RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 18, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

3. All In Dublin
25-069PDP **Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to accommodate a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The +1.55-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Location:	East side of the Dublin Center between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-069

MOTION 1: Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the following Waivers:

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

VOTE: 6-1

RESULT: The Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	No
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following 7 conditions:

1) The applicant update the Site Plan to reflect the Required Building Zone and side yard setback and confirm compliance with the applicable standards at the Final Development Plan stage (FDP).
2) The applicant continue to work with staff on addressing the lot coverage and open space standards at FDP.
3) The applicant work with Engineering staff to complete stormwater management calculations that are compliant with the City's stormwater regulations and provide the correct critical storm calculations prior to submittal for FDP.
4) The applicant continue to work with Engineering staff and the Washington Township Fire Department to confirm the necessary water lines are provided for fire coverage.
5) The applicant continue to work with staff on incorporating the BSD Streetscape Character Guidelines including incorporation of on-street parking.
6) The applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing the on-site parking details.
7) The applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing the building design details.

VOTE: 7-0

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB123C5BED0450...

Bassem Bitar, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning

agenda items would be introduced after 10:30 PM. Speakers were asked to use the microphone and keep comments to 3 minutes.
Anyone intending to provide public comment on administrative cases was sworn in by Ms. Call.

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

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

Case #25-080AFDP
Prince of Peace – Amended Final Development Plan
Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to allow a new bell tower. The 4.07-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Earlington Village and is located at 5475 Brand Road.

Case #25-086WR
EHG Partners Tenant Improvements - Waiver
Request for review and approval of a Waiver request to allow a reduction in the ground story transparency for an existing tenant space. The 0.56-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is located at 4495 Bridge Park Avenue.

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

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

NEW CASE

Case #25-069PDP
All In Dublin – Preliminary Development Plan
Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan to accommodate a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The ±1.55-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located on the east side of Dublin Center Drive between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.

Applicant Presentation
Jena Kessler, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Columbus, presented on behalf of All Inclusive Living, joined by Mark Dunham and Dan Scheinman from TFG Housing Resources, along with Edge landscape architects and American Structure Point civil engineers.
Ms. Kessler began by sharing All In Dublin's mission: "All In Dublin aspires to create a community of good neighbors in which adults with disabilities can live alongside people of all ages and abilities." She emphasized how this aligns with the Envision Dublin Community Plan to provide a community where people of all ages and abilities can thrive.

The presentation focused on four key areas of improvement since the Concept Plan review in June: community connectivity, mobility/transportation, open space, and gateway/architecture.
Community Connectivity: The site benefits from numerous nearby amenities within a 1,000-foot radius including commercial, grocery stores, food, shopping, and parks. A major update involved concentrating community space along the SR 161 first floor frontage, moving residential units that were previously there. This programmatic shift provided better buffering of residential units from SR 161, improved resident safety, and created a more activated façade with storefront glazing extending along the entire elevation to promote a mixed-use feel.
Site Access: The vehicular access point was shifted east to better align with the Bridge Street Network Plan, and is now positioned at the midpoint of the future block. This shared access point with the neighboring property captured approximately 2,000 square feet from the adjoining property, improving circulation and providing better buffers and setbacks.
Mobility and Transportation: The design prioritizes pedestrians, bicycles, and transit per the Envision Dublin Plan. Sidewalks connect to existing sidewalks on all sides. The site benefits from proximity to bus route 33 along Sawmill Road and SR 161, with three bus stops within 1,000 feet. The site also falls within COTA's Northwest Corridor Study for future bus rapid transit.
Open Space: The team worked to ensure open space meets requirements by being on the public right-of-way. The current plan provides 15,000 square feet of open space while accommodating 75 parking spaces. However, the corridor study for SR 161 improvements would shift the right-of-way 19 feet north into the site, affecting approximately 3,800 square feet of open space. The design includes a larger pocket park on the north end, reducing parking lot frontage on Banker Drive with a screen wall for buffering, plus pocket parks and plazas along SR 161.
Architecture: Updates included revising the massing and design at the corner of SR 161 and Dublin Center Drive by infilling the second, third, and fourth floors, creating a more prominent covered open space below accessible by gentle ramping and sidewalks. Transparency was increased throughout, with window proportions revised for consistency. The Dublin Center Drive elevation was differentiated with porches for a more residential feel, contrasting with the commercial storefront character along SR 161.

Staff Presentation
Deputy Director Bassem Bitar explained this is the Preliminary Development Plan stage in the Bridge Street District's three-step process, following the non-binding Concept Plan review. This stage sets the framework for final details, with one additional step remaining.
He confirmed the site acquired an additional sliver of land from the adjacent parcel through a minor subdivision approved administratively. The site is in the mixed-use urban future land use category allowing 3-6 story multifamily residential, consistent with the proposal. Within the Bridge Street District special area plan's east sub-area, the intent is to gradually transition from suburban to walkable development.
The Sawmill Center neighborhood encourages mixed uses and improved access. The intersection is classified as a gateway, which the building and open space design addresses. Bridge Street requires specific streetscape standards including concrete sidewalks, granite curbs, and permeable brick pavers for on-street parking.
Site Plan Details: The additional property sliver and requested right-of-way dedication for future SR 161 improvements were highlighted. Proposed on-street parking on Dublin Center Drive requires restriping and removal of left turn lanes, with details to be finalized before final development plan. The number of parking spaces is uncertain due to the intersection requirements.
Code Compliance Issues: The apartment building type requires buildings within 5-20 feet of the street. With three street frontages, the building addresses the two principal frontage streets (SR

161 and Dublin Center Drive) but the northern line falls outside the required building zone, necessitating a waiver. Required building frontage percentages may require an administrative departure. Some elements may encroach into the 5-foot setback. Stormwater will be addressed through a detention tank under the pavement, though this affects landscape islands above.
Parking: 88 spaces are typically required (with transit reduction), but they will have 82-86 spaces counting on-street parking. Staff believes this is reasonable based on the use, with a parking plan to be presented at Final Development Plan.
Waivers Needed:

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

The building includes 38 one-bedroom, 29 two-bedroom, and 8 three-bedroom units, plus 4,100 square feet of amenity/fitness/common space on the first floor.
Open Space: 15,000 square feet required based on unit count. The existing equipment yard and proposed generator in the north may not count toward public open space but falls within the 10% administrative departure allowance. Open space organization makes sense with the pocket park across from where the Dublin Center Drive greenway terminates and another at the gateway. Some dimensional requirements are not currently met but could be addressed through design adjustments.
The four-story building complies with the 2-4.5 story height limits. Some technical code requirements for vertical increments and transparency percentages may require waivers or administrative departures, though the architectural intent is met. The east elevation does not meet transparency requirements due to the public art opportunity.
Public art would be reviewed by the new Dublin Arts Council Public Art Board. Staff recommends approval with seven conditions addressing the items mentioned.

Commission Questions
Mr. Chinnock thanked the applicant for addressing previous comments. He asked about discrepancies between renderings and elevations regarding colors and materials. Ms. Kessler confirmed the material page and elevations are most accurate, with renderings to be updated. Regarding blocked-out storefront areas, these would be fiber cement panels matching the dark bronze storefront frame, with approximately 25% being non-glazed.
Mr. Chinnock questioned the generator location in the pocket park. Ms. Kessler explained it made sense near existing utilities with planned screening, though they could study relocating it. The street wall screening would be a low brick wall matching the building. Regarding the east elevation mural, they are open to reducing its size or adding glazing if appropriate.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Deschler asked about obligations for private outdoor space like community gardens. Mr. Bitar confirmed they can have private spaces beyond the public open space requirements. Regarding traffic, the Bridge Street District had comprehensive traffic studies, so individual studies are not required. The intent is to make streets more pedestrian-friendly by removing dedicated turn lanes. He expressed concern about the Banker Drive intersection becoming worse without the left turn lane.
On parking, Mr. Deschler noted the neighborhood design guidelines recommend structured or underground parking. Ms. Kessler confirmed surface parking is permitted in the Sawmill Center neighborhood. He asked about adding porches to more Dublin Center Drive units and whether those units have exterior egress (they have patios with secondary entrances). He inquired about further mixed-use investigation beyond the amenity space but none was explored.
Mr. Garvin echoed appreciation for the presentation and substantial changes. He supports keeping the covered corner design but suggests improving other open spaces for usability. He was disappointed not to see commercial mixed-use for activation. He is concerned parking feels tight at the minimum of one per unit and that continuing surface parking does not achieve the goal of eliminating parking seas.

