



SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 10, 2024, 6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin, Gary Alexander and Jamey Chinnock

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jason Deschler

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

MOTION CARRIED 6-0 TO ACCEPT THE DOCUMENTS INTO THE RECORD

CASE REVIEW

24-118AFDP – Vista Community Church

Proposal for a ground sign at the site of an existing building. The 6.67-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Vista Community Church and is located northeast of the intersection of Frantz Road and Parkcenter Avenue.

MOTION CARRIED 6-0 TO APPROVE THE AMENDED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH NO CONDITIONS

Public Comment: None provided

Next Steps: Building Permitting

24-125CP – Townes at Tuttle

~~Conceptual review and feedback of a development consisting of 148 single-family attached units and associated site improvements. The 21.8-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and Hirth Road.~~

~~The Commission supported a future rezoning to permit residential use, but only if traffic, safety, and access issues were addressed. The members directed the applicant to more thoroughly integrate the open space throughout the neighborhoods, paying particular attention to the recommendations within the Neighborhood Design Guidelines. Concerns were raised about the proposed street types; the character of the streetscape design will need to be addressed. The Commissioners recommended that the applicant incorporate a mix of residential types (attached and detached) and a variety of building heights and building designs. The Commissioners recommended that the overall site design incorporate a more creative layout and building orientation and that all units front on a street given the scale of the proposed project.~~



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 10, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the October 10, 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, Kim Way, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin, Jamey Chinnock, Gary Alexander
Commission members absent:	Jason Deschler
Staff members present:	Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the documents into the record.
Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion carried 6-0]

CONSENT AGENDA

- **24-118AFDP – Vista Community Church**

Proposal for a ground sign at the site of an existing building. The 6.67-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Vista Community Church and is located northeast of the intersection of Frantz Road and Parkcenter Avenue.

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

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion carried 6-0]

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc.

Form No. 30043

Ordinance No. 35-22

Passed _____, 20____

REZONING +/- 6.67 ACRES FROM MUR-4, MIXED USE REGIONAL 4 – LLEWELLYN FARMS DISTRICT TO A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DISTRICT, VISTA COMMUNITY CHURCH TO UTILIZE A DEVELOPED SITE FOR RELIGIOUS OR PUBLIC ASSEMBLY. THE SITE IS LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF FRANTZ ROAD, NORTH OF PARKCENTER AVENUE (CASE 22-009Z/PDP)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin,
_____7 of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. The following described real estate, (see attached legal description, Exhibit A), situated in the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, is hereby rezoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and shall be subject to regulations and procedures contained in Ordinance No. 21-70 (Chapter 153 of the Codified Ordinances), the City of Dublin Zoning Code and amendments thereto.

Section 2. The application, including the list of contiguous and affected property owners, and the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, are all incorporated into and made an official part of this Ordinance and said real estate shall be developed and used in accordance there within.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this 26th day of September, 2022.

Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Jennifer Delgado
Clerk of Council

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 26, 2022

Page 3 of 14

Mayor Fox moved to postpone Ordinance 30-22 to the October 10, 2022 meeting.
Ms. Alutto seconded.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 34-22

Amending the Annual Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2022

Mr. Stiffler stated that there are no changes from the first reading. Staff recommended approval.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

Ordinance 35-22

Rezoning +/-6.67 acres from MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional 4 - Llewellyn Farms District to a PUD, Planned Unit District, Vista Community Church to Utilize a Developed Site for Religious or Public Assembly. This site is located on the East side of Frantz Road, North of Parkcenter Avenue. (Case 22-009Z/PDP)

Ms. Rauch stated that there are no changes from the first reading. Staff recommended approval.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

Ordinance 36-22

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Ease Logistics Services LLC to Induce it to Purchase an Office Building for the Relocation of the Company's Existing Office and the Expansion of that Office and its Associated Operations and Workforce within the City; and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement

Ms. Goehring stated that since the first reading of this Ordinance, the Economic Development Agreement has been modified to reflect the actual building that is being purchased.

Abbi Failla, FASF Logistics, thanked Council for their partnership. She expressed excitement about this building and expansion.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes, Mr. Reiner, yes.

