Docusign Envelope ID: A4D0D02D-8954-449B-BB34-2E821A7C7F1A

RECORD OF ACTION
Planning & Zoning Commission
Thursday, June 20, 2024 | 6:30 pm

4. Lightbridge Academy
24-054AFDP **Final Development Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and approval of a daycare with associated site improvements.
Location:	Approximately 270 feet west of the intersection of Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway.
Request:	Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant:	Carter Bean, Bean Architects
Planning Contact:	Zach Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information:	614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-054

MOTION 1: Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the following text modifications.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: Motion carried 5-0 to approve the two Text Modifications.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION 2: Mr. Way moved, Mr. Chinnock seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with 6 conditions:

1) The applicant work with staff to modify the southern sidewalk stub location, subject to staff approval;
2) The applicant continue to work with Planning staff and Washington Township Fire Department to provide appropriate access to the site, subject to staff approval;
3) The applicant provide a fence detail to staff up to 5 feet in height;
4) The applicant update the color selections of the play equipment to be compatible with the building, subject to staff approval; and,
5) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure compliance with the lighting code, subject to staff approval.
6) The applicant work with staff to provide additional landscape screening in the central parking lot island, subject to staff approval.

VOTE: 5-0

Docusign Envelope ID: A4D0D02D-8954-449B-BB34-2E821A7C7F1A

4. Lightbridge Academy
24-054AFDP **Final Development Plan**

RESULT: Motion carried 5-0 to approve the Final Development Plan with conditions.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:
Zachary Hounshell
B1050D11513A490...
Zach Hounshell, Planner II

[Mr. Alexander recused himself for the next case.]

- **Case #24-054FDP – Lightbridge Academy**

A request for review and approval of a daycare with associated site improvements. The 1.68-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, The Corners, and is located approximately 270 feet west of the intersection of Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway.

Applicant Presentation

Paul Ghidotti, 185 South Riverview Street, Dublin stated that it has been 3 months since the Informal Review of this case on March 7, 2024. At the previous view, the Commission gave clear direction on a number of items. Commissioners thought the building materials were too dark, and the west elevation of the daycare did not have the same level of fenestration as the south elevation. They recommended that the Blazer Road frontage be enhanced, even though it is not the main entry, and expressed concern about the dead-end aspect of the parking lot configuration. Carter Bean is the architect for the entire Corners development; EMH&T is the civil engineer. His firm became involved in response to an RFP that the City sent out in 2018 for the 11 acres left from the former Cardinal Health parking lot to the west. The pond had been moved from the road frontage back to the west. The directive received was to follow the Dublin Community Plan and the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP) update in 2018. That updated plan suggested retail for the area and other ancillary services that would support both neighborhood office and the existing neighborhood residential. The DCAP laid out almost exactly their plan with one major exception: the DCAP contemplated 3-story walk-up residential to the rear. During the design process, the City encouraged the elimination of those apartments, which they did. Although they spent 2.5 years in almost weekly meetings with the Economic Development, Engineering and Planning staff, an error was made in the development texts for the various subareas. This daycare is in Subarea B3. They failed to pull forward the Suburban Office (SO) part of the zoning into this subarea. At the Informal Review in March, there was discussion that the development text would need to be modified to permit daycare in this subarea. A daycare use is a very obvious support for office and residential in close proximity. It was an inadvertent omission from the text. Lightbridge Academy is a large, national daycare operator, from here to the east coast. Lightbridge has identified a husband and wife team who will be operators of the Lightbridge facility at the Corners.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a Final Development Plan (FDP), so a determination will be made tonight. The 1.68-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, The Corners. The proposed facility is located specifically within Subarea B3. The site currently is vacant; a drive aisle that extends from the north provides access to the site. At their March 7 meeting, the Commission provided the following feedback:

- Were generally supportive of the daycare use but requested it be limited to this site;
- Raised concerns about the proximity of the building's outdoor play area to the nearby park and pond.
- Recommended breaking up the scale and size of the building.
- Recommended placing more emphasis on the Blazer Parkway façade.
- Recommended an alternative, brighter color for the building.
- Recommended reconfiguring the internal drive aisles to eliminate dead ends.

The daycare building will be the only building constructed within Subarea B3, and the proposed text modification is specific to this subarea. Currently, the development text permits only administrative, business and professional office uses, as listed in the SO district. However, daycare is currently listed as a permitted use in the SO district, so this text would incorporate the same uses currently listed in SO. There are use specific requirements that address play equipment, fencing, safety and screening of any outdoor amenity space. Staff has reviewed the criteria for text modifications and determined that it meets the criteria. The proposed site plan is generally consistent with what was shown in March. The dead-end parking bay has been removed and replaced with parking spaces shared with the shopping center. The building is 12,571 SF with 6,492 SF of outdoor recreation space, located southwest of the building. The lot coverage is calculated based on the entirety of the development in Subarea B, not just this lot, and that comes out to 51.7%. All setback requirements are met with this proposal. Staff is requesting that the small stub provided for a sidewalk that deadends into a parking space be removed, as there is no need for it. The size of the building exceeds what Code permits, but the Code provides the Commission the ability to approve a larger building. The application meets the parking requirements. A condition for approval is recommended that the play area fence be a maximum of 4 feet. An additional condition addresses the site circulation for the fire department.

To address the Commission's previous comments, the applicant has made the following updates to their development plan:

- Modified the parking area to eliminate dead-end parking bays;
- Updated the massing of the building to break up the appearance of the building;
- Updated the material selections for the building to lighten its color scheme;
- Improved the screening and landscaping along the outdoor recreation area.

The applicant is proposing 2 building-mounted signs: a wall sign on the north façade facing Blazer Parkway and a projecting sign on the south façade adjacent to the main entrance. The development text includes a Sign Regulation and Guidelines Document, which operates as a Master Sign Plan. Signs that meet these requirements are permitted to proceed directly to Building Standards and do not require PZC approval. The proposed signs meet the requirements except for the height of the projecting sign. The bottom of projecting signs is required to be a minimum of 8 feet above the sidewalk to avoid potential conflicts with pedestrians. The applicant is proposing the projecting sign at a height of 7 feet from the finished grade. However, the sign will be installed adjacent to the entrance and not in conflict with a sidewalk. Staff is supportive of the height change given this lack of conflict and the fact that the sign is appropriately positioned on the building.

There are 2 Minor Text Modifications. One is to permit the use and the other is the parking requirements. Staff is supportive of the proposed text modifications. Staff has reviewed the FDP against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with 5 conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Harter inquired if the applicant has addressed the safety concerns raised at the previous hearing regarding the proximity of the daycare play area to the adjacent park and pond. If so, have any modifications been made? Have they reached out to the Washington Township Fire Department and inquired if there are safety options?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Fire Department's concerns are based on accessibility of the site to a fire truck. The requirements for the outdoor recreation area are consistent throughout the entire City. The applicant is meeting those requirements.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the HVAC unit screening is opaque screening.