Ms. Call asked staff to confirm parking plans can be tied to specific uses rather than in perpetuity, which Mr. Bitar confirmed. She asked about safe pedestrian mobility through the parking lot, particularly from furthest spaces. Ms. Kessler noted the flush main entry and improved circulation with the shared access point.
Dan Scheinman of TFG Housing Resources, 68 South Front Street, Columbus, confirmed one space per unit (75 spaces) was determined sufficient based on market study analysts and other developers' feedback.

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

Public Comments
Todd Hemmert, 5824 Houchard Road, Dublin, asked about sustainability plans including wastewater reuse for gardens, solar panels, and electric car parking provisions.
Ms. Call noted these questions could be addressed at Final Development Plan.

Ms. Call closed public comment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Call appreciated the clear presentation of changes. She specifically appreciated activation along SR 161 for this mixed-use residential with quasi-commercial recreation areas expecting higher utilization. The corner massing improvement was critical. She likes the enclosure/coverage complementing the area and meeting pocket plaza definitions, preferring this over unused benches and art.
Her concerns focus on parking and pocket park A, which currently is not beautiful with 4-5 large mechanical elements. Adding a generator would make it unusable park space. She challenges relocating the generator closer to the building as a mechanical component rather than in a community asset.
On parking, she appreciates the land acquisition enabling 75 spaces. She would support a parking plan tied to the user/use and strongly encourages a shared parking agreement with Fifth Third Bank, even short-term, to evaluate actual needs and provide flexibility since the bank parking is

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

The Commission engaged in extensive discussion about whether the covered corner plaza should count as public open space. Reading the code definitions, pocket plazas are "intended to provide a formal open space of relatively small scale to serve as an impromptu gathering place for civic, social, and commercial purposes" while pocket parks are "intended to provide small scale primarily landscaped active or passive recreation and gathering spaces for neighborhood residents within walking distance."
Mr. Boggs clarified the Code considers suitability of open space based on community plan goals, suitability for active/passive recreation, need for specific open space types, anticipated users, and proximity to other open spaces. Mr. Chinnock stated that if it is publicly accessible with walkways, it should count regardless of screening. Mr. Way and others expressed concern about setting precedent, noting it feels like a building vestibule or lobby that people would not feel invited to enter.
Mr. Bitar added that Bridge Street District open space serves different purposes than elsewhere, intended for urban gatherings. Staff including their consultant felt this unique space fit the urban context with shade/cover at a busy intersection, allowing indoor/outdoor connection with the community space. However, commission members remained divided.
After a straw poll showing 4 commission members not wanting to count the covered corner as open space, Ms. Call summarized the direction: when returning, meet open space requirements without counting the enclosed area under the building mass at SR 161 and Dublin Center Drive.

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

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

Vote: Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no.
[Motion carried 6-1.]

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

Special Area Plan Tour Recap
Mr. Bitar reviewed the recent special area plan tour that began at City Hall and visited multiple areas:
Dubin Corporate Area Plan (Metro Center/Blazer Parkway): The stop at the old Max & Erma's site discussed the revitalization plan adopted by Council to reimagine Metro Center as mixed-use, using water as an amenity, providing connectivity, enhancing multimodal transportation including a potential bridge over I-270.
Blazer District: Highlighted the injection of additional uses and connectivity to Metro Center offering alternative routes beyond Frantz Road, coordinating with Metro Center development at different scale/character.
Emerald Corridor: The employment spine along I-270 with connectivity to other uses and certain mixed-use areas. The stop on Parkwood Loop discussed potential transition from office to mixed-use with smaller neighborhood office, residential, and commercial uses.
Southwest Area Plan: Envisioned for future residential at different densities with the future Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension bringing utilities for gradual development.
West Innovation District: Another employment area focusing on high-tech cooperation with universities, research, and light industrial. Discussion included zoning at Cosgray/Shier-Rings (ID-2, ID-4, ID-5), planning for a potential passenger rail station at the northwest corner with mixed-use opportunities, sports, Ohio University campus for education/research, and the future premier athletic facility.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 pm.

_____
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

_____
Deputy Clerk of Council

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 12, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

1. All In Dublin
25-042CP **Concept Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and non-binding feedback for a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The 1.59-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District-Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located on the east side of Dublin Center Drive between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.
Location:	PID: 273-013221
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-042

RESULT: The Commission was generally supportive of the use and layout but expressed concerns about the site access, amount of parking, adequacy of public open space, and proximity of ground-floor residential units to W. Dublin Granville Road given its busy nature. Members recommended activating the entire first floor frontage along W. Granville Road and differentiating it from the other street frontages.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB125C3BED6456...
Bassem Bitar, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 12, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the June 12, 2025 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:	Gary Alexander, Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way
Staff members present:	Thaddeus Boggs, Jenny Rauch, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

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

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

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 and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. 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

Case #25-042CP
All In Dublin – Concept Plan

Request for review and non-binding feedback for a four-story, 75-unit multi-family building and associated site improvements. The 1.59-acre site is zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District-Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located on the east side of Dublin Center Drive between W. Dublin Granville Road and Banker Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Dunham, Executive Director, All Inclusive Living, 215 North Front Street, Suite 600, Columbus, stated that the mission of All Inclusive Living is to expand housing opportunities for individuals with disabilities. The first project based on their inclusive housing concept is on its way to being developed in Dublin. After years of effort, a great concept has been assembled that will serve people with disabilities and older adults allowing them to live in communities where they are among people of different ages and abilities. TFG Housing Resources and The Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority are key partners in the project. They are here to share the design vision for this site. They believe it aligns with the intent of the Bridge Street District (BSD) plan.

Dan Gore, All In Board Member, 5577 Mountjoy Court, Dublin, stated that they are pleased to be before the Commission. He works as a Senior Vice President with The Pizzuti Companies. He volunteers his resources and time to the All Inclusive Living Board along with several others who are involved in the development community. As a Dublin resident, father and advocate for individuals with developmental disabilities, he feels passionate about the mission to build affordable housing for the disabled community, an underserved segment of our population.

Jena Kessler, Project Captain, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, stated that the building is oriented along two main street frontages (Dublin Center and SR161). The main feature is the corner of the building, which has been opened up to accentuate the gateway feature and activate the corner. There is a lot of storefront at the street level to increase engagement along the streetscape. There is landscaping shown with places to interact with the public. The façade materials are mainly brick with fiber cement siding on the fourth level. The vehicular entrance is off Banker Drive. They have created a circular parking lot to allow drop off on the passenger side of vehicles. They are looking at the green area on north end of the site as a quieter area with programming to sit and enjoy the outdoors.

Russ Garber, Senior Principal, MA Design, 775 Yard Street, Suite 325, Columbus, was also present.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that this project is at the early stages in the review process. In the BSD, the Concept Plan review calls for non-binding feedback. If the plan progresses, it will come back to the Commission for Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan at which stages the Commission would be looking at all the details on how it exactly corresponds to Code requirements. The intent at this point is to look generally at land use and densities, general site layout, access and circulation, open space framework and those types of general details. The site is located just west of Sawmill Road at the eastern edge of the BSD. The parcel was split from the Fifth Third Bank site a few years ago and is currently undeveloped. It is within the Mixed-Use Urban Future Land Use as identified in the Community Plan. Principal uses are intended to provide a strong mix of different urban uses with orientation to the street. Buildings are generally three to six stories in height and the streetscape promotes gridded street networks. The intent is to transform the area

from an auto-oriented suburban environment to a more walkable, high-density environment. Parking is encouraged to be structured parking or behind buildings. The location is within the BSD Special Area Plan Subarea B. One of the key elements is that Dublin Granville Road (SR161) will be a future bus rapid transit (BRT) route so some of the considerations revolve around public transit, which provides breaks from some of the parking requirements. Residential uses are listed as complementary to office and hotel uses. Within the BSD Code, the site is in Sawmill Center Neighborhood, where the intent is for a strong mix of uses and physical and visual connections back to the surrounding areas.