Ordinance 37-22

Adopting and Enacting a Supplement (S-52) to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Dublin, Ohio

Ms. Readler stated that there are no changes to this Ordinance from the first reading. Staff recommended approval.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Dublin City Council

Meeting

Form 6101

Held _____

September 12, 2022

Page 3 of 7

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

Ordinance 33-22

To Remove Special Assessments Previously Levied for Certain Public Improvements in the City of Dublin, Ohio in Cooperation with the Columbus Regional Energy Special Improvement District (Bridge Park D Block Project)

Mr. Dearth stated that there are no changes to this Ordinance from the first reading and he recommended approval.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

INTRODUCTION / FIRST READING / PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCES

Ordinance 34-22

Amending the Annual Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2022

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Mr. Stiffler stated that this is the third quarter appropriations ordinance. A memo outlining all the appropriations was provided to Council in the packet. Staff recommended approval at the September 26, 2022 meeting.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Amorose Groomes inquired as to the adjacent uses for the property along the river. She asked what the City's plan would be. Ms. Kramb stated she had similar questions. Ms. Kramb stated that this is considered parkland in the Community Plan.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the September 26, 2022 Council meeting.

Ordinance 35-22

Rezoning +/-6.67 acres From MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional 4 - Llewellyn Farms District to a PUD, Planned Unit District, Vista Community Church to Utilize a Developed Site for Religious or Public Assembly. This site is located on the East side of Frantz Road, North of Parkcenter Avenue. (Case 22-009Z/PDP)

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Noble stated that this Ordinance is for a rezoning and preliminary development plan for Vista Community Church located at 5626 Frantz Road. The site is a 6.67-acre parcel located on the east side of Frantz Road, north of Parkcenter Avenue. The site is developed with a two-story, 43,384-square-foot building and approximately 445 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing to utilize the existing building and associated parking area to accommodate the Vista Church. The use is a religious or public assembly that is proposing operations within the City of Dublin. This site was rezoned from PUD/Llewellyn Farms to MUR-4. The City initiated the rezoning to MUR-4 to implement the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). This district focuses on office uses and did not address religious uses. Working with the applicant, surrounding residents and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), staff has determined that the use is appropriate given the residential nature of the area. This proposal establishes a PUD that permits religious or public assembly, including exclusively permitted uses in MUR-4. No modifications to the building or site is proposed. The anticipated congregation includes 350-500 people. This proposal also maintains the uses and development standards of MUR-4 and provides new parkland to Llewellyn Farms Park that will be reviewed as an amended final development plan at a future

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held _____

September 12, 2022

Page 4 of 7

PZC meeting. PZC reviewed the application and found that the criteria was met. PZC recommended approval of a rezoning and preliminary development plan to a PUD with no conditions. Staff recommended approval of this ordinance at the second reading/public hearing on September 26, 2022.

There were no public comments.

Vice Mayor De Rosa clarified the actual uses. Ms. Noble explained that it will have all the uses of MUR-4 and will add this single use of religious use.

In response to Vice Mayor De Rosa's question about the parkland dedication, Ms. Noble stated that it will be a City responsibility.

Mayor Fox verified that the Llewellyn Farms residents are happy with this proposal. Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the September 26, 2022 Council meeting.

Ordinance 36-22

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Ease Logistics Services LLC to Induce it to Purchase an Office Building for the Relocation of the Company's Existing Office and the Expansion of that Office and its Associated Operations and Workforce within the City; and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Goehring stated that EASE Logistics is a multi-operational supply chain and transportation solution company that provides accelerated, innovative services that help deliver the products and goods of select clients by means of a highly effective global network. Since its founding in 2014, EASE has called the City of Dublin home. As EASE continues to grow, the company is considering the purchase of a 150,000 SF facility in Dublin to locate their corporate headquarters. The Economic Development Agreement proposed to EASE Logistics is a five year, 13% Performance Incentive on withholdings collected (2023-2027), capped at \$421,000 for the term of the agreement. The performance incentive is contingent upon EASE Logistics providing documentation of the purchase of the 150,000 SF facility within Dublin by September 30, 2022, receiving an occupancy permit and occupying the facility by December 31, 2023. The City is also proposing a \$200,000 location grant to offset moving and fit-up costs. Finally, the City is also proposing to install the Dublink lateral connection to the purchased facility. The value of this connection is \$32,416. The project would be EASE's fourth additional facility in Dublin and expects to retain 194 existing employee positions within the City. In addition, the Company expects to create 350 new employee positions, for a total of 544 employees within the City by December 31, 2027.

There were no public comments.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the September 26, 2022 Council meeting.

Ordinance 37-22

Adopting and Enacting a Supplement (S-52) to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Dublin, Ohio

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Readler stated that this supplement was prepared by the City's codifier, American Legal Publishing and includes local legislation approved by City Council through June 30, 2022, and State legislation current through April 6, 2022. Staff recommended approval at the second reading/public hearing on September 26, 2022.

There were no public comments.



