

**JOINT WORK SESSION OF
DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL,
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION,
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD,
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
October 16, 2024**

Minutes

Mayor Amorose Groomes called the Wednesday, October 16, 2024 joint work session to order at 6:02 p.m.

Members Present:

Council Members: Vice Mayor Alutto, Mayor Amorose Groomes, Ms. De Rosa, Ms. Fox, Mr. Keeler, Ms. Kramb

Members absent: Mr. Reiner

PZC Members: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Call, Mr. Chinnock, Mr. Deschler, Mr. Garvin, Ms. Harter

Members absent: Mr. Way

ARB Members: Ms. Cooper, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Damaser, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Patt-McDaniel

BZA Members: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kretz, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nigh, Ms. Tyznik

Staff Members: Ms. Rauch, Ms. O'Callaghan, Mr. Gracia, Mr. Boggs

Also present: Tracy Owens

Ms. O'Callaghan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

City Updates:

Mayor Amorose Groomes provided updates on City initiatives.

Land acquisition

Recent acquisitions include Carter Farms (137 acres), Shepherd Excavating (8 acres), and SportsOhio (98 acres).

This acquisition consists of multiple parcels that can be leveraged for a number of strategic opportunities related to economic development, transportation and recreational uses. The City has had a land acquisition policy that advances several of our Strategic Plans including:

- Strategic Framework and Vision
- City Council Visionary Goals
- Community Plan
- Economic Development Strategic Plan
- Parks and Recreation Master Plan and
- West Dublin Passenger Rail Station Study.

Purchases of land enable the City to control the ultimate use of the property and as the City continues to build out, there are fewer opportunities to purchase property.

Mayor Amorose Groomes shared the West Innovation District (WID) Special Area Plan map that was developed as a result of the Envision Dublin Plan. Before this purchase, Dublin was more than 90% built out. This purchase opened up another 20-30% growth opportunity. She listed some

future improvements, such as Cosgray widening, University extension, Shier Rings extension, Houchard improvements, Eiterman realignment, and a new road west of CSX. The roadway network is starting to take shape. Many of tonight's attendees will have input on how this vision will come to be. With the acquisition of SportsOhio Dublin nearly doubled our outdoor field usage.

Passenger Rail and LinkUS

Mayor Amorose Groomes reviewed the Ohio Corridor Identification and Development (Corridor ID) Program and shared a map showing rail lines through Ohio. The Corridor ID is a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) initiative to reimagine passenger rail planning nationally. The two most interesting lines to Dublin are the 3C&D - an application submitted by the State of Ohio and being supported by State officials; and the Midwest Connect, which was submitted by Fort Wayne, Indiana in conjunction with MORPC. Mayor Amorose Groomes shared that she will be traveling to Fort Wayne to meet with leadership to talk about next steps. The Corridor ID is a three-step process.

Step 1 (Selection and Initiation) is where we are now.

Step 2 (Route Planning) – This step details routes, stations, and what capital improvements must be made. It is estimated to take 1 to 3 years to complete. The City of Dublin invested heavily into the HyperLoop study and already has answers to many of these questions so she believes it will not take the full three years.

Step 3 (Project Development) – This includes the engineering and final environmental review.

Mayor Amorose Groomes shared the Central Ohio and Regional Rail Map and Potential Passenger Rail Stations showing a contemplated rail station in Dublin. She noted that this is a competitive process. A 20-minute drive shed map was shared showing that Dublin is centrally located.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that early polling shows LinkUS has a chance of passing in November. There are three primary corridors. The northwest corridor represents more than 60% of jobs in the region and terminates in Bridge Park. It will be a game changer for employers. The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is looking at a line across 270 from Dublin to the Intel site. This speaks to the work that boards and commissions do. No other community has the opportunity to be linked to mass transit like the City of Dublin. This could provide access to jobs and opportunity. LinkUS will be a dedicated lane for buses that operate as light rail. Passengers enter and exit the buses at grade. She encouraged everyone to vote for Issue 47 this November.