There is also a specific street network plan. To the east, a potential future neighborhood street is contemplated. The proposed project is a combination of one- to three-bedroom units and a common area. 81 parking spaces are being proposed. The site requires a few more, but staff feels they can reach an agreement through some adjustments because the drive aisles are wider than necessary and the actual needs of this use can be studied. The building generally fronts on the two streets as required by Code. The BSD requires a minimum frontline coverage, and the building as proposed meets that except for the corners that bump back. That is different with the open space at the corner and the parking on the north side. If the project progresses, staff would work with the applicant on parking screening, utilities and access. Two access points are proposed. One is off Banker Drive, which staff has concerns about due to its proximity to Dublin Center Drive. There is another through the parking lot of Fifth Third Bank for which there is a cross-access easement. Eventually, if the potential neighborhood street gets built, that is expected to be another organizing factor to create a block system and buildings would be expected to front on Banker Drive and that new north-south street. Staff would like to work with them on what that means in the future. Another option for access might be at the property line between the site in question and the bank site. The BSD Code is very prescriptive regarding permitted open space types and how they are defined.

The applicant is proposing a pocket plaza to create a gateway envisioned in Code at this location. The site to the north is envisioned as open space and both are open to the public. There is one shown internal to the site that would not qualify as open space because it is not open to public. There are a few spaces along the front of the building that are identified as greenways. That type of open space is permitted in this district but the width shown does not meet the requirements. As this project progresses, staff would look at other ways to activate those spaces to see if a waiver would be appropriate. Similarly, with parking located close to Banker Drive, there are requirements for a street wall and some additional landscaping that would be reviewed at later stages. The architecture is a four-story building with brick and cementitious siding that fits with the apartment building type. That is one of the building types permitted in this area. It fits within height requirements. For a residential building, there is a requirement for a finished floor elevation that must be 2.5 feet above grade. That will need further review. Some windows have more horizontal proportions where the Code requires vertical. There are opportunities at the corner to accentuate the gateway element. Those are items that could be resolved in the future. Mr. Bitar shared the following for discussion by the Commission.

1. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed use?
2. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout?
3. Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site access?
4. Is the Commission supportive of the architectural design approach?
5. Any other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock asked for more detail regarding the vision. The mix of uses and connectivity is important in this area, but this is not a mixed-use proposal. Mr. Garber stated that this is one of the first residential buildings in that area. They are proposing sidewalk connectivity along Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive. They are looking at creating gateway features at the corners and having them be open to the public. It is a relatively small site in a relatively large area. They agree to do what they can to promote public traffic like the connectivity of sidewalks, visibility at corners and the creation of public space. Mr. Chinnock asked staff for their input on the connection with Fifth Third Bank. He also asked if Banker Drive requires building frontage. Mr. Bitar stated that technically frontage is required on all streets. Generally, the intent has been to focus on a couple frontages because parking must be accommodated. There have been other projects in the BSD that had similar conditions where the focus was on the primary streets. There would have to be certain treatments along Banker Drive to create a more comfortable experience for pedestrians. There is quite a bit of parking already there but because this is a separately owned site, staff cannot say what will happen to the rest of the parking until there is a proposal for development. It is reasonable to accommodate parking here. As this moves into the more formal stages, it will have to be determined how much parking is needed given the transit and functions of the building. Mr. Chinnock asked for staff's preference regarding access. Mr. Bitar stated that the most efficient choice is to use the curb cut that straddles the property line, because it leaves less to consider if the adjoining site is redeveloped.

Ms. Harter asked if the applicant has had contact with Fifth Third Bank. Mr. Gore stated that they have made contact with Fifth Third Bank and they are aware of these requests. Ms. Harter asked if artwork or additional items have been considered. Mr. Gore stated that they will try to find a way to activate those places. Ms. Harter asked if there is a bus location at the site now. Mr. Bitar stated this is part of the larger area-wide BRT corridor, so eventually there will be a path through this corridor. There are already some COTA stops on Sawmill and Dublin Granville roads. Ms. Harter referenced open spaces and asked if other amenities, such as a dog park, had been considered to bring the community together. Ms. Kessler stated that this is a smaller site, so they are looking at ways to use the space for multiple functions like gardens, a dog park, or fire pit. Ms. Harter asked if street parking is being considered. Mr. Bitar stated that there will be a presentation coming before Council about the East Bridge Street Corridor that has been studied over the last couple of years. Here they are trying to accommodate the BRT but there could be some opportunities on neighborhood streets as the area develops. Ms. Harter asked for more information on the street wall. Mr. Bitar stated that a requirement of the BSD Code is that if parking is within 20 feet of a street, there must be a street wall, so it feels like a pedestrian is not looking at or walking beside a parking lot. Ms. Harter asked if staff would propose a speed limit change. Mr. Bitar stated that they will not at this point, but it will likely eventually change.

Mr. Way referenced the aforementioned requirement that the finished floor elevation be 2.5 feet above grade. He asked with this site being raised above SR161, what grade would be referenced. Mr. Bitar stated that the Code says the sidewalk level. Mr. Way asked about stormwater management requirements for this site. Mr. Bitar stated stormwater management would be required. That is an issue for a smaller site. It will come along with future stages. Mr. Way stated that when the lot split was done, the bank was using this site for stormwater management. He stated that it will have to be considered whether this site must absorb the neighboring site's stormwater of if that neighboring site will have to solve that problem when this develops. Mr. Bitar stated that the applicants' engineers have been in touch with City Engineers. Mr. Way asked

if staff's suggested access on Banker Drive would be a full-movement intersection. Mr. Bitar stated that based on initial review of the proposal, staff would expect that to be sufficient for full-turn movements. Mr. Way stated that he is interested in the residential units on the street level. This proposal puts people very close to cars. Even though the speed on SR161 may reduce, it is still a fairly high-speed road. He asked if there was discussion regarding people in proximity to fast-moving cars. Ms. Kessler stated that there was a need to maximize units. They tried to maximize the common area on the first floor so that there are fewer units there. The strategy of putting the parking lot on the back of the site means that any dropping off will happen on the protected side of the site. The landscape buffers and different requirements help create a buffer between private homes and the public street. They are not considering balconies on this building. Mr. Garber stated that the intent of the 2.5-foot requirement is so that units are elevated off the pedestrian level. They have not done a grading study but he thinks there is an opportunity to address that and elevate the building to provide more separation for privacy. There are only a couple of units at this far end and the majority are elevated or along the backside of the building. They have not gotten into stormwater management but expect an underground detention system. Mr. Way asked if the applicant explored options that lifted all units up and kept the bottom floor as community uses like a lobby, coffee shop, fitness center, etc. Mr. Garber stated that programmatic elements and funding requirements dictate the amount of common space on this building. They feel that they have done what they could to activate that corner and put common area programming where needed.

Mr. Alexander stated that this plan has some larger, three-bedroom units. He asked if they anticipate any children in the units. Mr. Boggs stated that the age of residents would not be within PZC's purview. Mr. Alexander stated if there were going to be children, the building might need to be modified and design considerations be made as a result. Mr. Dunham stated that the project is designed to address the unmet housing needs of adults with disabilities. They have 25% of units set aside as deeply affordable units for that population. They are also developing a preference for older adults (40% of units) because we see them as programmatically integral to the mission. The remaining units will be workforce housing for individuals and potentially families. Mr. Alexander stated that the two streets are very different and classified differently. He asked the applicant if they thought about differentiating the building mass based on the different conditions. Mr. Garber stated that from an overall massing study, they feel good about it. The programmatic requirement, parking and open space necessitated a four-story building. They did look at varying building heights. They will take into consideration how each elevation develops uniquely for its street façade.

Mr. Deschler asked if there has been consideration for underground parking to create more green space. Mr. Garber stated there are elevation challenges and economical challenges with underground parking. Mr. Gore stated that they have worked closely with staff to meet Code and underground parking has not been brought up, so they did not consider it. Mr. Deschler asked for the City's position on underground parking as greenspace is somewhat inadequate. Mr. Bitar stated that they have not discussed underground parking. Factors like Fire Department access can make underground parking more challenging when it is for one building versus a larger development. Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that this is one of the first projects for All Inclusive Living. Mr. Dunham stated that this is the first project for All Inclusive Living. The concept is informed by several different successful affordable housing models around the country. This will be unique to Ohio. Mr. Deschler asked if All Inclusive Living would be the property manager making decisions regarding applications. Mr. Dunham stated that TFG Housing

Resources will be leading the application process along with the property management firm. They will hire a qualified property management firm with experience in this space. Mr. Deschler inquired if once the 25% is filled, there is a preference for another 40% for older adults. Mr. Dunham stated that they are pursuing a 40% preference for older adults. They would have the right of first refusal for those units. If they are not rented by older adults within the first six months, they would go back to the general population. They are confident, given the demographic and need, that there will be a high demand amongst older adults for those units and those will be at a higher income level than the disability units. Mr. Deschler asked if it is the same application process for seniors and the general population. Mr. Dunham stated that after looking at other projects around the country, having a unified application seems to be a good way to handle this, but it remains to be seen. Mr. Deschler asked about associated tax credits.