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 18, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**3. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road
22-100FDP**

Final Development Plan

Proposal: Operation of a Religious/Public Assembly use on a 6.7-acre site proposed to be zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.055.

Applicants: Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Tammy Noble, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4649, tnobles@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-100

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Harter seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit an Amended Final Development Plan for the reduced parking area, creation of open space, and future sign modifications; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on traffic analysis for the proposed uses, including a Traffic Generation analysis or Traffic Impact Study, prior to final occupancy.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes - Virtually
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:


B62DEF02B6D24C7
Tammy Noble, Senior Planner





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 18, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road
22-099Z/PDP** **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal: Rezoning ±6.7 acres from Mixed-Use Regional 4 - Llewellyn Farms Office District to a Planned Unit Development District.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Rezoning and review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.055.

Applicants: Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Tammy Noble, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4649, tnobles@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-099

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Chinnock seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for Rezoning and to approve the Preliminary Development Plan without conditions.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Rezoning request was forwarded to City Council for review and approval and the Preliminary Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes - Virtually
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:



Tammy Noble, Senior Planner

B62DEF02B6D24C7





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 18, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the August 18, 2022 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, Lance Schneier, Warren Fishman, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way (virtual)

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble, Sara Holt, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawskiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 07-07-22 meeting.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission 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 swore in meeting attendees who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases.

NEW CASES

1. Amlin Crossing at PIDs: 274-001307, 274-001004, & 274-001218, 22-043CP, Concept Plan

~~A proposal for development of ±101.1 acres consisting of 190 single-family homes and 235 townhome units. The site is zoned Rural District and is located along the east side of Cosgray Road, ±1,300 feet south of the intersection with Rings Road.~~

should be typical for Dublin and not a "settle for" product. A significant amount of work is anticipated with the open space and wetlands. She is not comfortable with the implementation of the lanes as shown in this plan. She would need to see more dimensionality and application of that element in the Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Fishman commended the applicant for their attempts to be responsive to the Commission's earlier input, but there remains a long way to go. His concern is not the density, but the fact that there will be too many people and vehicles. Dublin has done a good job in developing for a quality of life. Streets packed with cars do not achieve a quality of life. Alleyways tend to deteriorate. He drove through the residential areas south of this site and viewed some of the townhomes. The appearance of those units has deteriorated, even though they are only 10-15 years old. He is concerned about the homeowner association's maintenance responsibilities in this proposal. It is critical to provide quality materials, such as brick, that do not require a high level of maintenance. The brick apartments on Zollinger Road, for example, are 85 years old and not particularly well-maintained, but they do not look bad. He does not believe the proposed townhomes fit in this site. The development is located in the Dublin School District, and there will be families with children here. The goal is for this development to look as good in ten years as the day it is built. That will be a challenge with this plan.

Mr. Supelak stated that private lanes in communities have posed a significant problem for those HOAs, and streets that are built to a different standard cannot be transferred to the City. There are "red flags" here. The potential HOA burden and fees must be in the forefront of the applicant's considerations.

Ms. Call stated that not only must private streets be built to public street standards, but the number of homes within the community must be too few to meet the maintenance needs/costs of their private lanes for the City to assume maintenance responsibility of those streets. She summarized the Commission's input. The Commission is open to some deviation from the Special Area Plan, and although work needs to be done with the density and layout, the issues are not insurmountable. There is no general consensus regarding the setbacks, so the Commission will be sensitive to any proposed undulations or deviations. The open space will need to work not only for this community but the community as a whole. There were mixed reactions from the Commission in regard to the product types, but there are opportunities for enhancement.

Mr. Underhill thanked the Commission for their thoughtful input and points of consensus. Good direction was given, which they will be taking into consideration.

Ms. Call stated that the next two cases would be heard together.

2. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road, 22-099Z/PDP, Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

A request for approval of a Rezoning of ± 6.7 acres from Mixed-Use Regional 4 - Llewellyn Farms Office District to a Planned Unit Development District, on a site located northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.

