



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 18, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Call at 6:38 PM at 5555 Perimeter Drive. Ms. Call welcomed attendees and noted that the meeting could be joined in person or accessed via livestream on the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Gary Alexander, Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way

Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Jennifer Rauch, Bassem Bitar, Josh Reinicke, Shawn Krawetzki

AMEND AGENDA ORDER

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to amend the order of the agenda to move the executive session after Discussion topics.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes..
[Motion carried 7-0.]

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the August 21, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes, September 2, 2025 Joint Council-BC Work Session minutes, and September 4 Special Meeting-Tour minutes.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes
[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when planning and property rezoning is under consideration, with Council receiving recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has final decision-making responsibility.

She 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 provide public comment on administrative cases was sworn in by Ms. Call.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Call noted that there were two cases eligible for the Consent Agenda.

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

Case #25-080AFDP

Prince of Peace – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to allow a new bell tower. The 4.07-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Earlington Village and is located at 5475 Brand Road.

Case #25-086WR

EHG Partners Tenant Improvements - Waiver

Request for review and approval of a Waiver request to allow a reduction in the ground story transparency for an existing tenant space. The 0.56-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is located at 4495 Bridge Park Avenue.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the consent agenda.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

NEW CASE

Case #25-069PDP

All In Dublin – Preliminary Development Plan

Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to accommodate a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The ±1.55-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located on the east side of Dublin Center Drive between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Jena Kessler, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Columbus, presented on behalf of All Inclusive Living, joined by Mark Dunham and Dan Scheinman from TFG Housing Resources, along with Edge landscape architects and American Structure Point civil engineers.

Ms. Kessler began by sharing All In Dublin's mission: "All In Dublin aspires to create a community of good neighbors in which adults with disabilities can live alongside people of all ages and abilities." She emphasized how this aligns with the Envision Dublin Community Plan to provide a community where people of all ages and abilities can thrive.

The presentation focused on four key areas of improvement since the Concept Plan review in June: community connectivity, mobility/transportation, open space, and gateway/architecture.

Community Connectivity: The site benefits from numerous nearby amenities within a 1,000-foot radius including commercial, grocery stores, food, shopping, and parks. A major update involved concentrating community space along the SR 161 first floor frontage, moving residential units that were previously there. This programmatic shift provided better buffering of residential units from SR 161, improved resident safety, and created a more activated façade with storefront glazing extending along the entire elevation to promote a mixed-use feel.

Site Access: The vehicular access point was shifted east to better align with the Bridge Street Network Plan, and is now positioned at the midpoint of the future block. This shared access point with the neighboring property captured approximately 2,000 square feet from the adjoining property, improving circulation and providing better buffers and setbacks.

Mobility and Transportation: The design prioritizes pedestrians, bicycles, and transit per the Envision Dublin Plan. Sidewalks connect to existing sidewalks on all sides. The site benefits from proximity to bus route 33 along Sawmill Road and SR 161, with three bus stops within 1,000 feet. The site also falls within COTA's Northwest Corridor Study for future bus rapid transit.

Open Space: The team worked to ensure open space meets requirements by being on the public right-of-way. The current plan provides 15,000 square feet of open space while accommodating 75 parking spaces. However, the corridor study for SR 161 improvements would shift the right-of-way 19 feet north into the site, affecting approximately 3,800 square feet of open space. The design includes a larger pocket park on the north end, reducing parking lot frontage on Banker Drive with a screen wall for buffering, plus pocket parks and plazas along SR 161.

Architecture: Updates included revising the massing and design at the corner of SR 161 and Dublin Center Drive by infilling the second, third, and fourth floors, creating a more prominent covered open space below accessible by gentle ramping and sidewalks. Transparency was increased throughout, with window proportions revised for consistency. The Dublin Center Drive elevation was differentiated with porches for a more residential feel, contrasting with the commercial storefront character along SR 161.

Staff Presentation

Deputy Director Bassem Bitar explained this is the Preliminary Development Plan stage in the Bridge Street District's three-step process, following the non-binding Concept Plan review. This stage sets the framework for final details, with one additional step remaining.

He confirmed the site acquired an additional sliver of land from the adjacent parcel through a minor subdivision approved administratively. The site is in the mixed-use urban future land use category allowing 3-6 story multifamily residential, consistent with the proposal. Within the Bridge Street District special area plan's east sub-area, the intent is to gradually transition from suburban to walkable development.

The Sawmill Center neighborhood encourages mixed uses and improved access. The intersection is classified as a gateway, which the building and open space design addresses. Bridge Street requires specific streetscape standards including concrete sidewalks, granite curbs, and permeable brick pavers for on-street parking.