Brad Carman, President, TFG, 685 South Front Street, Columbus, stated that they will get a legal opinion, but the intent is to have seniors neighboring the disability population. They will hire a qualified property manager that has tax credit experience. TFG and the Metropolitan Housing Authority will be in the project for 15 years providing guarantees. Mr. Deschler asked if TFG has done other projects around the area that they could review for massing, parking and location. Mr. Carman stated that TFG Housing Resources was started two and one half years ago. They partnered with Wes Finch of the Finch Group, who has been in the industry over 40 years and has done over $1 billion of development. They have a renovation project in Newark, Ohio for which they used Ruscilli Construction. Their approach is to use the best partners they know.

Mr. Garvin stated that the bus stop is relevant because a 10% reduction in parking spaces is being discussed. He asked for more information on bus stops in the area. Mr. Bitar stated that there are already existing bus stops, and there will definitely be more in the future. The project is within the distance prescribed by Code for a reduction. Mr. Garvin stated that there may be an issue with impervious lot coverage and not enough parking. He asked how projects like this typically deal with that. Mr. Bitar stated that this is at the preliminary stage. Staff thinks the drives could be narrow if the Fire Department has no concerns with the circulation. There may be other ways to get back to the 70% lot coverage or there is a waiver process as all requirements are considered. Mr. Garvin asked if the pocket plaza counts toward open space. Mr. Bitar stated that that areas facing outwards that could be programmed will likely be counted. Ones completely internal would not count toward the requirement in Code. Mr. Garvin asked if a traffic impact study will be required. Mr. Bitar stated that with the BSD zoning, there was a comprehensive traffic study at that time. There may be some trip generation questions that may need to be answered. Mr. Garvin asked if that would impact the access. Mr. Bitar stated that it would likely not impact it in a major way but there would be more detail needed. Mr. Garvin asked if any thought was given to reorienting the building to create more open space opportunities. Mr. Garber stated that many comments have been received. They feel optimistic that they can find other locations to capture that square footage.

Ms. Call asked the applicant if, with the compounding requirements of parking and open space, they are confident those can be met. Mr. Garber stated that they are certainly going to look at the project and opportunities to meet requirements. It will be tough but with this proposed population, they do not have the automobile traffic that a straight market rate multi-family housing project would have. This proposal meets the parking needs of the population of the building. Ms. Call stated that the Commission has to look at the building as a multi-use residential building. Mr. Carman stated that the owners of the property next to this wanted to see the

outcome of this meeting. The applicants will go back and continue to communicate with them. Ms. Call asked if historically a single point of access has been allowed for a residential use in this dense of an area with these types of streets. Mr. Bitar stated that Transportation and Mobility staff were comfortable with this access. The Fire Department has looked at this and the initial indication is they may not need to have their apparatus on site. Ms. Call asked if there are definitions for horizontal mixed use and vertical mixed use. Mr. Bitar stated that the intent in the BSD is to look at the area as a whole. This is within the east subarea. The intent was to introduce uses that will help densify the area that do not exist right now. There is no specific requirement that it has to be a vertical mix of uses. Staff does believe that this is introducing one of those uses that are listed as a principal use in an area where it does not exist. Ms. Call asked staff to clarify "ground floor activation" and to state whether this application qualifies for that. Mr. Bitar stated that ground floor activation refers to something that interacts with the street. Staff feels that the way the corner has been designed, not just with the plaza, but also the storefront treatment of the common open space on the interior that shows activity is a component of that activation for an otherwise single use building like this.

Mr. Deschler asked if anywhere else in Dublin there is a building with this type of density on this type of lot. Mr. Bitar stated that within Bridge Park there are a lot of buildings of that nature. The intent of the plan is to try to densify this area and create more volume. There was a previous proposal for a hospital use at this site and there was commentary from the Commission that it needed to be more substantial at that corner. With the intent to create a gateway there, densify the area and support other uses within the area including transit, staff believes the scale is appropriate and it meets the frontage requirements along the streets.

Public Comment

Ms. Rauch stated that one public comment was received and forwarded to the Commission regarding density and traffic. The Commission reviewed the comment received electronically.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock stated that Dublin Granville Road is a significant artery to the City, so this site is important. Options other than having residential that close to that corridor need to be considered. He would support a taller building as there is leeway to do a more significant building. He is generally supportive but feels there are a lot of opportunities for improvement. We need to consider how this fits into the overall long-term plan. There have been many things brought up tonight to be thought through. He is concerned about the amount of surface parking. Creating a vibrant streetscape is incredibly important to this area specifically.

Ms. Harter stated that this is such an important area. It must be walkable, safe and well-lit. It should also be sustainable. Landscaping will be very important. She feels the lack of vertical mixed use is a missed opportunity.

Mr. Way stated that as the first redevelopment in the area, there is no context for this building yet. In terms of walkability and street level connectivity, he is struggling with having residential units at grade. There is residential at grade in Bridge Park, but it is all on side streets. SR161 is a busy corridor and will get busier with the BRT. This is the first project where we get to test the Code, guidelines and plans. He has no problem with the proposed use but struggles with the

ground floor. There are not a lot of options with the site layout. The site access will be determined by Transportation and Mobility. Regarding the open space framework, he is not sold on any of those proposed beyond the pocket plaza and the little park on the other end. A greenway is something to be walked through. The dimension between the sidewalk and building is basically a landscape setback, not a greenway. It is too early to comment on architectural design, but as a gateway corner, even more could be done architecturally to celebrate that. There could be something done to make the two edges look different. He is totally supportive of the project but thinks there are some things that need to be worked through.

Mr. Alexander stated that he generally agrees with comments made by his fellow Commissioners. He is supportive of the use because it turns the area into a mixed-use area by introduction of residential, which is what the guidelines are recommending. This project is close to being able to conform to current zoning codes. He is supportive of the project but thinks some adjustments are going to need to be made. Much needs to be done to minimize that large sea of parking. He agrees with staff comments and recommendations regarding access. He does not see a greenway in this plan compared to other greenways that have been introduced in other projects. The architecture does not acknowledge that corner. By having those two identical wings, it dissipates visual interest instead of concentrating it. A lot more needs to be done in the architectural development of the corner.

Mr. Deschler stated that he agrees with many of the comments of his fellow commissioners. While he is generally supportive of the use, significant work needs to be done relative to parking and the open space framework. He is in favor of trying to remove some of the parking and/or moving some parking underground. He likes the idea of raising the height of the building with more focus on the gateway. The site layout is fine. There is not enough open space. There is no area for kids to go outside. It does not make sense to have residential units on the first floor with frontage on SR161 and Dublin Center Drive.

Mr. Garvin stated that he agrees with comments of fellow commissioners. He is partially supportive of the use. The goal of the BSD here is to promote walkability. Having a greater mix of uses at the ground floor does that better. He supports keeping the parking off of Dublin Center Road. He echoed Mr. Deschler's comments about finding a way to vary the parking to make it more visually appealing from the street as this is intended to be a walkable area. It is important to have the site be appealing from as many angles as possible. He is supportive of the site access as recommended by staff. He is skeptical of sharing access through the other parking lot. It is important to move it away from the intersection. In its current iteration, this plan does not provide much useful open space. There is an opportunity to make an amenity that is visually appealing and useful to the community.

Ms. Call stated that she echoes what her fellow commissioners said about the proposed use. It is supported by the Code. However, there are some conflicting items. She supports the residential use but there has to be consideration of the adjacency to higher speed, higher traffic corridors. Safety has to be paramount and first floor activation is required by Code. Neither of those are met in this proposal. The corner is well done but the legs are residential adjacent to significant street corridors. She sees the need for consolidation of open spaces. Open space is created for use of the community and a greenway that is adjacent to sidewalk is not equal to a parking lot does not equal a pocket park. Parking is her biggest struggle. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines' instruction for parking is, "above or below ground structured parking, structured

parking, on-street parking, garages screened from major corridors with liner buildings." This plan does not meet those. She agreed that the eastern access as recommended by staff is her preference. She thinks the architectural design is nice. Pedestrian transportation at the parking lot needs to be considered with future iterations. The Commission will be concerned about details and meeting Code requirements. We appreciate every applicant and treat all things equally. They look forward to continuing to work on this project to build something we can all be proud of. There is no action required for this application. She asked if the applicant would like any clarification. No clarification was sought by the applicant and appreciation was expressed for working with the Commission.