3. Vista Community Church at 5626 Frantz Road, 22-100FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for approval of a Final Development Plan for the operation of a Religious/Public Assembly use on a 6.7-acre site proposed to be zoned Planned Unit Development District located northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble stated that this request includes applications for a rezoning, Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan for a site located at 5626 Frantz Road. The site is currently zoned MUR-4, and the applicant is requesting to rezone the property to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The exclusive purpose of the rezoning is to allow a religious use to be a permitted use for the site and for accessory uses associated with the church. Following a review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan will be forwarded to City Council for review and approval. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is the approving authority for the Final Development Plan. The site is a 6-acre parcel located on the east side of Frantz Road, north of Parkcenter Avenue. The surrounding land use, particularly along Frantz Road, is primarily office. Residential uses exist to the south and east of the site. The site is developed with a two-story, 43,384-square-foot building and approximately 445 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing no modifications. They will be using the existing infrastructure. At the time the applicant initially considered the site, the property was zoned PUD - Llewellyn Farms, which permitted uses in the SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District including religious uses. However, in December 2021, City Council approved a rezoning of this area to MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional – Llewellyn Farms Office District. The MUR-4 District permits a limited range of uses primarily focused on office uses, and does not include religious uses. This has prompted the applicant to pursue a Rezoning and Preliminary and Final Development Plans to add religious uses for this site, including ancillary uses that have previously been described as day care and counseling services. The Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for the site on June 16, 2022 and was generally supportive of the proposed religious use. The applicant is proposing to retain the uses permitted in the MUR-4 District, as outlined in Dublin Code Section 153.046, and add “religious facilities and related accessory uses.” The applicant anticipates that their Dublin location will have a congregation size of 350 to 500 people. Their operation will include a church service on Sundays and a midweek service. The applicant has agreed to dedicate 0.75 acres in the southeastern portion of the site to Llewellyn Farms Park. The terms of this dedication are outlined in the Development Text, which states that the parkland dedication will be subject to the applicant acquiring ownership of the site and will be formalized through an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) within four months of the purchase of the land. The Amended FDP will include the dimensions and configuration of the dedicated parkland; any modifications to the existing parking area; and a Sign Plan, all of which must be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Staff has reviewed the applications against the applicable criteria and recommends the Commission recommend City Council approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions, and approve the Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge, New Albany, stated that there have been no modifications to the plan since the previous review. With the future AFDP, they will be presenting details on the parkland and parking area modifications. They believe the site is currently over parked for their needs. Typically, a Suburban Office Zoning permits religious uses, and they believe that use not being included in the recent rezoning and Code revision was an oversight. This application would

simply add a religious use to the MUR-4 zoning for this site. They also anticipate bringing back a sign proposal with the AFDP.

Commission Questions

Ms. Call inquired if the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) could be brought back to the Commission only under certain conditions or at any time.

Ms. Noble responded that an AFDP application could be brought to the Commission at any time.

Ms. Call inquired the reason for conditioning this approval on the applicant later bringing back an AFDP.

Ms. Noble responded that it would be a requirement regardless of whether it was made a condition. However, staff believed the anticipated modifications to the site warranted a condition, in particular, the parkland dedication. The condition essentially clarifies the applicant's intent.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that he visited the site today and found the building and grounds in disrepair. He assumes the applicant would be required to address those conditions.

Mr. Underhill responded that as soon as the applicant assumes ownership, it will be in their interest to clean up the site and make it as attractive as possible.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if in the future, the applicant should desire to add a school, that use would be covered by this rezoning.

Ms. Noble responded that would be an accessory use, and any proposed accessory use would need to be permitted by the MUR-4 District.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if there would be any limitations on outdoor gatherings.

Ms. Noble stated that there would be no regulations on outdoor activities. Typically, churches have associated accessory uses, and activities associated with religious services would be accommodated.

Ms. Harter stated that she believes this was an excellent example of the City and the applicant working together.

There was no additional discussion.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Chinnock seconded approval of a recommendation to City Council for approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions for the Final Development Plan approval.

Mr. Underhill indicated they had no objections.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit an Amended Final Development Plan for the reduced parking area, creation of open space, and future sign modifications; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on traffic analysis for the proposed uses, including a Traffic Generation analysis or Traffic Impact Study, prior to final occupancy.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