Metro Center Revitalization

The City Council and boards and commissions have spent a lot of time discussing Metro Center Revitalization. The implementation is nearing the end of the "thinking" process and soon entering the "doing" process. Current conditions include more than 7,500 parking spaces. There is pavement in spaces that could be used for other purposes to build density and vibrancy. Elements for Revitalization include:

- support existing office tenants,
- embrace walkability,
- foster a sense of place,
- consolidate underutilized surface parking, add structured parking with mixed-use development,
- provide a variety of new housing types for workers and residents, and
- establish a unique natural open space amenity and connect the district with greenspace.

The revitalization will start with focusing planning efforts along Frantz Road, which involves starting the central water portion.

Fiber to Every Home

Being the most connected City in the U.S. has been a goal of City Council. Fiber allows us to accomplish many of the City's goals. Fiber to the Home is now moving into phase 2 of construction. The City is ensuring there is ample communication with residents.

Questions

Mr. Garvin asked about the number of local LinkUS stations projected. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that it will function similar to light rail with the only stop contemplated in Dublin at in Bridge Park. Assuming LinkUS and a rail stop both come to fruition, there will likely be an interim stop between the two.

Ms. Harter stated Dublin City Schools had a speaker on LinkUS and it was well-received.

Ms. Call asked if there are other transportation efforts that would make a difference. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that there are also trails, sidewalks, bike paths, etc. but the rail and LinkUS would be advantageous to Dublin.

Lean Six Sigma Development Process Review

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the presentation this evening is the culmination of very hard work by all City staff. Every department has been represented in this process. This review follows the adoption of the City's Economic Development Strategic Plan Update. A cross-departmental team has focused on Strategy 2 regarding the development review process and identified six major action themes through a Lean Six Sigma analysis. Tracy Owens led the Lean Six Sigma analysis and helped identify improvement opportunities within the Development Process. Feedback from developers is a desire for more transparency and predictability. Every effort was made to engage with as many stakeholders as possible including our board and commission members. Ms. O'Callaghan expressed her appreciation for the members' engagement.

Ms. Rauch introduced the development process review topic, the Lean Six Sigma process, and invited Mr. Owens forward.

Mr. Owens began by referencing one of the past process improvements (Building Standards Plan Review Process Improvement) in which he was involved. There were a lot of long-held beliefs about how that process was supposed to work. They took a perennial backlog of 30-35 projects and brought it down to single digits within a couple of weeks.

Mr. Owens explained how Lean Six Sigma works. There are five phases:

Define – Define exactly what needs solving, determine whether it is worth trying to solve and engage sponsors.

Measure – Quantify the problem. Collect data to understand the current situation.

Analyze – Identify the cause of the problem.

Improve – Implement and verify the solution. Solutions need tested.

Control – Maintain the solution. Institutionalize the best path forward until the next round of improvements.

Mr. Owens stated that the development process review timeline began in April 2024. It was brought to our attention as an opportunity for improvement. In May, there was a current process analysis workshop that included many of the board and commission members in attendance this evening. External stakeholders were involved in that step. Soon after that study, a survey was conducted. A workshop was held June 21 to study and synthesize emerging themes to be turned into actions. On June 28, there was a feedback session. A second survey was conducted July through September and that brings the project to this joint work session.

Feedback from participants at the May 10 workshop included words like, predictable, responsive, friendly, and flexibility. Dublin is a community that is conscious of design that is proud of its environment.

Mr. Cotter asked if developers wanted the process to be faster or cheaper. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that with development, time is money, so they wanted both. Ms. Call stated that unpredictability leads to increased cost. Mr. Owens stated that there is always the iron triangle of speed, accuracy and cost.

Mr. Deschler stated that he thinks there should be more Code specificity not less.

Mr. Owens share more of the feedback shared on May 10, 2024. Knowing that was not the full voice of everyone involved, a survey of local stakeholders was conducted. Key takeaways from the survey included satisfaction with staff and the helpful nature of the City's employees. Clarifying the process was a theme that came up on May 10th and through the survey. How to help someone through the development review process is one of the action themes.