~~DISCUSSION~~

~~Building Materials~~
~~Review and discussion of the use of existing and proposed building materials presented by staff and the City's architectural consultant.~~

~~Mark Ford, Ford & Associates, stated that he and his team have been working with staff on multiple projects where he or his team has been asked specific questions about products that are being proposed. He would like to share his process for reviewing and making recommendations or evaluations of those products.~~
~~They evaulate what is good design by considering the selection of materials and the proper application of those materials. He provided an example of having a good material but poor design - brick pavers as a walking surface that become slippery and hazardous when wet. When reviewing materials, he tries to be objective and not consider his preferences. Cost is a consideration. That can play into the idea of sustainability and innovation. Innovation is a focus of the City of Dublin. Materials can also impact the structural requirements for a building. Projects that use lesser quality materials to meet a financial goal can create long-term maintenance issues. For reference, he uses the encyclopedia of different testing standards for different materials and what the manufacturer's product literature provides. Manufacturer's literature can be self-serving, however a way to divorce himself from the salesmanship of the literature is to try to find a project in which the product has been used. With some of the newer products, he reaches out to regional sales representatives and asks for projects in Central Ohio where the product has been used. He also collects samples of products and considers where the material will be located. With regard to sustainability, there is a consideration for how the products are manufactured. They then consider if the material is being used appropriately. Mr. Ford considers questions like where the material is being used on the building, how it will react with other materials, what type of flashings are required, and installation details. If it is a new material, what is the limited risk we are willing to accept? Installation is critical and is the most difficult to police.~~

~~Mr. Way stated that another consideration could be a material's relationship to other materials it is coming in contact with. Mr. Ford stated that it is an age-old problem and provided the example of steel railing in concrete rusting.~~

~~In response to Ms. Call's question regarding thin brick, Mr. Ford stated that thin brick is a clay product. It is brick that is baked and sliced and is applied to the face of a building. One manufacturer had a metal grid system where they come in and grout the joints just like true brick. There are other products designed to look like brick. He shared an example of styrofoam panels scored to look like brick.~~

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 17, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

1. Nutex Micro-Hospital at 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road
22-016INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	Informal review and feedback for the construction of a two-story emergency hospital. The 1.58-acres site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Location:	Northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.
Request:	Informal review and feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.
Applicant:	John Mills, JTM Architects
Planning Contact:	Zachary Hounshell, Planner I
Contact Information:	614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-016

RESULT: The Commission provided a review and feedback on the proposal and expressed concerns that the proposed hospital use is an auto-oriented use that does not further the vison of the Bridge Street District and the walkable, mixed-use environment. The Commission identified concerns that the proposed use would not be able to meet the Conditional Use or Sawmill Center Neighborhood District standards. Concerns were raised regarding dead-end parking and lack of integration within the area. The Commission recommended more emphasis be given to the W. Dublin-Granville Road frontage with regard to an increase of the building massing along the street and parking located to the rear. The members expressed the need for additional architectural and sign details at the next step, identifying concerns with the proposed number of signs. Additionally, the Commission stressed the need to provide a gateway feature at the intersection of Dublin Center Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Warren Fishman	Absent
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Zach Hounshell
B1050D11513A490...
Zachary Hounshell, Planner I

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with the following six (6) conditions:~~

1) ~~That the applicant continue to work with staff on all canopy lighting to meet the flush mounting requirement or the lighting be positioned behind the purlins to minimize glare, subject to staff review and approval;~~
2) ~~That the applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing all three canopy locations and the relocation of the existing utilities within the disturbed area to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;~~
3) ~~That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize all plant species and submit a finalized landscape plan, subject to staff review and approval;~~
4) ~~That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize all mobility hub sign-like features regarding design and colors;~~
5) ~~That the applicant and consultant apply for Building Permits and Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards prior to construction.~~
6) ~~That the chalkboard be eliminated and replaced with a suitable alternative, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes. [Motion approved 5-0.]~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modification: Modification of the Development Text of the Coffman Park Master Development Plan; Subsection Coffman Park Master Plan Elements: Community Recreation Center Element to permit one digital changeable copy sign for the Dublin Community Recreation Center Mobility Hub as follows:~~

1) ~~That the sign be located on the property to which it refers;~~
2) ~~The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties; and~~
3) ~~The sign does not exceed 8 square feet in size.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes. [Motion approved 5-0.]~~

INFORMAL REVIEW

1. Nutex Micro-Hospital, at 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 22-016INF, Informal Review

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the construction of a two-story emergency hospital on a 1.58-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that the Informal Review is not a required step in the development review process, but it gives the applicant an opportunity to receive non-binding feedback on the use, site layout, architecture and sign design. Should the applicant decide to move forward with the proposed project, the Concept Plan would be the next step in the process. The site is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. The entire Fifth Third site is 6.7 acres. It includes a 30,000 square foot office building and parking lot. In October 2021, City Council approved a Final

Plat for the site, which created two separate lots, one containing the existing office building, and also an additional lot. Although approved, the Final Plat has not yet been recorded. The proposed development the Commission is reviewing tonight would be located on this future parcel. The Sawmill Center Neighborhood is one of the few neighborhoods within the Bridge Street District that has its own set of requirements. Some of the conditions for this District include: encouraging active, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development, and encouraging interconnected site layouts for pedestrian access. The neighborhood map indicates areas where a shopping corridor is considered and where specific building types are permitted, as well as potential gateway locations. This site would be considered a potential gateway location. Gateway locations are points of identification and introduction to a specific area of the City. The identification can be achieved by architecture, landscape, or public open spaces. The adjacent Chase Bank development on Banker Drive also was responsible for providing a gateway feature. The site is located at the intersection of West Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive, both of which are considered principal frontage streets. West Dublin Granville Road is a corridor connector, and Dublin Center Drive is a district connector. Banker Drive to the north is an established neighborhood street. Principal frontage streets require the most emphasis within the District. When there are two principal frontage streets located adjacent to a site, the higher designated street would require more emphasis. In this case, that would be Dublin Granville Road, because it a corridor connector.

Proposal:
The applicant is requesting Informal Review of their use, architecture, conceptual signage and site layout. The applicant is proposing a micro emergency hospital, which would fall within the hospital designation within the BSD, which is considered a Conditional Use in this zoning. There is one use-specific standard regarding the gross floor area, but this proposal would not exceed that standard. Future approval of the Conditional Use with the Preliminary Development Plan will be necessary. The use is intended to be a 24/7 inpatient and emergency operation. The facility would include a number of private beds, treatment rooms, imaging rooms and a central pharmacy. The 22,000-square-foot building would be partially two-story and partially one story. Site access would be from Banker Drive leading to a 53-space surface parking lot extending along the rear of the property. There will be a parking wing between the building and Banker Drive. The site includes three potential open space areas, two south and southeast of the building and one near the intersection of Banker Drive and Dublin Center Drive. The gateway opportunity would be located at the southeast corner of the site and building. The applicant has proposed the Loft Building type. This building type has a required build zone; a 75% front property line coverage along both road frontages; and a minimum of two stories along the street frontage. Many of these items would receive more thorough review in the Concept Plan stage. Waivers may be required. Conceptual architecture has been shown. The south elevation would be on West Dublin Granville Road, the most emphasized elevation. The primary building materials would be stone and brick; the secondary material will be cementitious panels. There would also be aluminum store front windows and a metal canopy on the east elevation. [conceptual massing shown.] Three wall signs and a potential monument sign at the site entrance are proposed. A Master Sign Plan will be required.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

1) Does the Commission conceptually support a Conditional Use for a Hospital use?
2) Is the building siting appropriate given that W. Dublin-Granville Road is the highest priority street from a Planning and Engineering perspective?
3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed parking lot layout?
4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual massing and building materials?

5) Would the Board support the conceptual height, size, and design of the signage for the site?

Applicant Presentation

John Mills, Architect, JTM Architects, Denver, Colorado, stated that staff provided an excellent presentation. He would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired what impact the parking would have on the use of the adjoining property. Is the proposed parking appropriate with the adjoining bank property?

Mr. Hounshell responded that it is his understanding that the bank currently has more parking than was permitted within the Bridge Street District. Therefore, the parking wing on the west side of that lot would be stubbed off. The parking for the bank and the proposed site would be separate. The loss of those parking spaces would not impact the bank use.

Mr. Way stated that when this property was subdivided, there was an issue of a cross lot easement, but this proposal is not using a cross lot easement. What is the status on that item? The packet information reflects that stormwater management would be provided on this site. Is that intended to be provided underground, and would it support this site only or the bank site, as well?

Mr. Hendershot stated that stormwater management must be separate for each parcel, so the proposed development would need to provide their own stormwater management on this site. The existing stormwater management on the site to the east would be maintained.

Mr. Way stated that the cross lot easement was mentioned in the materials. Was that granted, and was it considered with the proposed site layout?
Mr. Mills responded that the cross access was considered, and several potential layouts with that access were considered. However, staff's feedback was, per discussions with the property owner, that option no longer was possible. Consequently, it has been eliminated from their layout; only a single access remains.

Ms. Rauch responded that the approved plat was not recorded, due to some concerns of the property owner regarding safety and cut-throughs. Staff, the property owner and the applicant discussed the concerns and determined a configuration that would limit access on Dublin Center Drive and SR 161, moving all the access to Banker Drive, so that the parcels operate independently. The potential for cross access could be re-visited, should the Fifth Third Bank site be redeveloped in the future.

Mr. Schneier inquired about the emergency vehicle access for this emergency hospital. Although there is a dock for an ambulance, the staff memo indicates the ambulance would be used infrequently, only for an occasional transport. Would it be used to transport patients to or from the hospital?
Mr. Mills responded that this would be a community hospital. It will not be part of the EMS network. Incoming patients would be transported to existing providers. The ambulance dock would be used only for transporting a stabilized patient to another facility for a higher level of care.

Mr. Schneier inquired if, although it is described as an emergency hospital, patients would arrive by private vehicle.
Mr. Mills responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier inquired what would be the highest/best use for this site, which has SR161 frontage. Because this is considered as a secondary, Conditional Use, what is considered the best use?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff would be looking for a use that is aligned with the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. That would be a development promoting pedestrian connections throughout the area, not just along the street, but through the site. It is difficult to state a preferred use, as the list of Permitted Uses is extensive. The ideal use would align with the Code requirements.
Ms. Call recited Code Section 153.058, Section 5: "This District applies to the majority of the commercial area located in the east of the District. The standards of the BSD, Sawmill Center Neighborhood create an active, walkable destination through integration of a strong mix of uses. Development within this District relies on the provision of physical and visual connections….and creates a walkable, mixed-use core as the east anchor of the District."
Mr. Schneier responded that it would appear that the primary concern is not the use, per se, but the fact that the use is not pedestrian-friendly.
Mr. Hounshell responded that the purpose of this Informal Review is to acquire the Commission's thoughts concerning the use. However, should the proposal move forward, the application would need to meet the standards of the Neighborhood District and for the Conditional Use, as well. The review will concern whether the use is consistent with the existing uses and the intent of the District.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the proposed signage and the Sign Code requirements.
Mr. Hounshell stated that the proposed signage could change. The Code permits a single tenant building to have a wall sign on each street frontage, up to a maximum of 50 square feet per wall sign. The signage must be on the first story of the building. The square footage is based on the linear square footage of an elevation. To meet the Code requirements, some changes would be required.
Mr. Supelak inquired the scale of these signs.
Mr. Mills responded that on the west elevation, the proposed wall sign would exceed the 50-square-foot maximum. It is important for people in need of emergency treatment to be able to identify the building easily. The wall signs are important, but can be scaled to whatever size the City requires.

Mr. Way stated that he is confused regarding the type of facility that is proposed. It is described both as an emergency hospital, but also as a community hospital. No patients would arrive by ambulance, however.
Mr. Mills responded that there are different magnitudes of emergency needs. This will not be a trauma center. Non-life threatening injuries and respiratory and heart issues would be handled here, ensuring that the patient is stabilized.

Mr. Way inquired who would make the decision regarding the type of emergency facility needed.
Mr. Mills responded the physician would make that determination. Because beds are included, there is ability to monitor a patient longer than the typical 23-hour stay. A patient can stay for several days, if necessary.

Mike Borland, 4318 Lyon Drive, Upper Arlington, 43220, stated that he is part of the operating group of Nutex Hospital.
Mr. Way requested clarification of the role of the proposed facility. It is identified as an emergency hospital. Does that differ from a regular emergency room?
Mr. Borland responded that it is technically an emergency hospital. It will be staffed by Board-certified emergency physicians. The facility has all the technical capabilities of a typical emergency department, including diagnostic and imaging services. The facility will care for patients in need of a high level of emergency care without the unfortunate waits associated with very large emergency departments in more complicated medical systems. The reason these type of emergency facilities are springing up is due to the concierge type of care and quick turnaround. Within 30 minutes, a patient can be seen by experienced emergency staff overseen by a board-certified emergency physician. Patients are seen here that are not in need of surgery or referral into a more-complicated emergency care. The majority of patients will be seen on an outpatient basis, but certain types of services could be provided by the facility overnight or short-term. Typically, stays will not be longer than two-three days. This is actually typical of most admissions and stays today.

Ms. Call stated that per Code Section 153.063, subsection 5.2, in this District at least one continuous shopping corridor located along at least one principal frontage street is required. How would this meet that requirement?
Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes that would apply to the current shopping center, which extends along Dublin Village Center Drive. Better identification can be provided as the project proceeds.

Ms. Rauch responded that the shopping corridor is identified on the graphic provided in the packet materials. That would not be applicable to this particular site.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided on this case.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested that the Commissioners provide responses to the five discussion questions.

Mr. Schneier stated that West Dublin Granville Street ranks as a high priority street. Accordingly, if not this use, what use would be optimal in this location? Should a hospital use be located here? Unless another pedestrian-oriented use could occur here, he would be supportive of a Conditional Use as a hospital. The business model is difficult to understand. It would be necessary to educate the community on what issues would be addressed at this site versus the Dublin Methodist Hospital. He assumes the applicant can address the need for that delineation. He is not opposed to the proposed Conditional Use, unless there is a reason a hospital is not desired at this location. At this point, not much detail has been provided. He does not object to the general height or size, but is not comfortable opining further in regard to massing and materials.

Mr. Way stated that he has concerns with the proposed use in the Bridge Street District, along SR 161 specifically. The Commission has discussed the types of uses we would like to see here to make this a very walkable environment. This use would not contribute to that character. He does not believe dead-end parking lots are particularly functional; that is the reason he inquired about

a cross-lot easement. From a functionality standpoint, emergency hospital parking lots should be easy to navigate. He also does not think that this use gives the desired priority to the Dublin Granville Road key frontage. He would like to see more emphasis placed on that frontage. Perhaps the entire building could be located closer to the street, providing more parking at the rear. He has no objection to the conceptual massing and materials. However, a hospital in this area does not contribute to the spirit of the Bridge Street District and its walkable, active environment. A hospital is a very destination-oriented use.

Mr. Grimes expressed agreement. He is unsure that this is the best use for this location, and the proposed parking lot would not permit good vehicle access and circulation. The signage would need to be very specific. How will the frontage of this facility blend with the adjacent building? The site plan is not yet well developed, and he is unable to comment further due to the limited information.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees with fellow Commissioners. The use is a concern. It is not a pedestrian-oriented destination; therefore, it is inconsistent with the District's intent. The siting and massing are appropriate, and the materials are acceptable. The signs seem to be exceed the sign requirements. However, those concerns are overshadowed by the question as to whether the use is appropriate here.

Ms. Call stated that we are discussing this use in this particular location. If it were proposed in a different location, the discussion would be very different. Dublin residents would have need of this type of facility. However, as a Conditional Use in this District, it must be harmonious with the general objectives of the Community Plan. It would appear that Commissioners do not believe it is harmonious with the Community Plan and the zoning in this area. There are concerns, as well, about its compliance with the Development Standards, specifically internal circulation and scale of the signage. Condition 3 for Conditional Use qualifications require that the use be harmonious with the existing and intended character. Condition 4 requires that the use does not have a negative impact on existing or future facilities and neighborhood structure. There is a condition about hours of operation. A hospital is not harmonious with the character sought in this District. However, Dublin is a large city. She would encourage the applicant to look at other location options within the City.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant requested any further input from the Commission.