4. Nest School at 570 Metro Place North, 22-006AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

~~An application for approval of exterior and site modifications for a childcare center on a 3.0-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Waterford Village located northwest of the intersection of Metro Place North with Upper Metro Place.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the Nest School. In 2012, the original 4.67-acre site was divided into two separate parcels: a 1.67-acre parcel to the west and a 3-acre parcel to the west. The 3-acre parcel is the site contemplated as part of this application. In 2017, the 1.67-acre parcel was developed by Dublin Metro Dental, directly adjacent to the subject parcel. The development of the site included the removal of a portion of the previously existing parking lot, which crossed property lines. Currently, no parking or pavement exists that encroaches the shared property line to offer cross access. The 3.0-acre site is zoned as part of the Waterford Village Planned Unit Development District (PUD) and is located within the Metro Center office area. The site is rectangular in shape and currently developed with a single vacant office building. There is a large parking lot located to the rear (north) of the primary structure and a turn-around with visitor parking forward of the building. The front entrance to the building is from Metro Place north. The applicant is proposing site and building modifications to accommodate a child daycare facility in an existing suburban office structure. The use is permitted under the current PUD requirements with additional use specific standards. The applicant is proposing an approximately 14,900-square-foot outdoor recreation area to accompany the daycare facility. The outdoor recreation area is proposed to be located to the west and northwest of the building, behind the front façade of the building. The area will be enclosed by a 4-foot tall Ameristar black aluminum fence, with 5-foot limestone veneer piers located at the corners of the fence to match the building. Staff has added a second text modification for the height of the stone piers to be considered as part of the fence height. Perimeter landscape screening will be provided, as required within the Suburban Office District for these uses. A number of parking lot modifications are proposed. The site currently has 123 parking spaces, most to the rear of the building. With the addition of the outdoor recreation area, the number of parking spaces will be reduced to 84 spaces, which meets the number required for this use. The circular access drive and parking forward of the building will be removed, and a linear parking bay will be added. This provides an opportunity for future cross access on the site, adjacent to the Dublin Metro Dental. The applicant has reached out to the adjacent property owner regarding this opportunity. Should the adjacent property owner agree to a cross access, the applicant should work with staff to finalize this access between the two~~



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 16, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**3. Vista Church at 5626 Frantz Road
22-082CP**

Concept Plan

Proposal: Request to permit Religious or Public Assembly and associated uses within an existing commercial building. The 6.67-acre site is zoned Mixed Use Regional 4 – Llewellyn Farms Office District.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road

Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.

Applicant: Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

Planning Contact: Tammy Noble, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4649, tnobles@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-082

RESULT: The Commission reviewed the Concept Plan and provided non-binding feedback on the proposed religious, daycare, and counseling uses. The Commission discussed the amount of paving, stormwater, and traffic requirements. It was discussed that a Traffic Impact Study or Traffic Generation Analysis would be needed, prior to final occupancy. Llewellyn Farms HOA Board did not express support for the rezoning of the site, as presented by the Board president. The Commission concluded general support for the rezoning with some guidance for removal of any extra paving, increase of green space, and the need for sign approval.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

B62DEF02B6D24C7...

Tammy Noble, Senior Planner





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 16, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the June 16, 2022 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. The City is interested in accommodating public participation to the greatest extent possible.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Jamey Chinnock, Lance Schneier, Warren Fishman, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak

Staff members present: Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Chris Will, Tammy Noble, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot, Heidi Rose, Nicholas Eastham

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission 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 swore in meeting attendees who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases.

TABLED CASE

1. Veterinary Emergency Group at 3800 Tuller Road, 22-056WR, Waiver Review

A request for a Waiver to reduce required street-facing transparency along Tuller Road on a 1.87-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of Tuller Road with Dublin Center Drive.

~~Mr. Fishman inquired if this would be a permanent use. The associated uses might require play equipment, which would impact the exterior of the building~~

~~Ms. Noble responded that the religious use would be a permanent use. There are some questions regarding the potential ancillary uses. At this time, no site modifications are proposed.~~

~~Ms. Harter inquired if, with the Traffic Impact Study, the City would make recommendations regarding the ingress/egress to the building site. Which entrance would be recommended?~~

~~Mr. Hendershot responded that the Traffic Impact Study also looks access management.~~

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, stated that he represents the applicant, Vista Community Church. This application has an interesting history and is the reason they are proposing a PUD versus another type of application. Pastor Mike Smith is present and will be able to address questions related to operations. The church has been present in the community since 2007. They have been meeting in Jerome High School and have not had a permanent home. They were looking at this property before the pandemic, and were unable to come to a lease price agreement. During the discussion process, however, this site was rezoned and did not include a religious use. The church was not informed by the property owner of the Code revision occurring, which did not include religious uses. Consequently, they have been engaged with City staff and the neighborhood on the proposed use. The general consensus seems to be that the use makes sense, but they had just completed a lengthy process, which did not include this use. There was little interest in deviating from the Code so soon. However, due to fact that this property is positioned next to a residential community where churches are often located, and in the Suburban Office District, churches are Permitted Uses, they believe the proposed use is appropriate on this site. Because altering the Code would have ramifications for the greater area, staff recommended filing a rezoning request for this site only. They would incorporate the MUR-4 Code by reference and add the religious use. That preserves the opportunity for the site to be used in the future as Office. Although a PUD permits some site modifications, no exterior site modifications are proposed, other than signs and perhaps re-striping the parking. There may be opportunity in the future to add greenspace on the site by removing some of the parking area. There is one update; however. The proposed temporary use for a food pantry is no longer needed, as they have found another permanent location. The other proposed uses would benefit the community and help the church to grow. Counseling services and daycare uses currently are permitted on the site. The traffic impact of this use would be less than that of an office building with peak traffic hours of 8 am and 5 pm. The primary use of this building would be primarily on Sunday.

Public Comment

John Phillaman, Llewellyn Farms Civic Association president, stated that the civic association board voted not to support the Vista Community Church rezoning request for two reasons. The community was recently engaged in a rezoning effort of this District for over three years. The MUR-4 achieved what the residents desired. Although they empathized with the applicant, and a religious use had been a Permitted Use prior to the MUR-4 rezoning, the request was not timely. Before the rezoning was approved, ample opportunity was provided for any interested party to participate in the associated discussion process. Essentially, the applicant is requesting a re-do for this specific property. We do not want to set that precedent, which will encourage future requests for zoning carve outs. Although the intent may not have been to exclude religious uses, at this point in time,

we have a new zoning law with which we need to comply. The question for the Commission is if the religious use is consistent with the intent of the MUR-4 District.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way stated that he understands that there was a lengthy rezoning process and a resolution was achieved to which the City agreed. However, this is a vacant 1980s office building. He is questioning whether an office tenant will want that building. He suspects it is a market challenge, which is the reason it is vacant. Seeing a use in this building, and having it no longer vacant, would have a positive impact on the area. He has no issue with the religious use. It was on the table previous to the adoption of the MUR-4 Code. He is supportive of continuing the existing conversation with the applicant. He believes the use would fit the building, site and greater area. He appreciates the applicant's comment about potentially moving some parking and increasing the greenspace. He would appreciate conversations about how this site could be improved and become a better asset to this part of the community. He is supportive of the proposed use because of the history associated with it; however, he is unclear about the process. Would approving this use permanently include it in the MUR-4 list of uses or approve it only for this site?

Mr. Boggs stated that the reason the applicant is proposing a PUD for this site is to avoid having it added to the MUR-4 District. If something similar were to arise in the future, it also would include specific review by the Commission. As proposed now, rather than a text amendment to the use table for the MUR-4, we are looking a potential PUD that would allow religious uses and adopt the MUR-4 by reference for this site only. Any property owner has the ability to come before this body and staff to try to undertake the rezoning of their property. While that can be frustrating for the neighbors that were involved in work of the MUR-4 process, that would not factor into the deliberation of the Commission on this application. The Commission needs to consider the planned district criteria and compatibility.

Mr. Way inquired if, even though not be approved for the entire district, the precedent would still be an encouragement to do the same.

Mr. Boggs responded that an applicant could always make that argument, but any application would have to stand on its own merits. There would always be different site characteristics.

Mr. Way stated that due to that clarification, and the history of this application, he is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would be more appropriate to make this a Conditional Use.

Mr. Boggs responded that he does not know if making it a Conditional Use in the MUR-4 would be advisable or not, as we don't have that type of application for review.

Ms. Call noted that making it a Conditional Use would apply to the greater MUR-4; it would not be specific to this application. As it is being approached, the application is narrowed to this single parcel.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is divided in his position, because the MUR-4 rezoning was initiated by the City for the neighborhood property owners. He is supportive of this use but is concerned about the process. If we make a change, it is essentially negating our earlier agreement. He believes the use is appropriate but is unsure of his position on the rezoning.

Ms. Harter stated that this is an opportunity that should not be missed. The site has been vacant for approximately two years, and now there is an opportunity to fill it. She is supportive of the

proposed use. She is encouraged with the possible changes that could be made to the site, i.e. the greenspace. The church has been a good tenant at Jerome High School and has had a positive presence within the community. Having them locate to this permanent location would be good.

Mr. Fishman stated that if the Commission approves the different use, he assumes that the existing MUR-4 zoning would remain. Staff has indicated that the proposed rezoning would be more narrow than a Conditional Use. In similar situations in the past, the Commission has added a Conditional Use to the zoning. If the property owner vacated the site, it reverted to what it originally was. He does not believe a use should be changed based upon the fact the building is empty. The use must be compatible to the site and meet all the requirements. Although Office is the preferred use, he believes the church is a compatible use; it will generate less traffic and have other positive impacts. At this point, he is tentatively supportive of the Concept Plan.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes this is a compatible plan and a good use for the site. He believes the decision should not be made solely on not setting precedent. The Commission needs to be adaptable. There is a vacant building on this site, and there is much less need of office space. In such cases, changing the zoning to accommodate what we believe is a good use would improve the use of the property. In his view, there are more positives than negatives with the proposed use.