Carter Bean, architect, Bean Architects, 4400 N. High Street, Columbus, stated that the screening is primarily but not entirely opaque. They are mimicking the cross rail fence that is being used at the north and south corners of the building, but also infilling it with some vertical boards with limited space between for air flow.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the building color previously was very dark, and Commissioners recommended a brighter color be used for the daycare. However, it has been replaced with a very blue color. Is this color used elsewhere in the development?
Mr. Bean stated that when they designed the first 3 buildings, followed later by a 4th building, there was a concern expressed about everything being a monotone color. There were suggestions to differentiate the first 3 buildings with various colors. Their response at the time was that they would bring in additional color with future development, which is what they are doing now. The color renderings provided to the Commission are not quite accurate. The color is actually a rich blue color.

Mr. Chinnock noted that the dumpster enclosure is located very close to the entry. Has this already been addressed?
Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.
Mr. Bean stated that they are happy with the dumpster location, as it is separated a distance from the City's park.

Mr. Deschler requested clarification of the building square footage concerns.
Mr. Hounshell responded that the development text provides maximum building footprint sizes. For this specific subarea, 12,000 SF is the maximum building footprint. However, the Planning Commission can approve a larger building. Typically, there is a reason for doing so. The proposed square footage exceeds the maximum by 571 SF.
Ms. Call noted that per the earlier conversation, the solution was to make the mass look like two separate buildings with a stepdown between.

Mr. Deschler inquired if it is a typical requirement with daycares that the parent check in the child, regardless of their age.
Mr. Bean responded affirmatively.
Mr. Deschler inquired if the only entry to the daycare is the one from the parking lot.
Mr. Bean responded affirmatively.
Mr. Deschler inquired if there was any concern that people would park on the road and run their children in.
Mr. Bean responded that staff has indicated that they did not like the redundant sidewalk on the east edge that is parallel with the access drive. However, they would like to retain that walk because those spaces south of the handicapped parking spaces and the spaces that run along the north edge of the parking lot are designated as the pick-up/drop-off spaces. The daycare would like parents to unload their children and immediately access a sidewalk and navigate to the front door front via those 2 paths, rather than walk through the drive aisles of the parking lot.

Mr. Deschler stated that the goal is not to have people park on the street, nor have parents struggle walking in more than one child through the center parking lot, if the drop-off spaces are filled. There probably aren't any other solutions, however, due to the design of the area.

Ms. Call inquired the intent for the sidewalk stub that staff referred to as deleted.
Mr. Bean responded that the intent was to provide some paved access between the parking lot and the park.
Ms. Call stated that there are 4 trees in the corners. Are they anticipating pushing snow into one of the parking stalls or up to one of the trees?
Mr. Ghidotti stated that he does not know the answer to that question at this time.
Mr. Bean stated that they tried to maximize the parking while meeting all Code requirements. They are pushing some of the parking into a shared situation to reduce the number onsite. From an operational standpoint, they are still in excess of what the daycare needs. There should be plenty of unparked area into which to push the snow.
Mr. Ghidotti stated that this is a lease. They will own this building as well as the retail buildings to the south. There will be one snow removal company handling all 11 acres. He would presume the snow would be pushed to an appropriate area.

Mr. Deschler stated that there is a bike rack there. How do they foresee that being used?
Mr. Bean stated that it is a Code requirement. However, it could accommodate a daycare staff member who lives nearby and wants to bike to work.

Mr. Way stated that the island in the parking lot appears wide enough to handle a row of evergreen shrubs. Is there a reason there is no landscaping in the island?
Mr. Bean responded that if no plantings are shown on the plan, they certainly can be added. It is intended to be greenspace and can provide some screening of the vehicles. In regard to the landscaping, he would like to request that the stipulation of 4 feet for the fence be increased. There has been a level of discussion at the first hearing and tonight, as well, regarding the security of the children in the outdoor play area. Concern was expressed that a child could scale the fence and wander down to the pond. Typically, Lightbridge Academy facilities have fences 6 feet in height. Other daycares that he has worked with typically use fences 5 feet in height. He would request a 6-ft. fence. If the Commission is not comfortable with that, he would request a 5-ft. fence. 4 feet is not a comfortable height here.
Mr. Way stated that he has expressed his concerns about this fence previously. He would be supportive of a 6-ft. fence.
Ms. Call requested staff to explain the Code requirements and the exceptions that would be necessary to allow a 6-ft. fence.
Mr. Hounshell responded that because this is in a planned district, that is something that can be conditioned and added. 4 feet is the standard fence height throughout the City, but there are some places, such as Bridge Street, where taller fences are permitted in some locations. It is dependent on the location and situation. If the Commission would like to change that condition, that would be acceptable.
Ms. Call inquired examples of where a 6-ft. fence height has been permitted by the Commission.
In response to Mr. Way's inquiry about pool fences, Ms. Call indicated that, typically, 4-foot fences are required around pools. The Dublin North Pool has a 6-foot fence.
Ms. Rauch stated that she would look for examples of fence height increases.
Mr. Chinnock stated that he would be supportive of a 5-ft. fence height.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Consensus of the Commission was that they were supportive of the proposed text modifications and of approval of the FDP with the proposed conditions.
Ms. Call stated that she would recommend retaining the sidewalk stub but would shift it down to the corner where the tree is located, providing a curvilinear extension up to the path. The applicant could work with staff on the appropriate placement for that connection from the parking lot to the park.
Ms. Call inquired if Ms. Rauch had identified other daycare locations where a fence height greater than 4 feet was permitted.
Ms. Rauch responded that she has not found any at this point in her review, but is certain that accommodations have been made, depending on the circumstances. If the Commission is comfortable with a greater fence height, that would be within the Commission's purview to approve.
Mr. Boggs stated that the Code specifies a fence height of 4 feet. However, this particular development text states that fences are to be complementary to the architectural character; they do not call out height specifically. Therefore, the fence height can be identified by a condition to the FDP approval, rather than requiring a text modification for the height.

Mr. Way and Ms. Harter expressed support for a 6-ft. fence height, deferring to the daycare operator experience. Mr. Chinnock, Ms. Call and Mr. Deschler were supportive of a 5-ft. fence height.
Condition #3 was modified to a 5-ft. fence height.
Commissioners reviewed the modified conditions.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded approval of the following text modifications:

1) To modify the Corners development text under Item 2. Permitted Uses, Section B, Subarea B3 – Permitted Uses, to permit a child and adult daycare center, based on the requirements listed in Code §153.026(A)(6),

2) To modify the Corners development text under Item 5. Parking and Loading, B – Minimum Number of Parking Spaces, to require for a child and adult daycare center – 1 parking space per teacher + 1 parking space per 6 students.

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

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Chinnock seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with 6 conditions*:*

1) The applicant work with staff to modify the southern sidewalk stub location, subject to staff approval;
2) The applicant continue to work with Planning staff and the Washington Township Fire Department to provide appropriate access to the site, subject to staff approval;
3) The applicant provide a fence detail to staff up to 5 feet in height;
4) The applicant update the color selections of the play equipment to be compatible with the building, subject to staff approval; and,

5) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure compliance with the lighting code, subject to staff approval.
6) The applicant work with staff to provide additional landscape screening in the central parking lot island, subject to staff approval.

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

- **~~Case #24-069CP – The Farms at Cosgray~~**

  ~~A Concept Plan review and feedback for 52 detached single-family lots and associated site improvements. The approximately 30.6-acre site is zoned R, Rural District and is located west of the intersection of Cosgray Road and Barronsmore Way.~~

~~Applicant Presentation~~

~~Todd Ferris, Ferris Planning and Design, 4876 Cemetery Road, Hilliard, stated there was an Informal Review of this project earlier this year [January 2024]. This parcel is 100 acres and is bisected by the railroad with 30 acres on the east side and 70 acres on the west. The feedback received in that Informal Review was that residential made sense on the east side; on the west side, it did not. Although this project is caught between the City's old and new Community Plans, they have moved forward on the portion east of the railroad track. The owner, Kiran Basireddy, will be developing the west acreage in a later phase consistent with the vision of the City's new Community Plan. The proposal submitted tonight is generally the same as presented to the Commission at the previous review, taking into account the feedback received. Although the site plan is not significantly different, they have reduced the number of units to 51 plus the existing home on the site, which is in relatively good shape. The existing house fronts on Cosgray Road. There are some architecture issues to address, and they will find the right solution to do so. The sample building products shown in the meeting materials are examples of Fischer Homes' (the builder) products, but they will be working through more detailed architecture in the future to be aligned with the City's guidelines. The Commission will notice that some of the lots are larger than the 55-ft. lot width proposed previously. In addition to some 55-ft lots, there will be some 75-ft. lots. The builder will be able to incorporate side-loaded garages on the 75-ft. lots. While the 55-ft. patio homes would be catered to homeowners age 55-up, the others will accommodate a mix of homebuyers. The open space remains the same with a 200-ft. setback along the railroad track that will provide a buffer. The open space will have a community pathway, a pond and casual seating for the development. There will be an entry feature at the main entrance on Cosgray Road, across from the Ballantrae neighborhood. The setbacks are set up to be similar to Ballantrae. The intent is a conservation design site plan, providing a significant amount of open space on the site, approximately 46%. Other than on the one central street where the homes back up to each other, the other homes will have access to the open space. They believe the proposed, single-family sites will blend well with the existing Ballantrae development and provide a better transition site than a TF - Tech Flex warehouse use.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that Mr. Ferris explained the site plan and proposed architecture well, so he will provide information on the background information and the Community Plan. This is the second time this project has been before the Commission. In January 2024, the Planning and~~

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 7, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

2. The Corners - Lightbridge Academy at PID: 273-013224
24-035INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	Informal Review and feedback of a daycare with associated site improvements.
Request:	This is request for an Informal Review and feedback of a future Final Development Plan application.
Applicant:	Carter Bean, Bean Architects
Planning Contact:	Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner II
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-035

RESULT: The Commission reviewed the proposal and provided feedback regarding member support for a text modification to the Corners development text to permit a daycare use. The Commission discussed whether the daycare should be considered a conditional use versus a permitted use, and clarified the request would be limited to Subarea B3. A majority of the members were supportive of the daycare use. Concerns were raised about the proximity of the building to the pond, the scale and size of the building on the parcel, the rear of the building fronting Blazer Parkway, the dark color palette, building articulation and reconfiguration of the internal access. The Commission encouraged the applicant to address these items prior to returning to the Commission with the final design.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____

Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner II

~~Commission Discussion~~

~~Mr. Schneier stated that previously some angst was expressed regarding the tenant signs. Those have now been removed, so he has no concerns with the proposed plan.~~

~~Mr. Supelak, Mr. Fishman, Ms. Harter and Mr. Way indicated that they were supportive of the proposal with the addition of the one condition. Mr. Chinnock stated that he is disappointed that the sign on the south elevation was not revised, per the Commission's previous recommendation. Additionally, he remains convinced that a monument sign is not a good idea; therefore, he is not supportive.~~
~~Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of the proposed plan. She pointed out that an amended Sign Plan is anticipated to consider the additional signage for The Friendship Village tenant. When submitted, the Commission will consider those signs as part of the entire signage package for The Bailey. She encouraged the applicant to work with staff on those signs, as the Commission is sensitive to both the amount of signage and the creativity of signage in the Bridge Street District.~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one condition:~~
~~1) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the landscape plan around the base of the ground sign, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.~~
~~[Motion carried 6-1.]~~

- **Case #24-035INF – The Corners, Lightbridge Academy**

Request for Informal Review and feedback of a proposed daycare with associated site improvements. The 1.68-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, The Corners, and is located approximately 270 feet west of the intersection of Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway.

Applicant Presentation

Paul Ghidotti, The Daimler Group, 185 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that they appreciate the opportunity to obtain informal feedback from the Commission. Their goal is two-fold. They would like to clarify the land use and to obtain feedback on the architecture concept plan and the site plan. During the four-year period in which they worked on developing The Corners project, he made a mistake in the development text. When they said permissible uses would be suburban office, he assumed that incorporated all the permissible uses under suburban office, not just suburban office. He is referring specifically to the site immediately to the west of the Starbucks facility. The City Code incorporated daycare under Suburban Office as a permissible use. They did not include it in the development text daycare as a permissible use. In the previous work on The Corners project, two Planning staff members, who are no longer with the City, worked with them. He has obtained the following comment from Claudia Husak: "The ommission of daycare as a use in the development text for The Corners development was not intentional, but an oversight. The use is certainly needed in the area and would serve as an amenity for residents and businesses in this important corridor in the City of Dublin." Similarly, Colleen Gilger commented: "During our years of discussions, negotiations and planning efforts around The Corners development, as well as with the research conducted that led to the creation of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), it was always contemplated by the City Economic Development division that a daycare facility would

be a permissible use in the DCAP area and would be included in the final development text for The Corners. Daycare is deemed one of the necessary amenities for the surrounding office park tenants and the significant number of employees and residents travelling to and from the Frantz Road corridor."
Mr. Ghidotti stated that, hopefully, those statements from previous City employees who worked on The Corners PUD reassures the Commission that we simply made a mistake. Ms. Rauch has suggested that, rather than pursuing a rezoning, that we present this situation to Commission members, who, hopefully, would understand the oversight that occurred but also would be comfortable with a daycare use in this location. The use is consistent with DCAP, which was the motivation for the development of this 11-acre site.

Carter Bean, Bean Architects, 4400 N. High Street, Columbus, stated that this proposal is a very early draft for the purpose of obtaining the Commission's feedback. If the Commission is supportive, they will develop the proposal further with a Final Development Plan (FDP). The general site layout includes a building located on Blazer Parkway with parking to the rear, which is consistent with the conceptual site plan submitted for the entire development several years ago. It has been difficult to work with this particular daycare user's footprint, as it is larger than what they had anticipated for this site. However, it has worked out well because the narrow end of the building fills out the lot frontage along Blazer Parkway. Due to the position of the entrance drive, they angled the building. This provided a triangular playground space that is primarily obscured by the building. In addition, the retention basin to the east provides separation from the adjacent development. They have exactly the number of parking spaces needed for the anticipated number of children and staff in this facility. The draft landscape plan focuses on the south end of the site. If the project proceeds, they will bring back a landscape plan for the entire site, remaining cognizant of the parking as it is associated with the adjacent park area. A significant amount of landscaping was installed previously with the initial development. The one-story, rectangular building is 12,411 square feet, and the playground is approximately 7,000 square feet. The user has provided them the flexability to modify the plans slightly and the elevations entirely. The architectural challenge is to integrate this development with the first four existing buildings in the development. At that time, there was some concern with the consistency of the color palette. They had indicated that the color consistency made sense for that initial development sector, but they would bring in additional colors and materials with future development. Accordingly, they have remained true to the building style, but are changing the color. The user has allowed them to modify the building massing from their prototypical design. They have modified the large rectangular footprint into a smaller gable element separated into two pieces. They have introduced shed roofs and lowered the roof in the middle of the building facing east. They have attempted to break the larger volume into consistent pieces that are in scale with what is currently constructed. The stone material is similar in pattern and texture, although a less gold color, to the stone on the existing Starbucks building. He reviewed additional architectural elements, including: white windows; natural wood screening around ground-mounted condensing units; 2 cupolas with a contemporary style; vertical board and batten in the main body of the building and lap siding on the smaller projecting elements, all in a gray color; and metal canopies on the north and south sides of the building. He noted that there would be a heavy amount of screening on the west side of the playground.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review for a proposed daycare on a

1.68-acre site zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - The Corners. If the project proceeds, the next step is a Final Development Plan (FDP). Tonight's discussion will focus primarily on whether the proposed use is acceptable. If the Commission finds it acceptable, the discussion will consider the site and building designs, as well. This site is located in Subarea B3 of the PUD and is approximately 270 feet west of the intersection of Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway with vehicular access off Blazer Parkway. It is located directly west of Subarea B1, which includes Starbucks and multi-tenant commercial buildings, and directly east and north of Subarea A, which includes a park and shared-use paths. The site is also located within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which encourages a variety of uses for workers, hotel visitors and residents within and adjacent to the District. It is intended to utilize open space as a focal point and usable amenity. The site is located within the Future Land Use designation of MUR-2 – Tuttle/Rings (North), identified as Site 9, designated for a neighborhood center along Frantz Road with office use internal to the site. This proposal would be the 3rd phase of the development within The Corners.

The applicant is proposing a 12,411-square-foot daycare facility with approximately 7,000 square feet of playground space and 58 parking spaces on the 1.68-acre site. Daycare uses are currently not permitted within the Corners development text. A future Final Development Plan application would require a text modification to allow the use.

The following discussion questions are provided for the Commission's discussion:

(1) Is the Commission supportive of a text modification to permit a daycare use?
(2) Should the Commission support the text modification, does the Commission support the proposed site layout?
(3) Should the Commission support the text modification, does the Commission support the proposed massing and architecture of the building?
(4) Any additional considerations?

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman inquired if the request is to change the zoning to allow daycare uses.
Mr. Hounshell responded that only the approved uses in the development text would be modified.
Mr. Fishman inquired the reason it is not being considered as a Conditional Use. If the Permitted Uses include daycares, any standard daycare building could attempt to come in here.
Mr. Hounshell responded that any new development would require Commission approval. Although the text could be modified to permit daycare only as a Conditional Use, a Conditional Use would require an additional application to be submitted for approval.
Mr. Fishman stated that a Conditional Use would permit only this particular daycare, not other daycare uses, including national chain daycares.

[Discussion continued regarding Conditional versus Permitted Use advantages.]
Mr. Fishman recommended a Conditional Use direction be pursued, as it provides future Commissions more flexibility.

Ms. Call requested staff to clarify the development process for any future development within this parcel or a different parcel within the DCAP.
Mr. Hounshell responded that any new building within The Corners PUD would need to submit a Final Development Plan (FDP) application, which is consistent with the Preliminary Development

Plan (PDP), for review and approval of the Commission. In other areas of DCAP, if a site is within a PUD, the same process would apply.

[Discussion resumed regarding Conditional versus Permitted Use.]

Mr. Boggs clarified that the only difference between a Permitted Use and a Conditional Use is that with the latter, an applicant would need to seek approval of the use first, before seeking approval of an FDP.
Mr. Fishman stated that he would prefer future daycares be required to seek approval as a Conditional Use before submitting an FDP for approval. It makes it easier for future Commissions, should they not want another daycare within this PUD.
Mr. Boggs stated that doing so would add another application step for this applicant. They would need to seek a text modification for Conditional Uses; then they would need to submit an application for a Conditional Use. If approved, they could submit an FDP application.
Mr. Fishman stated that he is considering the difficulty for future Commissions, if they should prefer not to have another daycare here. He would prefer not to limit their ability.
Mr. Boggs responded that would be a concern if this were a straight zoning district and daycare was a Permitted Use. In that case, a Commission would need to approve any application that met the requirements of that zoning. In a straight zoning, a Conditional Use provides an avenue for Commissions to require additional conditions. Because The Corners is a PUD, should daycare be added as a Permitted Use, any daycare application would still need to meet the design standards.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the use discussion is specific to this site, The Corners, or DCAP.
Mr. Hounshell responded that the use would be specific to Subarea B3.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the traffic flow for the drop-off.
Mr. Bean responded that the spaces along the east side of the site, including the handicapped parking spaces, and the spaces along the north side of the parking area are designated pick up/drop off spaces. The remaining spaces are for longer-term parking. Parents are able to immediately come/go from the building without the need to traverse the parking lot with their child.

Mr. Schneier stated that the staff report noted that the proposed facility exceeds the permitted square footage of 12,000 square feet; it is 12,400+ square feet. Is that decision based on the design and proposed utilization?
Mr. Bean responded that it is a licensing decision. The number of children the daycare license permits is based upon the square footage of the facility. This is the square footage that meets their operational model.

Mr. Schneier stated that the report indicates the mechanical screening enclosure is natural wood. Is there a functional reason?
Mr. Bean responded that it probably would be cedar. He likes the feel of a natural material along the walkway and entrance drive, but he dislikes the warm color of wood against the building. Cedar will "gray" over time, so the contrast will be less stark in the future.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he would like to complete the discussion on the use first, before discussing the architecture and site layout. A daycare is a 9 am – 5 pm use. Is this use consistent with the vision, or is the vision for this area to create more "after hours" activity?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the vision for this area and this site specifically was to provide amenities that currently are not available to the workers within the area or the neighbors to the east. Those amenities would be varied – restaurant, office and personal services, such as daycare. Ms. Rauch clarified that is true for the entire Corners area. However, according to the existing development text, this particular subarea is limited specifically to office use.

Mr. Way inquired if there is another example within the City where an outdoor daycare area is adjacent to a pond.
Mr. Hounshell responded that he is not aware of any that abut a pond, but there are two daycare facilities with outdoor areas abutting Cramer Ditch.
Mr. Way pointed out that those are natural features, not a man-made feature in a park with a walkway adjacent to an outdoor daycare play area.

Mr. Supelak inquired if Code would permit a 12,000+ square-foot daycare to be multi-storied. If so, was it considered here?
Mr. Bean responded that they have designed daycares that were multiple stories due to the small size of those sites. Although the City's Code permits it, multiple stories are difficult operationally. This site, however, is large enough to permit a one-story daycare building, and from the perspective of moving kids within the space, one-story buildings are ideal.

Ms. Harter inquired if they had considered a circular driveway with drop-off area and if they had considered adding awnings for protection from inclement weather.
Mr. Bean stated that most daycares today are not interested in having drop-off areas. Parents do not want to pull up and have their small children run into or out of the building. Even where drop-offs are provided, parents will park their vehicles and walk with their children. There are parking spaces immediately adjacent to the building that are designated specifically for pick up/drop off.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the main vehicular entrance is from Blazer Parkway.
Mr. Bean responded that the main entry is on the south end, facing the parking field. The Blazer Parkway entrance door shown in the drawing is for emergency egress purposes. The entry from Blazer leads to the existing common drive, which turns east at the park.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is aware that building orientation is always challenging, but that seems to be the back of the building, where screened mechanical units would be located. That elevation is one concern. Another concern is the very homogenous look. Have they considered adding more articulation in materials on that elevation, as well as on the west and east elevations?
Mr. Bean responded that they did not consider adding more, as this is already significantly more than they were requested to do. The design was developed to the point that he thought was consistent with what exists.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the mechanicals.
Mr. Bean stated that the main entrance is to the south, the Blazer frontage is on the north, and the playground is to the west. That leaves the east side for the location of the mechanical units, which are only residential-size condensing units.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the cupolas are essential, should the Commission want to recommend a different articulation.
Mr. Bean responded that they are not essential.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that the vision for this area is that it would include supportive services. The front elevation along Frantz Road should have uses that activate the area. Behind that, office uses were contemplated. There were considerations regarding minor accessory uses, or supportive services for the employees within the area. However, today, fewer office developments are being developed. Her concern is that this is a very large building for that parcel. A small-scale accessory use to complement the existing office use would be preferable. Mr. Supelak has suggested a vertical building, as it would consume less land area. It would be preferable not to give up this much land, as there will be future use opportunities. The Commission can be patient for those to emerge. There may be a hybrid approach that permits an accessory use but does not consume an area that might be utilized in a better manner.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that development follows the market and how nearby areas have developed. In the beginning of this project, 3-story walk-up apartments were contemplated. The DCAP RFP permitted it, and they responded to that. The Corners project, however, looks much different than what DCAP originally contemplated. For 6 years, they have been trying to make this work, but it is very challenging. The 411,000-square-foot office building next door does not have a single occupant. That is not helping their situation. It is the reason they continue to have as much unused ground today as they had 6 years ago. The current dentist office was achieved by using flex space, and their retail development along the Frantz Road frontage is good. However, the remainder of the site is different. There is a demand in this community for this type of service. He pointed out that this would be a 15-year lease. There have been approximately 8 other daycares interested in the site, but none were able to meet the cost of this quality of building. He believes the size of the facility and number of children they can have is the reason this daycare is able to make it work. They are asking the Commission to approve a text modification and permit a daycare use here. They realize that the building is 400 square feet more than what was contemplated in this subarea, but he believes what is proposed is probably the nicest daycare building in the area.

Ms. Call requested members to comment on the use question.
Mr. Chinnock stated that he is generally supportive of the use, although there are some concerns about the size of the facility and its orientation on the site.

Ms. Harter stated that she also is supportive of the use, and there is a demand for this type of service.

Mr. Way stated that he is very concerned about the adjacent, unfenced retention pond with children running about. That is a safety factor that needs to be considered. Even though the play area itself is fenced, children are capable of finding ways to climb over it. He was glad to see the park introduced into this development; it is a great asset. He had hoped that the use that occurs on this site could take advantage of that park, and by doing so, contribute activity to the park. He is not supportive of the use.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the use, as he believes it is appropriate for the area. Although this site currently is approved for office, he is supportive of a text modification to allow the daycare use.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees that having a daycare use next to a pond is not the best situation. However, he was made aware several years ago that the City's ponds are constructed with safety in mind; the depth increases slowly. He is supportive of the use.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is supportive of the use. There is a complementary nature to the use, as it could be an amenity for office workers within the area. He noted that he has children, and would not be concerned about the nearby pond.

Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of the use as an accessory use. She is concerned about the scale of the building. She requested Commission members to provide input regarding the other discussion questions.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is concern about the proposed massing, a very large block on the site. Perhaps it should be 2 stories. There are concerns about the future convertibility of the large one-story building. There is viable access on only one side. The building orientation seems cumbersome, usable only by one type of user or tenant. The architecture is attractive; however, he believes the mix of materials needs to be changed. The renderings of the proposed site layout are very dark; the asphalt, roof and lap siding – all look black.

Mr. Schneier stated that he agrees with Mr. Supelak's comments about the articulation and dark colors.

Mr. Way stated that because of the size of the building footprint, the parking has been squeezed into the site. He is not supportive of dead-end parking lots. He suggested that the entry road extend to the rear of the parking lot, eliminating the dead-end. The building seems to fit well with the context of the overall development. However, it does not feel like a daycare. He would recommend that the dark colors be lightened and more kid-friendly. As proposed, it would not be inviting to children.

Ms. Harter stated that she appreciates the quality of the project. She noted that security and storage of the play equipment would be priorities with the use. She can imagine people jumping the play area fence after hours and playing with the play equipment. As a mother of 5, she believes there is value in having a drop-off area, in which children get out of the car on one side only.

Mr. Chinnock stated that providing 4-sided architecture and an attractive streetscape along the main entrance throughout the entire site would be important. Adding a landscape element on the corner could create some energy for the site. Adding more height variation as well as more articulation would offset the massing. He would encourage efforts to make the corner site feel less over-built.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned about the front entrance. There are entrances on front elevations of other buildings in Dublin that were intended to be used only as emergency egresses that have ended up being used regularly. He believes the traffic flow within the parking lot is important and that there should be another site egress.

Ms. Call stated that the building architecture is attractive. She agrees that although it is camouflaged, the colors of the rear elevation should be lightened, particularly the bump-out portion.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant needed further input from the Commission.
Mr. Ghidotti stated that he would respond to the comment about a 2-story building. He believes the efficiency of the building would be diminished if it were necessary to install stairs, an elevator or bathrooms on a second floor. As the owner of this building, he would prefer to have a single-story building, as it is much more efficient. Should the use convert to office use in the future, it would be easier to market a single story than a 2-story building for office use.
Mr. Bean pointed out that should the use be converted to office in the future, the building mass could be broken up, and the play area could be made into an arrival courtyard with multiple entrances from the west elevation.

Mr. Way stated that, programmatically, the daycare use will be separated according to ages. Taking advantage of that, he would suggest the building mass be separated into two connected buildings.
Mr. Bean stated that he had attempted to achieve that appearance on the east elevation. The renderings were too dark; however; when the colors are lightened, that should be more apparent. On the west side, that is lacking, which they will address.

In summary, a majority of the members were supportive of the daycare use. Concerns were raised about the proximity of the building to the pond, the scale and size of the building on the parcel, the rear of the building fronting Blazer Parkway, the dark color palette, building articulation and reconfiguration of the internal access. The Commission encouraged the applicant to address these items prior to returning to the Commission with the final design.

Ms. Call noted that as this is an Informal Review, no action is taken.

- ~~**Metro Center Implementation Framework**~~

~~Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the Metro Center Revitalization Plan. The City is collaborating with area stakeholders and working with consultants to develop a plan with implementation steps. The study of the area includes looking at the opportunities for revitalization of existing office buildings, infill and new projects, including housing, and opportunities to replace superfluous parking areas with green spaces throughout. Three scenarios will be shared with City Council at their May work session for their determination as to which scenario to pursue. It is anticipated the Metro Center Revitalization Plan will be finalized in September 2024. Staff committed to providing additional updates to the Commission at future meetings as the project progresses. The Commission expressed appreciation for the update.~~

~~Communications~~

- ~~The Commission recognized PZC member Lance Schneier at the final meeting of his 4-year term on the Commission, presenting him with his dais nameplate.~~
  ~~Mr. Schneier stated that he has gained much knowledge during his time on the Commission and has much respect for staff and fellow Commissioners. During meeting discussions, his contributions have often included grammar guidance. Stating that, "A punctuation custodian is necessary for the fair and equitable administration of justice by the Planning and Zoning Commission," he bequeathed to Mr. Way the responsibility of "Keeper of the Comma"!~~

DocuSign Envelope ID: DB3E11B9-B9FC-4241-9B22-5DAD6E55356E

RECORD OF ACTION
Planning & Zoning Commission
Thursday, September 1, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

3. The Corners, Phase 2 at PID: 273-013223
22-098FDP **Final Development Plan**

Proposal:	Construction of a ±7,100-square-foot commercial building to accommodate a medical office tenant and a future commercial tenant in a Planned Unit Development – The Corners.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of Rings Road with Frantz Road.
Request:	Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.055.
Applicants:	Vance Thornton, President and Construction Manager, Advance Construction, Inc.; Shawn McAllister, Architect, Inc.; and Dr. Taghreed As-Sanie, Owner
Planning Contact:	Taylor Mullinax, Planner I
Contact Information:	614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-098

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with 10 conditions:

1) That the applicant extends the sidewalk on the west side of the site to connect with the shared-use path, and from the parking lot to the public park prior to submitting for building permits;

2) That the bike racks be located closer to the shared use path immediately west of the site, and the bench shown on the renderings be provided between the tenant entries;

3) That the applicant revise the plans to demonstrate the canopy edge sign meets the height requirement, and the future tenant sign meet the development text and sign design guidelines, subject to Planning approval;

4) That the applicant revise the proposal to select an asphalt roof shingle of similar design and color that is 325 lbs or greater in weight;

5) That the applicant add pedestrian lighting to walkways throughout the site and revise the photometric plan to ensure the footcandle requirements are met, subject to Planning approval prior to building permitting;

6) That the applicant revise the landscape plan prior to building permitting to include:

   a. Specifications for the plantings around the dumpster enclosure;

   b. Foundation plantings at least 42 inches wide to fill in the areas surrounding the building where plantings are not shown and should be;

DocuSign Envelope ID: DB3E11B9-B9FC-4241-9B22-5DAD6E55356E

c. Hedge and tree treatment adjacent the handicap parking area;

d. Clarification of the site plantings labeled "TI and TH" and make appropriate substitutions should that not be an appropriate planting material; and

e. Incorporate evergreens to ensure year-round landscaping on site.

7) That the applicant modify the location of the fencing outside of any utility lines and easements and provide a detail of the fencing and landscaping along the Rings Road frontage, subject to Staff approval;

8) That all street trees are planted along the access drive (east side) prior to the occupancy of the proposed building and that written documentation is provided with the building permit submission that the street trees will be planted by the developer;

9) That the applicant provide cross-access easements for shared parking and public access to open space in accordance with the development text and Infrastructure Agreement, which should be recorded prior to occupancy; and

10) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Taylor Mullinax
D9CF7A1C484149E...
Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Mr. Way stated that it initially seemed strange to put the signage on the awning, but he now better understands the proposal, and it will be a one-time type of approval. Because there is a consistency for edge signs along the street, although not on awnings, the proposed sign could be considered consistent. As staff noted, this is a unique sign, designed to make this corner special. There has been a significant amount of discussion about making the corner unique. He is supportive of the sign, which is consistent, yet interesting and will make this corner special.

Mr. Schneier stated he also is supportive of the sign. It is the right look for this corner, where the pedestrian bridge lands. The sign blends with the street, yet is unique and inviting. It provides the kind of energy that the City is attempting to achieve here. He has no issues with the sign.

Mr. Harter stated that, initially, she had concerns about the stripes and use of color. However, per the discussion, she likes the color tones, the art, the surprise it provides, and the consistency with other street signage.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with fellow Commissioners. She appreciates that the approval would only be for this tenant. The Commission likes master sign plans, which permit members to look at the signage in totality. One of the challenges with this proposal is that the awning is asked to be an awning, structural architecture and also a sign base. If we had looked at it earlier, the awning would have been considered a marquis sign for this corner, and it probably would not have met sign requirements, such as square footage. She likes the vertical suggestion. However, the proposed sign is cohesive, and for that reason, she is supportive.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one (1) condition:

(1) That the awning edge sign is permitted only for this tenant and will not apply to other tenant spaces within Block B.

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

3. The Corners, Phase 2 at PID: 273-013223, 22-098FDP, Final Development Plan

A proposal for construction of a ±7,100-square-foot commercial building to accommodate a medical office tenant and a future commercial tenant. The 13.5-acre site, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) – The Corners, is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation:

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for The Corners development. The 1.48-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Frantz Road within The Corners Planned Unit Development (PUD), Phase 2, Subarea B2. The total area of the PUD is approximately 13.5 acres. The site is located directly north of The Field of Corn (Sam and Eulalia Frantz Park) Public Park and art installation. The City of Dublin Department of Development initiated a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in May 2018 to identify a suitable developer for collaboration on the 10-acre site retained by the City. The Daimler Group was the selected developer and partnered with the City on The Corners development. The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the Zoning/Preliminary Development Plan

(Z/PDP) in September 2019, to establish the development text, uses, phasing and subareas, site layout and circulation, parking location and amounts, and sign requirements. City Council approved the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan on December 2, 2019 from OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District to PUD, Planned Unit Development for the future Corners development, to permit up to 70,000 SF of commercial and office uses and a public park. A Final Plat was approved by City Council on April 13, 2020 to subdivide the site into three lots. The Final Development Plan (FDP) and Conditional Use for the Corners Phase 1 were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on July 9, 2020 for ±23,500-square-feet of commercial space in three buildings, approximately 2,000 SF of patio space, a 3.8 acre public park, and associated site improvements. The Corners development includes the following four subareas:

Subarea A - a 3.8-acre public park – approved in Phase I
Subarea B1 - 23,500 SF commercial use in three buildings - approved in Phase I, and 23,500 SF commercial use in two future buildings – future approval required
Subarea B2 - 7,090 SF proposed office building in one building – current request for approval
Subarea B3 - 12,000 SF future office in one building – future approval required

Subareas B1, B2, and B3 are limited to a total of 70 percent lot coverage across Subarea B. The total acreage for Subarea B is 9.67 acres (421,225 SF); the permitted total lot coverage for Subarea B is 294,858 square feet (SF). The developed areas of B1 and the proposed area of B2 will total 221,985 SF or 52%, leaving a remainder of 72,873 SF of undeveloped and unapproved areas in Subarea B to be developed and not exceed the 70% maximum lot coverage. Access to Rings Road is obtained from the existing private drive immediately east of the property. The proposed building has frontage along Rings Road; the parking lot will be internal to the site, between the building and the public park. The density requirements for the proposed building, setbacks and minimum yard requirements are met. The applicant is proposing 38 parking spaces, which will include 2 handicapped spaces; only 28 spaces are required. The development text requires all parking within Subareas A and B and the adjacent park to be shared. The applicant is required to provide cross access easements for shared parking and public access to open space in accordance with the approved development text and infrastructure agreement. Existing sidewalks are located along the eastern and northern property lines. The applicant is proposing sidewalk connections to all building entrances as required by the development text. The development text also requires a pedestrian connection to the park and open space area from existing sidewalks and shared use paths, which has not been provided. Staff recommends the plans be revised to include two additional sidewalk connections to the shared-use path and the public park. The Code requires pedestrian lighting along all sidewalks, which has not yet been provided. Currently, the applicant is utilizing the same building-mounted and site lighting approved in Subarea B1.

The proposed materials include stone veneer and Hardie board as the primary building materials, aluminum storefront windows, and a mix of asphalt shingles and standing seam metal. The proposed materials match Phase I materials while introducing variation with the proposed roof materials. Staff is supportive of the scale, massing, and the amount of balanced fenestration of the proposed architecture. The maximum permitted building height in Subarea B2 is 40 feet, which is met. Additional architectural features, such as window muntins, canopies, and exterior lighting approved on Phase 1 buildings are reflected in the proposed architecture. Asphalt shingle is permitted by the development text, but the weight is required to be over 325 pounds. The applicant will need to revise the materials to include a shingle with an increased weight. The application meets all landscaping requirements for interior landscaping and screening for vehicular use areas, tree plantings, and site plantings. As a condition of approval, street trees should be planted along

the private access drive prior to building occupancy. Additional foundation plantings should be added to fill in the areas surrounding the building where plantings are not shown, and should be at least 42 inches wide. Thematic fencing is proposed at both corners of the building along Rings Road, which is consistent with the fencing approved for Subarea B1. Staff is recommending a vehicular screening hedge and tree treatment be implemented on the south side of the parking lot. Staff recommends the two proposed bike racks be located closer to the shared use path and the bench be located closer to the building between the tenant spaces. The development text includes a Sign Regulation and Guidelines Document, which outlines examples of high quality sign design. Additionally, the applicant is required to obtain approval of the proposed signs from the developer (Daimler) and the architect (Bean Architects). Two wall signs are proposed for the primary building tenant: a 26-SF canopy edge sign facing the Rings Road frontage and an 8-SF sign for the main entry, internal to the site. The canopy edge sign is internally illuminated by white, 3-inch LED channel letters with acrylic faces attached to the canopy. The proposed sign area and secondary copy meet the development text requirements. The height of the canopy edge sign was not provided, so the plans will need to be revised to include the height, ensuring the permitted maximum height of 15 feet is met. The proposal includes a proposed wall sign location for the future tenant sign adjacent to the main entry. The future tenant sign will be required to meet the approved development text, subject to staff approval. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Final Development Plan with 10 conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Vance Thornton, Advance Construction, Inc, 9313 Lake of the Woods Drive, Galena, Ohio and Taghreed As-Sanie, DDS, business owner, were present. Mr. Thornton stated that due to an unexpected situation, the applicant and the architect were not present. As the contractor on the project, he will answer questions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired the reason that the entrance to the parking area was moved since the initial concept.
Ms. Mullinax responded that although the entrance to the site from the private drive deviates from the Preliminary Plan, staff is supportive of the proposed location. The access shown in the Preliminary Development Plan was on the corner of the private drive, which would make it challenging for fire truck maneuverability.
Mr. Way requested clarification of the landscape box depicted in the presentation.
Ms. Mullinax responded that staff is recommending the same landscape treatment for the vehicular perimeter screening, with trees replicated next to the handicapped spaces.
Mr. Way referred to the proposed signage. The copy states "Dental Reflections Dublin." Is the word "Dublin" part of the business name?
Dr. As-Sanie responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the dumpster is in the correct location.
Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively, and there are no issues. The applicant is proposing to use the same stone reflected on the building, as well as the same board and batten material for the gate. The dumpster will be screened with landscaping.

Mr. Way referred to the walkway connection to the north from the parking lot. There is no pedestrian island or point of connection within the parking lot. However, the parking layout

indicates space would be available to pull the parking to the west and east and allow room for an island where the walk is proposed.
Ms. Mullinax responded that the Preliminary Development Plan shows the parking area located against the existing sidewalk, which extends east to west, and staff has recommended a sidewalk connection. She deferred to the applicant to respond to the suggestion regarding a landscape island.
Mr. Way referred to the graphic depicting the sidewalk on the north side, and inquired if it would be possible to add a 6-foot island in the parking lot by locating the parking 3 feet to the east and 3 feet to the west.
Ms. Mullinax responded that she believes it would be possible but would defer to the applicant to comment further.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant had reviewed the conditions and considers them acceptable. The applicant responded affirmatively.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the proposed plan complements what the City has already approved in this area. The materials are interesting but also complement what has been approved thus far. He is generally supportive of the conditions but believes they may need some clarification.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is an attractive, well thought-out building and makes good use of the site. He believes some small improvements are needed, including the pathway connections. He agrees that if the sidewalk will connect to the parking lot, adjustments of the parking space locations should be made to provide a point of arrival within the parking lot. The landscaping seems to be lacking in the proposed foundation landscaping, but staff has addressed that in the recommended conditions. While the stone is attractive, he would not be adverse to a lighter, buff tone color.

Mr. Way stated that staff has identified and addressed most of the concerns, including the lightness of the foundation landscaping. The proposed bike rack location also should be a landscaped area. He advocates for an area to be added to the parking lot as a reception point for the walkway to the north. Much of the landscape plan consists of perennial plants; he would recommend evergreen plant materials be added to provide balanced seasonal landscaping.

Ms. Harter stated that the proposed project complements the new development located nearby. She is supportive of the proposed conditions.

Ms. Call stated that she concurs with fellow Commissioners' comments. She is not typically supportive of additional parking, but the amount proposed is appropriate in this location. She believes that if the pedestrian walkway were separated with one section located at the entrance, it could be used by those waiting on patients. In cases such as this with a circular drive aisle, it would be good to identify areas for snow stacking, ensuring that the landscaping is protected. She believes the proposed plan is consistent with what we were looking for in the area.

Mr. Way inquired how the base of the light pole in the parking lot would be addressed to provide protection from the parking.
Ms. Rauch responded that perhaps it could be moved to the proposed parking island.
Mr. Way inquired if it were located within the island, the photometrics would be negatively impacted.
Ms. Rauch responded that the measurements could be re-run to ensure there would be no issues.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has recommended two modifications to the conditions. [Discussion of the modifications ensued.]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant has any objections to the proposed modified conditions.
The applicant indicated that they had no objection to the conditions.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following ten (10) conditions:

1) The applicant extend the sidewalk on the west side of the site to connect with the shared-use path, to the parking lot to the public park, and work with staff on additional pedestrian path circulation throughout the site, prior to submitting for building permits;
2) The bike racks be located closer to the shared use path immediately west of the site, and the bench shown on the renderings be provided between the tenant entries;
3) The applicant revise the plans to demonstrate that the canopy edge sign meets the height requirement, and the future tenant sign meets the development text and sign design guidelines, subject to staff approval;
4) The applicant revise the proposal to select an asphalt roof shingle of similar design and color that is 325 lbs. or greater in weight;
5) The applicant add pedestrian lighting to walkways throughout the site, relocate parking lot light fixtures to the parking lot island, and revise the photometric plan to ensure the foot-candle requirements are met, subject to staff approval prior to building permitting;
6) The applicant revise the landscape plan prior to building permitting to include:
    a. specifications for the plantings around the dumpster enclosure,
    b. foundation plantings at least 42 inches wide to fill in the areas surrounding the building where plantings are not shown and should be,
    c. hedge and tree treatment adjacent the handicap parking area,
    d. clarification of the site plantings labeled "TI and TH" and make appropriate substitutions should that not be an appropriate planting material; and
    e. incorporate evergreens to ensure year-round landscaping on site.
7) The applicant modify the location of the fencing out of any utility lines and easements, and provide a detail of the fencing and landscaping along the Rings Road frontage, subject to staff approval;
8) All street trees be planted along the access drive (east side) prior to the occupancy of the proposed building and that written documentation be provided with the building permit submission that the street trees would be planted by the developer;
9) The applicant provide cross access easements for shared parking and public access to open space in accordance with the development text and infrastructure agreement, which should be recorded prior to occupancy; and

10) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that:

- Staff is working on an alternative method for sharing digital meeting packets with board and commission members.
- There are currently two vacant Planning positions. Until new hires have been completed, consultant assistance will be utilized.
- Mr. Way stated that the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Planning Conference is scheduled September 29-30, 2022 in Louisville, Ky. At that conference, a Planning Commissioners training session will be provided.
  Ms. Rauch noted that she would email conference details to the Commissioners.
- Review of the remaining 2022 PZC meeting dates will be added to the 09-15-22 PZC agenda.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, September 15, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council

DocuSign Envelope ID: C35CDF5B-D3CF-4DC0-A2A6-1C15629F5049

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 9, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

3. The Corners, Phase 1
20-095CU/FDP **Conditional Use/Final Development Plan**

Proposal:	Construction of ±23,500 square feet of commercial space in three buildings, approximately 2,000 square feet of patio space, a 3.8-acre public park, all associated site improvements, and a restaurant drive-thru.
Location:	West of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Blazer Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District.
Request:	Review and approval of a Conditional Use and a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.050-153.056 and 153.236.
Applicant:	Paul G. Ghidotti, The Daimler Group
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager
Contact Information:	614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-095

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the Conditional Use to allow for a restaurant drive-thru.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Conditional Use was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve three Minor Text Modifications to address the architectural requirements of development:

1. To allow additional secondary building masses such as projecting bays and entrance features.

DocuSign Envelope ID: C35CDF5B-D3CF-4DC0-A2A6-1C15629F5049

2. To permit secondary forms or masses that may incorporate pitched and/or straight parapet rooflines.

3. To permit bead board as a façade material and restrict fiber cement materials to a smooth surface finish to promote a contemporary aesthetic.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Minor Text Modifications were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 3: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with five conditions:

1) That the parking plans be updated to reflect the required number of bicycle parking spaces;

2) That the developer continue to work with staff on the final layout and species selection for the park landscaping;

3) That the developer work with staff to ensure adherence to the text and the Landscape Code during the permitting stage of this proposal;

4) That the applicant work with staff on the utilization of an art piece; and

5) That the applicant work with staff on the building materials and articulation.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Claudia D. Husak
B3ED324AADD0439...
Claudia D. Husak, AICP,
Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager

~~Mr. Shamp explained that a majority vote of the members present is required for the motion to pass. A tie vote would fail.~~
~~Mr. Fishman stated that a minor adjustment of the existing sign structures could make the signs consistent with Code, such as lowering the sign height. Would the applicant have any questions regarding the recommendation?~~

~~Mr. Genges inquired if, to utilize both monuments, it would be necessary to lower the bases, or would it be necessary to remove one sign and bring the other sign into compliance.~~
~~Ms. Husak stated that the applicant is permitted to have two monument signs. They are allowed 1-1/3 of the maximum allowable height and square footage permitted for one daycare use sign. A daycare sign is permitted to be a maximum of 15 square feet; therefore, 20 square feet would be the total number divided between the two signs. The maximum height of a daycare sign is six feet, so with the additional one-third percent, the maximum height would be 8 feet divided between the two signs.~~
~~Ms. Call requested that, in the future, pertinent calculations be provided in the staff reports.~~

~~Mr. Genges stated that it would cost the applicant $17,000-$20,000 to remove the existing sign structures and for engineering, versus the $1,000 cost of utilizing the existing signs. That is a significant cost impact to an individual attempting to start up a new business.~~
~~Ms. Call stated that if this were a retail use, there would be no issue; however, the Code requirements are different for this use. This can be accomplished by utilizing one sign or two signs.~~
~~Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission is not asking the applicant to tear anything down, but to be creative and make what exists meet Code. Previous applicants have been able to be creative and meet Code. However, the Commission cannot set a precedent for permitting an applicant not to meet Code. