requests might be supportable, but they do not meet the proposed land use.

Mr. Way agreed Emerald Parkway was designed as a major business address with highly valued land for office/institutional uses. The site's prime medical office location was reinforced by the new hospital. Important frontage should be Emerald Parkway for medical office with potential integration of linear assisted living behind facing west, giving proper Emerald character with buffers/parking while the riparian corridor divides uses. Assisted living could support medical office synergies but currently appeared as primary use inappropriately. The bridge intersection created a major gateway/landmark opportunity not to waste on secondary uses. Could another site accommodate their program more appropriately given community need?

Mr. Chinnock added he liked the facility/architecture/villas/variation but not on this site. He appreciated the nice building/design/concept just not here.

Mr. Way supported spreading facilities rather than concentrating two adjacent ones, making them accessible citywide.

Mr. Alexander noted planning differs from market-driven building, asking how delayed office development fit others' thinking. Mr. Way said development agreements handle phasing to prevent cherry-picking, believing medical office markets exist.

The applicant indicated they had no questions.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Bitar shared the following:

1. Proposed 2026 meeting dates provided to commissioners. Some individual absences were expected but no major conflicts arose. Mr. Deschler noted definite absences and Ms. Harter stated she would be out August 20, 2026.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Chinnock seconded approval of the 2026 meeting dates as proposed.

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

2. Tori Brubaker, a new planner, was introduced. She started with the City about a month ago and would be presenting at future meetings.
3. Hilary Damaser, a long-serving Architectural Review Board member, was announced as the newest Commission member. She would be joining the Commission in January.
4. Emails have been received by commissioners from Bridge Park area residents about building heights. He noted the City Manager and Ms. Rauch would meet with residents next week. Bridge Street District measures height differently causing confusion, with literature forthcoming to clarify.
5. Regarding public comment process, comments arriving just before meetings were not fair to public or commissioners. A new policy establishes 48-hour cutoff before meetings for comments to be included, with no expectation for reading at meetings - verbal comments

require in-person sworn testimony. The public comment button glitch still allowed late comments; 2026 would officially start the new process.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:39 pm.

---

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Deputy Clerk of Council

require in-person sworn testimony. The public comment button glitch still allowed late comments; 2026 would officially start the new process.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:39 pm.



Kim May  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Payne Maxwell  
Deputy Clerk of Council