Mr. Schneier stated that there was an earlier reference to process over substance, and while the Commission would advocate for substance over process, we are following the prescribed City rezoning process. We are not setting a precedent by considering a rezoning matter. He believes both logic and equity call for this use in this particular circumstance with these particular facts. He is not concerned about the precedential nature, because a rezoning always has its own particular specificity. The next rezoning case within this area will have to stand on its own merits, as is occurring here. He, personally, has no concerns about the merits of this proposal. He is supportive of the Concept Plan moving forward.

Ms. Call noted that her employer is moving nearby to 5555 Frantz Road. She echoes Mr. Schneier's comments. The Commission is asked to judge this application based on certain criteria. In regard to the proposed discussion questions, the use is not only compatible but also complementary. It will have less of a traffic impact on the area. Complementary uses will lower the overall intensity of the neighborhood. Each application must be judged on its own merits.

Ms. Call stated that no action on the Concept Plan is requested. She inquired if the applicant desired any additional input from the Commission.

Pastor Mike Smith, 6480 Scioto Court, Westerville, OH stated that he oversees two churches; one is the Dublin campus. He is encouraged and thankful for the process. City staff has been responsive and helpful. Their church has been a part of this community and wants to continue to be a part of it. They are hopeful of locating on this parcel, but would not want to be there if it did not fit, did not work with and was not conducive to the community. He is very glad to hear that the Commission believes that it is. He finds that welcoming. The ancillary uses are proposed because people have expressed an interest in them. That is what they will continue to do in the future -- they want to do things that are helpful, provide a service, are cooperative and work for the City. They enjoy this community; it has been a blessing to serve it.

Mr. Fishman asked confirmation that a change in zoning would be preferable to adding the church as a Conditional Use in the MUR-4.

Mr. Boggs responded that a rezoning is what the applicant has requested. In his view, it accomplishes the objectives of allowing this use on this site and not changing the Permitted or Conditional Uses within the MUR-4 District altogether. This would be more limited and conservative in the sense of not over reaching. If approved by Council, this building would be a church as long as this organization remains on the site. If they leave, the site would revert to the office use that is otherwise permitted in the MUR-4.

Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of keeping the tree to parking space ratio high and considering opportunities to restore some of the greenery that is native to Dublin.

4. ~~6801 Village Parkway, 22-041CP, Concept Plan~~

~~A request for a conceptual plan for a multi-family development consisting of 184 units with a combination of podium and surface parking on a 3.71-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and located southwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.~~

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that a new development in the Bridge Street District follows a three-step review process, beginning with a Concept Plan. The applicant is requesting review and approval, so a determination would be required. If approved, the project would advance to the Preliminary Development Plan application. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. There is a greenway along the south edge of John Shields Parkway. The undeveloped site lies within a mature stand of trees on the south property line, which demarks the boundary with a City-owned parcel with a shared-use trail to the south. A little further south is Greystone Mews. The applicant engaged with the neighborhood association early in the planning stage. This site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is subject to those standards. The Bridge Street District Code provides a hierarchy of requirements for establishing a gridded street network. The Bridge Street District Code identifies three families of streets: Corridor Connectors, District Connectors, and Neighborhood Streets. Additionally, the Code designated Principal Frontage Streets (PFSs), which contemplate additional design measures to ensure a continuous, pedestrian-oriented block. Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway are both district connector streets and principal frontage streets. Three buildings are proposed. Building A is a 4-5 story podium apartment building, with a 260-space single-story parking structure base. Buildings B1 and B2 are 3.5-story apartment buildings with 24 end unit garages. There are an additional 30 surface parking spaces on the site. A total of 314 parking spaces are being provided. For 174 units, the Code requires 260 parking spaces with a maximum of 350, so the proposal meets Code. In regard to the architectural character, there will be a mix of vertical and horizontal facade treatments and a mix of roof types. The upper story of Buildings B1 and B2 is a loft style. The proposed building materials are brick and stone; and there will be stoops on the front facades. Access is proposed from John Shields Parkway, opposite the future Grafton Street, which is being constructed with the recently approved Towns on the Parkway development. Waivers would be required for access from a principal frontage street and for the block size. [Discussion of proposed site plan continued.] The applicant is proposing to meet the greenspace requirements via the existing greenway and the pocket park. They will be providing 45,500 square feet where 35,000 square feet is required. The City will comprehensively design the greenway

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 86-21

Passed _____, 20_____

AMENDMENTS TO ZONING CODE SECTIONS 153.045-153.048 TO ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR MIXED USE REGIONAL 4 DISTRICT (MUR4) WITHIN THE DUBLIN CORPORATE AREA PLAN. (CASE 19-117ADMC)

WHEREAS, it is necessary from time to time to amend Dublin's Zoning Code to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City of Dublin, and

WHEREAS, the proposed Zoning Code amendments further the implementation of the recommendations outlined within the adopted Dublin Corporate Area Plan, and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and recommended adoption of the proposed amendments to Sections 153.045-153.048 to establish development standards for the MUR4 District on November 4, 2021,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, 7 of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. Sections 153.045-153.048 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Dublin is hereby amended and shall provide as attached to this Ordinance:

Section 2. This ordinance shall be effective on the earliest date permitted by law.

Passed this 10th day of December, 2021.


Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:


Clerk of Council

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc.

Form No. 30043

Ordinance No. 87-21

Passed _____, 2021

REZONING 27 PARCELS FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (CC), SUBURBAN OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT (SO), AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PUD) TO MIXED USE REGIONAL 4 DISTRICT (MUR-4). (CASE# 21-087Z)

WHEREAS, it is consistent with the Dublin Community Plan and the Zoning Code,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, 7 of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. That the following described real estate (parcel numbers) situated in the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, and shall be subject to the regulations and procedures contained in Ordinance No. 21-70 (Chapter 153 of the Codified Ordinances), the City of Dublin Zoning Code and amendments thereto:

273002703, 273002704, 273002705, 273005001, 273000375, 273002707, 273003160, 273003161, 273003163, 273003164, 273003165, 273003166, 273003167, 273004292, 273004293, HOA379944, 273004566, 273004567, 273004568, 273004569, 273001723, 273010201, 273010866, 273004570, 273004571, 273005003, 273005366 is hereby rezoned Mixed Use Regional 4 District (MUR-4):

Section 2. The application includes the list of affected property owners, the rezoning map and the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, are all incorporated into and made an official part of this Ordinance and said real estate shall be developed and used in accordance therewith.

Section 3. That this Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this 6th day of December, 2021.



Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:


Clerk of Council

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 6, 2021

Page 6 of 12

20

Mr. Reiner asked about when AEP would have to communicate with the City regarding the trimming of the trees. Mr. Hammersmith stated that in safety situations or in an emergency, they would notify us and then trim or remove the trees, but they do not need our consent. Mayor Amorose Groomes asked if they provided a definition of safety. Mr. Hammersmith stated that AEP's goal is to not have vegetation in the lines. Mr. McDaniel stated that the right tree will be planted so it does not grow into the lines.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

Ordinance 86-21

Amendments to Zoning Code Sections 153.045-153.048 to Establish Development Requirements and Procedures for Mixed Use Regional 4 District (MUR-4) within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (Case 19-117ADMC)

Ms. Rauch stated that this Ordinance was introduced on November 15, 2021. There was discussion at the first reading regarding screening and building height. Based on Council's direction at that reading, staff revised the Code Amendment to make the requirements consistent. Staff also removed the stipulation that the mechanical screening would be incorporated into the overall building height, but kept the recommendation that the mechanicals should be located away from the residential areas. Ms. Rauch provided illustrations and landscape buffering graphics to show some examples.

Ms. Fox clarified that a parapet around the entire building would not be allowed. Ms. Rauch stated that a parapet around the entire building would be considered as part of the overall building height. Ms. Fox asked about the review process for a new building and whether or not Planning and Zoning approval would be required. Ms. Rauch stated that this would be a new development that would require Planning and Zoning Approval. Ms. Fox asked that it be noted that Planning and Zoning will be part of the review process. Ms. Rauch stated she would clarify the language to reflect that. Ms. Fox asked when the design guidelines are coming forward. Ms. Rauch stated that the work is still being completed on the MUR-1 area revisions and staff intends to bring the document forward as one comprehensive document showing transition pieces between the different subareas.

There was no public comment.

Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

Ordinance 87-21

A Rezoning of 27 Parcels from Community Commercial District (CC), Suburban Office, and Institutional District (SO) and Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Mixed Use Regional District 4 (MUR-4) (Case #21-087Z)

Ms. Rauch stated that there have been no changes from the first reading of this Ordinance.

There was no public comment.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

Ordinance 88-21

To Establish Appropriations based on the 2022 Operating Budget of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, for the Fiscal Year ending December 31, 2022

Mr. Stiffler stated that there have been no changes from the first reading of this Ordinance.