Mr. Mills stated that the use is an important factor. Perhaps how the use will perform for the consumer is where the Commission has questions, as well as the character of the District. Medical services, particularly emergency services are changing. Consumers are seeking a different type of facility. While very serious emergencies need another type of facility than what is proposed, consumers desire to be treated quickly for unidentified problems. Typically, they are not in need of an EMS transport to a larger hospital facility for surgery. The proposed type of emergency facility provides ability to be seen quickly. Patients would arrive by private vehicle or ambulance. The visitors associated with these patients would interact with the surrounding commercial neighborhood. He believes it is a compatible neighborhood use.

Mr. Way stated that he understands the role of a micro hospital or freestanding emergency department. These type of facilities provide an opportunity to care for patients not in need of acute care. The issue for him is that this is the wrong location for the facility, due to the intent of the

Bridge Street District. These type of facilities need convenient access; they are automobile-oriented, not pedestrian-oriented. Perhaps the applicant could find another more appropriate site in Dublin. He understands the need for this type of emergency service, and it is not his intent to discourage the applicant from pursuing it in another location. However, significant effort has been expended by the City and the Commission in the goal to make this particular district unique and different.

Ms. Call stated the use is valuable; she also encourages the applicant to seek another location within the City. The Commission appreciates the time and effort the applicant has expended.

~~2. 5055 Upper Metro Place, 21-094INF, Informal Review~~

~~Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the construction of a four-story, mixed-use building containing residential units and a commercial tenant space. The 2.55-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial and is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Noble stated that this case originally was presented to the Commission on July 8, 2021. Tonight, nonbinding feedback from the Commission is sought on a revised proposal. Should this application advance, it would return as a Concept Plan request. The 2.5-acre vacant site is located south of Upper Metro Place and west of Frantz Road. The site has frontage on Upper Metro Place to the north. There are pedestrian facilities on both Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. The site is zoned Bridge Street Commercial and is surrounded primarily by hotel uses, including Embassy Suites and Home2 Suites to the north; Town Place Suites to the west; to the south, an office and bank use; to the east, other hotel uses. Although the site is included in the Bridge Street Commercial District, it is also located within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The concepts of both areas are similar, specifically, a walkable and mixed-use urban environment. In this location, there is a need to attract amenities for workers, including usable open space. DCAP is a fully developed area, and the focus is now on additional infill development. When the Commission reviewed the case in July, they were generally supportive of the use but expressed concerns about the massing, which was essentially a 4-story linear wall located very close to the Upper Metro Place roadway. There also was concern that the open space located to the rear of the building would be perceived as private space, not usable public open space.~~

~~The revised proposal essentially bisects the building, placing the two sections on the Upper Metro Place frontage and Frantz Road frontage, with a connector between the two. The open space includes a private pool for the building tenants; it also includes an outdoor patio space for use by the commercial uses on the first floor of the Frantz Road building. The building is proposed to be a Mixed-Use Building Type containing 175 residential units and 7,700-square-feet of commercial space. The commercial uses include a restaurant user, a fitness facility and conference space, available for use by the nearby hotels. Open space was a concern, as there is none in close proximity to the site. The Bridge Street District requires open space for both commercial and residential uses. This application proposes 35,000 square feet of open space, nearly an acre, but slightly under the amount required. The open space includes the inner corridor of greenspace, the area around the pool, landscaping along Upper Metro Place, and a patio. There will be a need to activate that space. The primary access to the site is from Upper Metro Place. The parking includes~~

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 59-21 *Passed* _____, *20*____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ACCEPTING THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE REPLAT OF AN APPROXIMATELY 6.69-ACRES PARCEL WITHIN THE DUBLIN CITY CENTER SUBDIVISION TO ESTABLISH TWO NEW PARCELS APPROXIMATELY 1.58-ACRES AND 5.11-ACRES IN SIZE ZONED BSD-SCN, BRIDGE STREET DISTRICT - SAWMILL CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD DISTRICT LOCATED NORTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE ROAD AND DUBLIN CENTER DRIVE (CASE 21-026FP).

WHEREAS, application for approval of the plat for Dublin City Center has been made under Chapter 152 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Dublin; and

WHEREAS, the plat application has been reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission, which has recommended approval and acceptance of the plat; and

WHEREAS, the Council has considered the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the reports of staff, and the subdivision requirements of Chapter 152 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Dublin, and desires to approve said plat;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, of the elected members concurring that:

Section 1. The City Council hereby approves and accepts the plat for Dublin City Center, attached hereto and incorporated by reference as Exhibit A.

Section 2. The City Manager, Law Director, Clerk of Council, and any other required City employee or official are authorized to execute the plat on behalf of the City.

Section 3. Pursuant to Section 4.04 of the Charter, this resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage.

Passed this 25th day of October, 2021.

Mayor – Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Clerk of Council

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 59-21

Approving and Accepting the Preliminary Plat for the Replat of an Approximately 6.69-Acres Parcel Within the Dublin City Center Subdivision to Establish Two New Parcels Approximately 1.58-Acres and 5.11-Acres in Size Zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District Located Northeast of the Intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request, as recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission, to accept revisions to the Dublin City Center plat to establish two new parcels in order to facilitate future development in the Bridge Street District (BSD). The 6.69-acres site is presently developed with a two-story, 30,000-square-foot office building with drive-thru bank. The parcel, located at 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road, was originally platted in 1988 as a portion of the Dublin City Center plat (Reserve A); platting approximately 44.16-acres of land between Sawmill Road and David Road, north of W. Dublin-Granville Road. The Preliminary Plat establishes two new lots (Lots 1 and 2) and utility easements as well as an ingress/egress easement.

Staff recommended approval.

There was no public comment.

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

Resolution 60-21

Approving and Accepting the Final Plat for the Replat of an Approximately 6.69-Acres Parcel Within the Dublin City Center Subdivision to Establish Two New Parcels Approximately 1.58-Acres and 5.11-Acres in Size Zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District Located Northeast of the Intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. Martin stated that this is the final plat for the 6.69 acre parcel in accordance with the preliminary plat. Additionally, a new cross-access easement is provided along a portion of the property line between Lots 1 and 2. The plat provides the flexibility for the City and the property owner to modify or remove cross-access easements as depicted on the plat to accommodate future development. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended acceptance to Council.

There was no public comment.

Mayor Amorose Groomes asked what the setback will be. Ms. Martin stated that the setbacks are determined by the Zoning District. This is zoned the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District within the Bridge Street District so the potential future development would have to identify a building type and then there would be a required build zone in lieu of a setback. Mayor Amorose Groomes was questioning the experience for the passerby since this lot was so small next to a building so large. Ms. Martin stated that this final plat is intended for future development both known or unknown. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that this will be interesting from a streetscape perspective.

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

~~**Resolution 61-21**~~

~~**Extending the Timelines in Resolution 34-21 Temporarily Permitting Outdoor Dining and Eating Areas Beyond Previously Approved Locations, Temporarily Permitting Portable Nonresidential Structures and Temporarily Permitting Certain Signs**~~

~~Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.~~

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 5, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

2. 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road
21-026FP **Final Plat**

Proposal:	Re-subdivision of a 6.69-acre parcel located within the Dublin City Center Subdivision into two parcels consisting of the following acreages: 1.58 acres and 5.11 acres.
Location:	Northeast of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 152.
Applicant:	Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge
Planning Contact:	Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-026

MOTION: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Final Plat with two conditions:

1) That the applicant update the Final Plat to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, prior to City Council's review; and

2) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Plat was recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Nichole M. Martin
294AB0C6383F490...
Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 5, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

1. 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road
21-025PP **Preliminary Plat**

Proposal:	Re-subdivision of a 6.69-acre parcel located within the Dublin City Center Subdivision into two parcels consisting of the following acreages: 1.58 acres and 5.11 acres.
Location:	Northeast of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 152.
Applicant:	Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge
Planning Contact:	Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-025

MOTION: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

1) That the applicant update the Preliminary Plat to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, prior to City Council's review; and

2) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat was recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Nichole M. Martin
294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 5, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the first Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held in the new Council Chambers at 5555 Perimeter Drive. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present:	Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Rebecca Call, Lee Grimes, Mark Supelak, Kim Way
Commission members absent:	Jane Fox
Staff members present:	Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 17 and July 8 meeting minutes.
Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

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 individuals intending to address the Commission on tonight's cases.

1 – 2. 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-025PP/21-026FP, Preliminary Plat/Final Plat

These applications are a request for the re-subdivision of a 6.69-acre parcel located within the Dublin City Center Subdivision into two parcels consisting of the following acreages: 1.58 acres and

5.11 acres. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located northeast of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a combined Preliminary and Final Plat. The site is located within the Bridge Street District north of West Dublin-Granville Road and west of Sawmill Road. The site is presently developed with an office building and parking lot. The site has frontage on three public streets – Banker Drive, Dublin Center Drive, and West Dublin-Granville Road, and has five access points. The request is for a re-subdivision of the Dublin Center plat, Reserve A, which is 6.69 acres in size. The proposed Preliminary Plat documents the existing conditions and proposes a re-subdivision into two parcels: 1.58 acres and 5.11 acres. It also memorializes existing cross access located forward of the building. Staff is recommending a condition to address the existing cross access necessary for this site to continue to function as it exists today. The Final Plat will be filed with the County. It reflects the lot lines and essential easements. Staff has reviewed the applications against the existing criteria and recommends the Commission forward the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions of approval to City Council with a recommendation of approval.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak inquired if the scale of the parcel subdivision is comparable to other parcels within the area.
Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the cross easement would limit said parcels to the south side of the parking lot.
Ms. Martin responded that the intent of the Plat is to facilitate future development, whether it occurs within 6 months or five years. Because it is not clear at what point that development might occur, the plat establishes the lots but also addresses existing conditions and facilitates existing site circulation. The request is that the applicant work with staff to provide cross access to the tenant on Lot 2 to Dublin Center Drive and the tenant on Lot 1 to Banker Drive. The exact location of that access is yet to be determined; however, the zone of that access and flexibility thereof will be defined before the Plats are forwarded to City Council.

Mr. Supelak noted that Lot 1 appears to be restricted, so flexibility with the access will be important.

Ms. Call stated that on Lot 1, there is existing parking. Will that parking count toward the requirements for the current use on Lot 2?
Ms. Martin responded that at the time the lot was developed, it did count toward the parking requirements. Today's zoning requires fewer parking spaces, so Lot 2 will be able to meet their minimum required parking, exclusive of Lot 1.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the separate lots would have access to the appropriate utilities.
Ms. Martin responded affirmatively; that has been thoroughly vetted by the Engineering Division.

Mr. Way stated that there appears to be a retention basin on the smaller lot, which he assumes presently services the entire site. That retention would need to be accommodated on the site with the building on Lot 2.

Ms. Martin responded that new development would need to address water quantity and quality and the conditions of Lot 2. Since open water areas and dry basins are not permitted within the Bridge Street District, it will likely require underground stormwater facilities.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, stated that he is the attorney for the applicant, Dublin 18 LLC. With him tonight is the owner, Mr. Robert Meyers and COO, Dan O'Hara. This group has owned this site for 2.5 years and has enhanced the existing building and landscaping. The re-subdivision is anticipated to enhance the marketing opportunities of the under-utilized portions of the site. They will work with staff on the cross access, which will be noted on the plats. A future development plan will define that access, which the Commission will review.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Supelak inquired if, other than re-subdivision, there are no specific marketing plans at this point.
Mr. Underhill responded affirmatively. There has been some interest from various parties, but for confidentiality purposes, he cannot reveal the parties. There are no specific plans.

Ms. Call inquired if the property owners have a particular use in mind.

Robert Meyers, 136 Stanberry Avenue, Bexley, Ohio, property owner, stated that there is an anticipated use. They have been in discussions with a lead prospect, which is a professional medical use.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the proposed re-subdivisions, and has no further questions.
Mr. Grimes stated that he is also supportive.
Mr. Supelak stated that his only concern is that the easement agreement be written with the preferred flexibility for the parcels. That should be included as a condition.

Ms. Call requested that the condition be displayed and inquired if the applicant had any concerns with the requirement to work with staff to provide those easements for the re-subdivided parcels.
Mr. Underhill responded that the staff report also addresses this requirement. With that clarification, they have no objection. The Commission will be reviewing any future development plan for this site along with the proposed cross access. These meeting minutes and the staff report will reflect the expectations for this site. The plat notes will provide that assurance.
Mr. Boggs stated that he concurs with Mr. Underhill. They will be able to identify a solution that will be protect the existing use on the site and accommodate the manner in which it may develop in the future. The Commission is requested to make recommendations to City Council; Council will make the final decision on the plats. The conditions require the access conditions be clarified before proceeding to City Council.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is merit to preserving the access flexibility for both parties. With that, he is comfortable with supporting the plats.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned about the easement restrictions for the second, smaller lot. With the condition, he is comfortable with the request.

Mr. Schneier stated that given the fact that the Commission is making a recommendation, but Council will also review it and make the decision, and given the fact, that the Commission will be reviewing any future development plan, he has no objections.

Mr. Supelak inquired if Lot 1 would be required to address the water quality and quantity for both parcels.

Ms. Martin responded that the new development on the parcel will need to address the stormwater functionality component. She would anticipate there will be more than one location on the site to do so.

Ms. Rauch stated that her understanding is also that the new development would have to mitigate the stormwater needs for their particular parcel.
Commissioners emphasized the concern that Lot 2 should not bear the mitigation responsibility for both lots.
Mr. Way stated that the plan seems to indicate that Lot 1 presently has the retention responsibility for the entire site. Once Lot 1 is developed, however, would Lot 2 have the stormwater retention responsibility for that lot only. He does not believe Lot 1 is large enough to handle the needs for Lot 2, as well.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would like to move forward with the application at this point.
Mr. Underhill responded that it is important for them to move forward with the current prospect, but they can attempt to obtain better information and resolve the issue before the plats proceed to City Council for approval. This owner will continue to own Lot 2 and the building. As such, they will work with the new prospect and ensure the issue is addressed fully.

Mr. Underhill stated that if there is a need to revise something with the plats, it can be identified and addressed as part of the development plan process. He is in favor of putting less on a plat than more, as it provides the flexibility to make changes over time. He believes the engineering issues will be satisfactorily addressed during the development plan review process.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would concur that the engineering issues for both lots will be addressed during the development plan process. Engineering is not present at this time, so he is reluctant to condition a plat recommendation regarding stormwater issues.

Ms. Rauch responded that this has been a collaborative process. Those issues will be adequately addressed when there is a proposed development to review.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

1) Prior City Council review, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, the applicant update the preliminary plat to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation.
2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Final Plat with two conditions:

1) Prior to submission to City Council for review, the applicant update the final plat to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to establish a cross-access easement between Lots 1 and 2 to the rear of the existing structure to accommodate internal site circulation.
2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-0.]

~~OTHER~~

~~3. 2035 Dublin Framework~~

~~An overview of the Dublin 2035 Framework visioning process and a facilitated discussion with the Commission to provide transformative ideas for the future of the City of Dublin.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the 2035 Dublin Framework Visioning Process at this point. This effort is responsive to direction given by City Council at their 2020 Goal Setting session. The intent is to identify visionary, transformative ideas to direct the City's development toward 2035. Following an introductory workshop, milestone one involved Council's four committees offering and considering "big ideas" regarding four themes: quality of life, infrastructure, land use and economic development. Milestone 2 involved expert and public engagement, and community stakeholders and public feedback have been solicited. Tonight, Commission members will offer their "big ideas." Adoption of the plan is anticipated early 2022, after which implementation will follow.~~

~~Commission Questions/Discussion~~

~~Mr. Schneier inquired if there was a "City government" category.~~
~~Ms. Rauch responded that item would fall under quality of life.~~
~~Mr. Schneier stated that one big idea would be to radically change City government.~~
~~Ms. Rauch invited him to elaborate.~~
~~Mr. Schneier stated that a big idea would be something out of the box. For instance, Houston, Texas does not have zoning. What if Dublin's participatory form of government was deemed not to be the most effective to achieve City objectives? Would we have a City Council or might the City merge with the Franklin, Delaware or Union counties? Perhaps we might have a New England town hall type of meeting, where everyone who attends the meeting votes. He is not advocating for anything, but we tend to believe that what we do is what we should do. Should we re-examine our~~