A benchmarking survey was conducted as well. Some of the organizations researched were Cincinnati, Cleveland, Delaware, Detroit, MI, New Albany, Grove City, Upper Arlington, Westerville, and more.

A workshop was held June 21, 2024 to turn ideas into action. He shared examples of work sheets used to facilitate the *analyze* and *improve* phases. Some could be put in place immediately. The following action themes were identified/developed:

- Project Management Approach
- Central Intelligence
- Tiers of Service
- Technology Use
- Requirements and Review Process
- Staff Reports

Mr. Owens noted that there is always another round of improvement projects.

Mr. Nigh asked how many people attended these meetings.

Ms. Rauch stated that there were maybe 20 attendees at the first meeting. Staff tried to target those with whom they work on a very regular basis. Mr. Owens stated that there were 30 or 32 survey responses received.

Mr. Kretz asked if the City loses any business because of the process as it exists today. Mr. Gracia answered affirmatively and stated that there are people that choose not to engage because of

perception of the process. Mr. Owens stated that one of the action themes, Central Intelligence, involves tracking overtures people make toward developing in Dublin and determining how to keep them engaged.

Mr. Deschler asked if the developments lost are developments Dublin would want. Mr. Gracia stated that the future development of those large parcels in which the City has recently invested, hinge a lot on this development review process, the envision Dublin process, and related Code changes. To utilize that land properly, these issues will need to be addressed. If no changes are made, Dublin will not compete on a global scale. Mr. Gracia references some of the City-owned parcels that had a specific strategy regarding semi-conductor supply chain and stated that use is currently not permitted on those sites.

Mr. Keeler stated that it is important to make the distinction between commercial and residential uses. The desire is to streamline the process for commercial development in the western part of the City. Someone constructing residential knows they will reap a financial upside of building in Dublin and will follow a process. A corporate partner would have many options.

Mr. Cotter asked how the City will measure success with this endeavor. Ms. Rauch stated there will be process metrics. That is part of the loop of evaluation. Some results are subjective and others are objective. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the City currently has a performance measurement tracking system and performed extensive benchmarking.

Ms. Harter stated that she hears staff circle back with an applicant regarding a site that is more appropriate. Staff is cultivating relationships behind the scenes. Ms. Rauch stated that Planning and Economic Development work very closely together.

Ms. Rauch summarized and shared the six action themes. Each theme has a project statement or goal and identified tasks to help with accomplishment. Some are more complex than others.

Project Management Approach

This came out of the stakeholder discussion and is an effort to help shepherd projects through the process without having multiple points of contact. That single point of contact could be any staff member. It was not desirable to have someone going through the development review process trying to hunt down answers. Staff has identified a number of projects and tested this approach. Staff utilized this with five specific projects: Media Source, COhatch, Lightbridge Academy, Fallback Studios, and Roundtable. This helped staff determine that the approach works. This does not require the case manager to be a subject matter expert but determine how to get the answers needed. That requires more training and transparency amongst staff. The formalization of the Case Manager role and project management training is in progress.

Mr. Gracia shared an example of a broker telling an existing company looking for a new home that they would not get a permit in time to stay in Dublin. Because of the relationship with the Economic Development Department, this representative reached out to Dublin and they were able to help this company stay in Dublin. A case manager would be very beneficial in a case such as this.

Central Intelligence

Ms. Rauch stated that this is the ability to track inquiries. Previously staff members had their own way of tracking inquiries. Inquiries do not always come in to Planning staff. Central Intelligence

provides the opportunity to consolidate that information. This action involves how to track contact the contact, what was the question asked, and what was the answer given. This will also help with properties that generate many inquiries. A fact sheet was created on those properties to ensure consistent information is reviewed, updated and provided.

Tiers of Service

Ms. Rauch stated that there are developers that are very familiar with the process and those that are new to Dublin. This action then involves looking at ways to engage with them and any necessary Code changes. One of the in-progress items is how to handle people that want to meet with staff. Staff is looking at establishing a set time every week to meet with developers that includes the same set group of staff members.

Technology Use

This action item considers how to use technology to the best advantage. Staff has identified and accomplished how to use technology to access and research cases or permits. Another piece of this action item is considering other software solutions to make the development review process as seamless as possible.

Ms. Fox asked if the desire for an easier online system is addressed in this theme. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively and stated that many of the themes overlap. There was discussion around the many application types that currently exist and whether there is a way to rebuild the system to allow applicants to submit one application that would then getting routed appropriately based on responses or information submitted.

Requirements and Review Process

Ms. Rauch stated that this theme as well as the next theme are areas for discussion and feedback from the group this evening. This covers many pieces of this process including how we are communicating with owners/applicants, posting submission deadlines on the website, and linking applications between planning and building divisions. In progress items include standardizing comments, updating standard drawings and posting on website. Staff is also investigating necessary code modifications that could streamline the review process.

Staff Reports and Recommendations

A survey was conducted with boards and commission and City Council. Very specific conversations have been held at board and commission meetings. Staff reports are very different depending on the reviewing body. Staff wanted to determine how staff reports and recommendations can be helpful and how to tailor it to the needs of the reviewing body. Next steps would be to implement changes requested by the boards and commission. That also includes the topic of the level of details required for engineering, transportation and mobility and defining that. A lot of engineering information is currently required at the planning stage. Some of that could possibly be required at the building review stage. The determination needs to be made as to what the compromise is that allows staff to be confident the project would work but would not require the significant investment of 80% engineering.

Ms. Rauch shared the survey results from the board and commission survey. There were a series of questions asked that looked at how information is provided in a staff report, how clear that

information is, how clear the scope of what the body is reviewing is, and what other things would be helpful to be included. A question was also asked regarding staff recommendations. Respondents shared that information is clear. There was a lot of agreement that more clarity could be provided on concept plans. Comments were received about ensuring continuity between the City vision and development proposals. There was feedback given that encouraged staff to look for opportunities to abbreviate the information. Additional information about how the other divisions engage throughout the process could be added. The majority of survey respondents felt that staff recommendations were helpful.

Ms. Rauch summarized the survey responses regarding staff reports as follows:

- Each Board and Commission has different informational needs
- Opportunities to streamline information
- Clarity around what the Board/Commission should focus
- Integration of Envision Dublin information/recommendations
- Provide information about previous items discussed with applicants
- Importance of applicant engagement with neighborhoods
- Majority of members expressed support for staff recommendations

The second part of this survey sought feedback regarding presentations. Recently PZC has changed the order in which they hear presentations allowing the applicant to go first followed by staff. BZA has kept their order the same with staff presentations going first. Staff is trying to tailor these for the specific board or commission. There was a lot of discussion around making sure presentations include graphics and 3D modeling. Staff's takeaways were to further refine presentations, not duplicate applicant presentation, help keep the board or commission focused, and the order in which presentations occur.

Staff benchmarked recommendations with area municipalities and professional resources. Staff has determined that they will continue to provide a recommendation. A staff recommendation provides a level of transparency to applicants as they move through the process.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she assumes applicants have a good idea of what conditions will be from staff. For ARB, applicants may not have public speaking experience but she thinks an applicant should be given the opportunity to go first because they will feel they have more agency. Applicants may see staff's recommendation as biasing the Board. Ms. Rauch stated that is the hybrid approach that staff will employ with ARB. There are some applicants that feel comfortable going first, and some who do not.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated applicants have asked to have a chance to tell their story

Ms. Call stated PZC had similar conversation about staff recommendations. The perception of the applicant as well as the public is that the decision has already been made. Public comment could be impacted. PZC discussed whether the staff recommendation should be removed.

Ms. Damaser stated the applicant also has the burden of proof and traditionally those people go first and they get to state their case and then staff can agree or share an alternative view.

Mr. Alexander asked about the case manager and if there has been an evaluation of staff responsibilities and if the potential increase in workload factors in. Ms. Rauch stated that it will be an increase because an employee would be fielding inquiries that they may not have in the past, but the goal is not for that employee to have the answer to every question. They are the connection

point to find the answer. Hopefully that will reduce other finding answers. These actions will need to be implemented and evaluated.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that she is passionate about this recommendation (case manager). Typically, when she gets involved, a developer has not received a satisfactory answer or has received conflicting information. One point of contact will save dividends on other projects, provide predictability and customer service.

Mr. Alexander referenced the feedback regarding more context for code requirements. One of the best things he experienced on ARB, was staff had consultants write staff reports that were a tutorial on Code and how to apply it. It was a great way to provide some training without having a separate meeting. It could be helpful to have some sort of "why" behind the Bridge Street zoning code.

Ms. Call stated that the Envision Dublin Community Plan with the Neighborhood Design Guidelines tell the "why" and show what the City desires and that is included in staff reports.

Mr. Cotter referenced the Tiered Service action item and suggested staff make sure to present it in a way so that it does not feel like one party is being favored over another.

Ms. Fox stated that so much of this is to provide predictability for the applicant. Many tools are utilized, such as the Code, Guidelines, Envision Dublin Plan, special area plans, etc. It takes a lot of time to understand all of that. She asked how staff help applicants to understand the abstract vision. Ms. Rauch stated that is part of initial meetings with applicants. Those meetings provide a good opportunity for staff to determine how to share that information and communicate it clearly throughout the process. Staff has talked about how to include that information more clearly and succinctly.

Mr. Gracia stated that staff thoroughly reviews and evaluates processes among many divisions/departments.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she would like to reinforce that this process is about being very clear about the process, steps and expectations and not getting every application to approval. She does not want everyone to think that we need to say yes to everything. We do not. She said to board and commission members that this is a fantastic community because people just like you have sat in your seats and made tough decisions just like you. These are ways to help remove negative perceptions in the marketplace.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she did economic development at the State level for many years. Removing cloudiness and making the process clear is uber important. Shepherding someone through the development review process in a community could be a waste of resources for the State. All of these proposals will make it easier for people who are coming to Dublin that are not currently in the state or region. There is a lot of opportunity in Dublin. To the extent that the process can be made clear, it should be done. Developers want to know what the game is and what the rules are. They will play by them as long as they know what they are.

Ms. De Rosa stated when Amazon launched one-click buy, it seemed impossible and is now the standard. The goal is to keep standards but make it easy for people to follow them. This work does that.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated there will not be any part of this process that will lower the bar. Transparency and fairness is what this is all about.

Mr. Boggs shared potential code modifications. Some of the stakeholder feedback was able to be implemented administratively. Some will require action by the people in the room this evening in one way or another because it will require changes to the Code. Two points of stakeholder feedback were:

- Focus on vision and reduce Code specificity; and
- Opportunity to reduce the form-based Code restrictions.

He would like to approach this in the spirit that it was intended, which was to make sure that we are focusing on what is essential to get a high-quality product. People talked about creativity, personality and innovation. There are things in the Code that may be too prescriptive. There are two pillars that staff have identified as opportunities. The first one is about Concept Plans and the second is with regard to the Bridge Street Code and differentiating code and guidelines. Currently the City has a three-step review process, generally speaking. For many years, the Planned Unit Development (PUD) has been the cornerstone of how development has happened. The PUD process begins with a concept plan that may have some form in terms of architectural inspiration and site layout. The applicant is looking for honest and open feedback from PZC about what that level of support there is for use, layout and general architectural style. In the Bridge Street and Mixed-Used Regional (MUR) and Historic Districts, the Concept Plan is a decision step. There is a vote taken at the end of the presentation and if the vote is negative, then that application stops in its tracks. Staff and legal have discussed code modifications for the Concept Plan to make it so that the process is consistent in the Bridge Street District, MUR and Historic District the way it is used with the PUD. An applicant could then decide to move forward to a Preliminary Development Plan if they so chose. A benefit of this is that it will encourage more free-flowing dialogue because, while it will be tethered to the Community Plan, there will not be criteria to focus on creating a record around because the next stage would be an administrative appeal. Another benefit would be that it streamlines the process. Before Concept Plans, applicants often begin with an Informal Review creating a four-step process. The next code change is to the Bridge Street code itself. The conversation around this began years ago. There is a desire to have guidelines but leave room for innovation.

Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that applicants would still have the option for Informal Review. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively. Mr. Deschler asked how much waiver backlog the code modification would assist with. Mr. Boggs stated one of the challenges with the waiver process is that people think a waiver is a variance. A waiver in the Bridge Street District is not intended to be a variance. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that a waiver can be a good thing.

Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that moving forward, this discussion will continue in upcoming individual meetings. The point of this evening was to introduce these concepts and the work that has been done.

Board/Commission Reporting

Ms. De Rosa stated that due to the late hour, the boards/commission reporting may continue at a different meeting. She thanked everyone for joining the boards and commissions and expressed appreciation for staff. Each year, the PZC, BZA and ARB provide a written report/update to City Council. In that report they give background about cases they've reviewed and what they need from Council. Going forward, at the joint meeting, there will be opportunity to have that discussion. She then asked Ms. Call to explain what might be the subject of a report.

Ms. Call stated that the last time we were together, there was discussion about lines of demarcation - which boards/commission are responsible for what. There is no predictability when PZC is talking about school enrollment or utility requirements. Keeping focus on what each body is responsible for allows the

process to keep moving forward. City administration executes, each board or commission has roles and responsibilities. If PZC operates outside of our purview, it is at a detriment to the whole process. This year, PZC saw 588 acres of development. They looked at 40 separate cases ranging from administrative code reviews to amended Final Development Plans and everything in between. Those 588 acres of the City's approximately total 16,000 acres is a significant percentage. They did see some very interesting projects, such as a film studio and a new headquarters. Everyone is here because they love the City of Dublin. With PZC's 40 cases and an average of 2 hours per meeting, it was a labor of love. We can see from previous years successes like a hospital under construction and a hospital fully operational with an expected expansion, a funeral home, additional headquarter offices that are currently thriving, why PZC takes the larger overview rather than the myopic case by case review. PZC is appreciative of the roles each board plays. It is in meetings like these, that we can see how we work better together to continue to make Dublin the place we want to grow.

Ms. Krumb, as City Council's liaison to ARB, welcomed new planning commission members. She thanked Mr. Alexander for his service on ARB. ARB has done a lot of work on the Code this year that is improving the historic district.

Mayor Amorose Groomes thanked all members. She recognized that time is money and everyone has given a lot of their time. That is a tremendous investment in this City. She looks forward to continuing these conversations and the work easing pain points.

The joint work session was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Mayor, Dublin City Council

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals

Deputy Clerk of Council



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 14, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the November 14, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

Commission members absent: Gary Alexander

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

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

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call explained the hearing process that would be followed.

Ms. Call swore in staff and audience members who anticipated providing testimony.

CASE REVIEW

- **24-102AFDP - MAG – Ferrari at 6321 Perimeter Loop Road**

Construction of a 3,065-square-foot building addition and associated site improvements. The 15.51-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District (PUD), Midwestern Auto Group, and is located southeast of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road.