Site Plan Details: The additional property sliver and requested right-of-way dedication for future SR 161 improvements were highlighted. Proposed on-street parking on Dublin Center Drive requires restriping and removal of left turn lanes, with details to be finalized before final development plan. The number of parking spaces is uncertain due to the intersection requirements.

Code Compliance Issues: The apartment building type requires buildings within 5-20 feet of the street. With three street frontages, the building addresses the two principal frontage streets (SR

161 and Dublin Center Drive) but the northern line falls outside the required building zone, necessitating a waiver. Required building frontage percentages may require an administrative departure. Some elements may encroach into the 5-foot setback. Stormwater will be addressed through a detention tank under the pavement, though this affects landscape islands above.

Parking: 88 spaces are typically required (with transit reduction), but they will have 82-86 spaces counting on-street parking. Staff believes this is reasonable based on the use, with a parking plan to be presented at Final Development Plan.

Waivers Needed:

- Required building zone - for the portion outside the 5-20 foot setback
- Occupied space requirement - for water/electric rooms facing public streets

The building includes 38 one-bedroom, 29 two-bedroom, and 8 three-bedroom units, plus 4,100 square feet of amenity/fitness/common space on the first floor.

Open Space: 15,000 square feet required based on unit count. The existing equipment yard and proposed generator in the north may not count toward public open space but falls within the 10% administrative departure allowance. Open space organization makes sense with the pocket park across from where the Dublin Center Drive greenway terminates and another at the gateway. Some dimensional requirements are not currently met but could be addressed through design adjustments.

The four-story building complies with the 2-4.5 story height limits. Some technical code requirements for vertical increments and transparency percentages may require waivers or administrative departures, though the architectural intent is met. The east elevation does not meet transparency requirements due to the public art opportunity.

Public art would be reviewed by the new Dublin Arts Council Public Art Board. Staff recommends approval with seven conditions addressing the items mentioned.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock thanked the applicant for addressing previous comments. He asked about discrepancies between renderings and elevations regarding colors and materials. Ms. Kessler confirmed the material page and elevations are most accurate, with renderings to be updated. Regarding blocked-out storefront areas, these would be fiber cement panels matching the dark bronze storefront frame, with approximately 25% being non-glazed.

Mr. Chinnock questioned the generator location in the pocket park. Ms. Kessler explained it made sense near existing utilities with planned screening, though they could study relocating it. The street wall screening would be a low brick wall matching the building. Regarding the east elevation mural, they are open to reducing its size or adding glazing if appropriate.

Ms. Harter appreciated the applicant listening to previous comments. She asked about noise mitigation through landscaping, with the generator having sound panels and additional landscape buffering. She was concerned about rooftop appearance from future taller buildings. Ms. Kessler noted no major equipment on the roof, only required stair/elevator shafts, with a low-slope membrane that could be colored. Certified installers would be required for critical components like roofing. Regarding underground parking, Ms. Kessler said they prioritized the building, residents, and units over structured parking.

Mr. Way complimented the clear presentation. He expressed concern about the enclosed corner plaza at Dublin Center Drive and SR 161, questioning how public it would feel despite being open-air and accessible. He questioned whether on-street parking on Dublin Center Drive serves ground-level residential well, suggesting the sidewalk could be pushed out for more green space instead.

He asked about shared parking with the adjacent bank. He suggested the public art element does not have to be a mural on the building and wondered about windows for residential units on that elevation.

Mr. Alexander appreciated the presentation and the continuity of four-sided architecture but felt the mural compromises this. He confirmed minimal landscaping exists between Dublin Center Drive units and the sidewalk.

Mr. Deschler asked about obligations for private outdoor space like community gardens. Mr. Bitar confirmed they can have private spaces beyond the public open space requirements. Regarding traffic, the Bridge Street District had comprehensive traffic studies, so individual studies are not required. The intent is to make streets more pedestrian-friendly by removing dedicated turn lanes. He expressed concern about the Banker Drive intersection becoming worse without the left turn lane.

On parking, Mr. Deschler noted the neighborhood design guidelines recommend structured or underground parking. Ms. Kessler confirmed surface parking is permitted in the Sawmill Center neighborhood. He asked about adding porches to more Dublin Center Drive units and whether those units have exterior egress (they have patios with secondary entrances). He inquired about further mixed-use investigation beyond the amenity space but none was explored.

Mr. Garvin echoed appreciation for the presentation and substantial changes. He supports keeping the covered corner design but suggests improving other open spaces for usability. He was disappointed not to see commercial mixed-use for activation. He is concerned parking feels tight at the minimum of one per unit and that continuing surface parking does not achieve the goal of eliminating parking seas.

Ms. Call asked staff to confirm parking plans can be tied to specific uses rather than in perpetuity, which Mr. Bitar confirmed. She asked about safe pedestrian mobility through the parking lot, particularly from furthest spaces. Ms. Kessler noted the flush main entry and improved circulation with the shared access point.

Dan Scheinman of TFG Housing Resources, 68 South Front Street, Columbus, confirmed one space per unit (75 spaces) was determined sufficient based on market study analysts and other developers' feedback.

Mr. Deschler followed up about the potential senior population mix. Mr. Scheinman confirmed their attorneys determined it is possible to have a mixed-age project with some units set aside for seniors.

Public Comments

Todd Hemmert, 5824 Houchard Road, Dublin, asked about sustainability plans including wastewater reuse for gardens, solar panels, and electric car parking provisions.

Ms. Call noted these questions could be addressed at Final Development Plan.

Ms. Call closed public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock reiterated appreciation for the presentation and moving in the right direction. He noted parking will be challenging but understands surface parking makes sense here, though more green space is always preferred. He would like the generator relocated from the pocket park. He

supports on-street parking on Banker Drive as it activates the streetscape and provides traffic calming. He emphasized needing accurate architectural and material depictions when they return.

Ms. Harter appreciated the time spent on details. She noted parking is a big decision since they have worked to hide parking in Bridge Park. Landscaping is important both outside and for views from inside. She suggested considering water features for noise mitigation. She has mixed feelings about the mural placement but likes the building overall. She supports examining Dublin Center Drive without parking for more green space.

Mr. Way appreciated the progress made. As the first building of its type in the area, getting it right is important as others will follow. He suggested pushing the sidewalk out where parking is proposed on Dublin Center Drive to create more green space consistent with the plan's north-south greenway. He feels on-street parking typically supports ground-level commercial, not residential. The enclosed corner plaza will not feel inviting to the public despite being great for residents - he questions counting it as public open space.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is fine with parking as it is permitted by Code and they meet open space requirements without burying parking. He supports keeping the roof over pocket park B as it defines the prominent corner, though access could be more direct. He would not remove upper units or revert the design. He encouraged considering sustainability features like photovoltaics per Council's mandate.

Mr. Deschler acknowledged parking is permitted but not recommended per neighborhood design guidelines. He would like to see more architectural interest on the Dublin Center Drive elevation with the porches. He shares concerns about on-street parking on Dublin Center Drive not slowing traffic. If surface parking could be reduced, it would create additional green space and potentially private space for residents like walking gardens, creating more community within the community.

Mr. Garvin called this a vast improvement, particularly the elevations. His preference for the new corner design outweighs usability concerns. He remains concerned about the generator affecting the largest pocket park's usability. He was disappointed not to see commercial use, as "storefront" implies active space that might look unused from outside. While appreciating the design, he noted the first project continuing surface parking may set precedent against eliminating parking seas. Covered parking would change the feel to more urban/walkable rather than looking at a 75-space lot.

Ms. Call appreciated the clear presentation of changes. She specifically appreciated activation along SR 161 for this mixed-use residential with quasi-commercial recreation areas expecting higher utilization. The corner massing improvement was critical. She likes the enclosure/coverage complementing the area and meeting pocket plaza definitions, preferring this over unused benches and art.

Her concerns focus on parking and pocket park A, which currently is not beautiful with 4-5 large mechanical elements. Adding a generator would make it unusable park space. She challenges relocating the generator closer to the building as a mechanical component rather than in a community asset.

On parking, she appreciates the land acquisition enabling 75 spaces. She would support a parking plan tied to the user/use and strongly encourages a shared parking agreement with Fifth Third Bank, even short-term, to evaluate actual needs and provide flexibility since the bank parking is

not full. She is concerned about pedestrian mobility through the parking lot and suggests widening the natural belt, losing spaces on either side, with striped crosswalk for safer passage from furthest spaces to the building.

The Commission engaged in extensive discussion about whether the covered corner plaza should count as public open space. Reading the code definitions, pocket plazas are "intended to provide a formal open space of relatively small scale to serve as an impromptu gathering place for civic, social, and commercial purposes" while pocket parks are "intended to provide small scale primarily landscaped active or passive recreation and gathering spaces for neighborhood residents within walking distance."

Mr. Boggs clarified the Code considers suitability of open space based on community plan goals, suitability for active/passive recreation, need for specific open space types, anticipated users, and proximity to other open spaces. Mr. Chinnock stated that if it is publicly accessible with walkways, it should count regardless of screening. Mr. Way and others expressed concern about setting precedent, noting it feels like a building vestibule or lobby that people would not feel invited to enter.

Mr. Bitar added that Bridge Street District open space serves different purposes than elsewhere, intended for urban gatherings. Staff including their consultant felt this unique space fit the urban context with shade/cover at a busy intersection, allowing indoor/outdoor connection with the community space. However, commission members remained divided.

After a straw poll showing 4 commission members not wanting to count the covered corner as open space, Ms. Call summarized the direction: when returning, meet open space requirements without counting the enclosed area under the building mass at SR 161 and Dublin Center Drive.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the following waivers:

1. Waive Section 153.060(O)(3)(a)(1) – Corner Side Require Building Zone to allow the building to be located approximately 62 feet on average from the Banker Drive property line where the required building zone is 5-20 feet.
2. Waive Section 153.060(O)(3)(c) – Occupied Space to allow unoccupied space to occupy a portion of the ground story of the west façade facing Dublin Center Drive where the minimum is 20 ft depth.

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

[Motion carried 6-1.]

The Commission then discussed adding conditions beyond the 7 recommended by staff. They considered whether to add a condition to relocate the generator outside pocket park A. Open space concerns were covered by condition #2 with tonight's minutes providing context. They also added direction to investigate pedestrian transportation through the parking lot (4 commissioners in favor).

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. The applicant update the Site Plan to reflect the Required Building Zone and side yard setback and confirm compliance with the applicable standards at the Final Development Plan stage (FDP).

2. The applicant continue to work with staff on addressing the lot coverage and open space standards at FDP.
3. The applicant work with Engineering staff to complete stormwater management calculations that are compliant with the City's stormwater regulations and provide the correct critical storm calculations prior to submittal for FDP.
4. The applicant continue to work with Engineering staff and the Washington Township Fire Department to confirm the necessary water lines are provided for fire coverage.
5. The applicant continue to work with staff on incorporating the BSD Streetscape Character Guidelines including incorporation of on-street parking.
6. The applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing the on-site parking details.
7. The applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing the building design details.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

DISCUSSION

Special Area Plan Tour Recap

Mr. Bitar reviewed the recent special area plan tour that began at City Hall and visited multiple areas:

Dubin Corporate Area Plan (Metro Center/Blazer Parkway): The stop at the old Max & Erma's site discussed the revitalization plan adopted by Council to reimagine Metro Center as mixed-use, using water as an amenity, providing connectivity, enhancing multimodal transportation including a potential bridge over I-270.

Blazer District: Highlighted the injection of additional uses and connectivity to Metro Center offering alternative routes beyond Frantz Road, coordinating with Metro Center development at different scale/character.

Emerald Corridor: The employment spine along I-270 with connectivity to other uses and certain mixed-use areas. The stop on Parkwood Loop discussed potential transition from office to mixed-use with smaller neighborhood office, residential, and commercial uses.

Southwest Area Plan: Envisioned for future residential at different densities with the future Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension bringing utilities for gradual development.

West Innovation District: Another employment area focusing on high-tech cooperation with universities, research, and light industrial. Discussion included zoning at Cosgray/Shier-Rings (ID-2, ID-4, ID-5), planning for a potential passenger rail station at the northwest corner with mixed-use opportunities, sports, Ohio University campus for education/research, and the future premier athletic facility.

The Commission discussion highlighted connectivity between various facilities and areas, particularly for SportsOhio athletics with nearby hotels and Ohio University. Members suggested future tours look at lessons learned from approved projects and possibly visit other communities like Hilliard. Ms. Call noted the Tartan Fields apartment building exemplifies high density but low intensity, illustrating these as different concepts.

The Commission discussed whether to allow public comment on this discussion item. Mr. Boggs advised that typically public comment is not taken on discussion items since there is nothing concrete to comment on. The Commission decided not to take public comment but encouraged written submissions through staff for future consideration.

ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded to adjourn to executive session for the purposes of conference with an attorney for the public body concerning disputes involving the public body that are the subject of pending or imminent court action.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Call yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]

The meeting was reconvened at 9:25 p.m. with all members present.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch announced the next meeting on October 2nd, the Central Ohio APA Planning and Zoning Workshop on October 24th in Columbus (8 AM - 4 PM), and the Evening of Gratitude recognizing volunteer boards and commissions on October 29th at The Exchange from 6-8 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council