Applicant Presentation

Brad Parish, Archall Architects, 59 E. Third Avenue, Columbus, stated that he is representing the applicant's request for the expansion of the MAG campus. They are proposing a 3,000+ SF service addition to the recently completed Ferrari showroom. Since 2020, when that construction was completed, there has been an increased demand for service. He stated that the existing 7,000 SF Ferrari showroom is in Subarea A of the PUD-MAG site. With this proposal, they would be adding to the south side of the building within the parking lot area, with the intent not to disturb the front façade. The addition will match the height of the existing building and will add five service bays with some parts storage and ancillary space for the service department. They will screen any new rooftop mechanicals that are needed. Like most of the MAG buildings, the front of the facility is comprised of a primary material. In the service area, a secondary material is used. The front of the façade is comprised of an alucobond metal panel. Around the service area, they will use a split face on the base with a stucco EIFS finish. The service area of the Ferrari building is a little more high end, so all glass doors will be used on the inside. The biggest challenge with this project is that the existing electric service must be re-located, which will be a big financial commitment for MAG to add these bays. They continue to meet the parking requirement and will provide screening for the newly relocated transformer.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that this is an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP). The Commission has reviewed the previous stages of the development, and the amendment also requires the Commission's approval. The project will require some minor site modifications in terms of removing parking spaces and relocating some utility pieces, but all remains in compliance with the development text. The project is consistent with the current development, and staff has determined the application meets the review criteria. Staff recommends approval with no conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there will be roof top units (RTUs), and if so, if the parapet height would provide adequate screening.

Mr. Parish responded that the height will be the same as the existing parapets. He does not anticipate an issue with screening any of the RTUs. There will be no RTUs on the big box component.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if they would be matching the existing finishes.

Mr. Parish responded affirmatively. They will be using a primary and secondary material, so the back of the service area on the main building will have a stucco EIFS finish. This will be necessary to be energy compliant.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the vehicles are not currently being serviced on campus.

Mr. Parish responded that there is one bay in the big building, and it is insufficient to meet customer demands.

Ms. Harter inquired if the intent is to replace the six dead evergreens on Venture Drive.

Mr. Parish responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if he had contemplated incorporating solar panels in the design.

Mr. Parish responded that they have not contemplated them for this addition, but they have, overall, for the campus. He anticipates being before the Commission again in the future related to the use of electric vehicles (EV) and solar panels on the campus.

Ms. Harter inquired if directional signage is needed for customers on the campus.

Mr. Parish responded that in most cases, the car in need of service is picked up from the customer's home.

Commission Discussion

PZC members indicated that they were supportive of the proposed project.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

- **Proposed Code Amendments**

Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the following four anticipated Code amendment proposals:

- Concept Plan Process and Procedures (Bridge Street, Mixed Use Regional and Historic Districts)
- Innovation District 2 (ID-2) Requirements (West Innovation District)
- Special Event Temporary Sign Requirements (sign provisions)
- Public Nuisance Regulations

Concept Plan Process and Procedures

Ms. Rauch stated that the Concept Plan Process amendment was proposed at the joint work session. This amendment and the amendment to Innovation District 2 Requirements are aligned with the Economic Development Strategic Plan. Currently in the Code, the Concept Plan varies; how the Concept Plan is used is very different depending on the district in which the site lies. In a PUD, the Concept Plan is non-binding discussion; in Bridge Street District, the Historic District and the MUR District, the Concept Plan is a determination. The intent is to make the Concept Plan review process consistent in regard to receiving non-binding feedback, regardless of the District.

West Innovation District 2 Requirements

Most Innovation District 2 development applications are handled by the Administrative Review Team (ART). There are a few instances where applications would come before the Commission, such as the application is not consistent with Code or there is a need for shared parking or a conditional use approval. Within the Innovation District, there are four districts. The standards for each are similar, but the scale of development, what uses are permitted, dimensional standards and the intensity of development varies by the district. The intent is to modify the ID2 use standards to clarify the Flex Office requirement; allow warehousing, wholesaling and distribution as a

permitted use. To offset that, the intent is to look at the development standards and require increased setbacks and more robust landscaping buffers for those areas adjacent to residential development.

Special Event Temporary Signs

They are working with the Events Department to ensure the Code aligns with the current practice.

Public Nuisance Regulations

Minor clarifications are being made regarding premise conditions, including how properties must be maintained; vehicle parking in residential areas, specifically commercial and recreational vehicles; and required screening of trash receptacles. Receptacles can be kept in garages, but also on the side of the house, using landscaping for screening. The proposed amendment also would allow fencing or walls as an alternative to landscaping.

Ms. Rauch invited Commission comments or recommendations for consideration.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call suggested that Planning staff obtain feedback from the Public Safety department concerning the potential need to broaden the scope of public nuisance in regard to parking in residential areas and the public safety concerns of critters accessing garbage cans that are screened only by landscaping. In regard to the Innovation District 2 amendment, she suggested that staff look at primary use of warehousing versus ancillary use of warehousing.

Per Mr. Deschler's inquiry, Ms. Rauch provided clarification of the current Concept Plan review process versus the proposed amendment. Mr. Deschler inquired what view the landscaping screening for trash receptacles is intended to block – the view from the street or neighbors' views? Ms. Rauch indicated that the Code requires: "Recycling and waste containers shall be placed inside the garage of a residence or to the side or rear of the residence that is shielded from view of any adjoining property occupants and any street by natural landscaping barrier." It also requires that it be maintained with 100% opacity year-round. The issue is that landscaping takes a while to grow to full opacity, whereas a fence with a gate would fully enclose it.

Mr. Deschler inquired if the proposed amendment would permit a homeowner to build a small fenced area on their property to screen the trash cans.

Ms. Rauch responded affirmatively; it would be limited to around the trash can only.

Mr. Deschler inquired how that would align with those neighborhoods that do not allow any type of fence.

Ms. Rauch responded that it would be similar to what it is now. If a homeowner requests a fence, it is reviewed from a zoning perspective. If the deed restrictions or homeowner (HOA) rules and regulations are different, that is for the HOA to enforce.

Mr. Deschler inquired if a neighbor could report a trash screening violation of another neighbor.

Ms. Rauch responded affirmatively.

Mr. Deschler stated that a fenced trash enclosure adjacent to or behind a house potentially could be more of an eyesore.

Mr. Boggs stated that in terms of bringing this back for the Commission's consideration, Commissioners have identified some items that should be considered regarding the additional aesthetic and process considerations that need to be in place to ensure these potential fenced areas are not problems.

Mr. Way inquired if guidance could be incorporated into the Neighborhood Design Standards concerning how to locate appropriately an enclosure for trash.

Mr. Boggs responded that it would be important to address that in that particular document. It would be similar to the document's existing guidance regarding air conditioning units.

Ms. Call stated that complying with the sideyard setbacks would be essential.

Ms. Rauch responded that every neighborhood has its own setback requirements that must be met. Fenced trash enclosures currently are permitted in the Historic District, so we can compare the situations and requirements.

Mr. Way stated that with the issue of off-the-shelf plastic fences, the material component should also be addressed.

Ms. Harter stated that in regard to the amendment concerning temporary signage, incorporate consideration of opportunities or need for lighting. She is curious if banners would be a type of temporary signage. Additionally, she believes that HOAs should be involved in the discussion re. public nuisance regulations for trash receptacles. Another opportunity she would suggest staff consider is enclosures for large delivery items.

Ms. Call suggested that when these proposed Code amendments are scheduled for Commission consideration, that the information for each include what the amendment would cover and not cover.

Mr. Way suggested that it be clarified to applicants that the Concept Plan review is non-binding, as the applicants sometimes are confused about the feedback they receive from the Commission. There should be clarity as to what the applicant needs to provide at each development review stage.

Ms. Call stated that if the applicant submits more information than is required for a Concept Plan, staff's report should clarify the components of the proposal that are being addressed by the Concept Plan review, re-focusing the Commission's discussion on the requirements for that stage of the review process.

Mr. Chinnock stated that if the applicant chooses to spend more money to provide more details in hopes of obtaining more feedback, that is his choice.

Commissioners had no additional suggestions for the future proposed Code amendments topic.

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 12, 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Assistant Clerk of Council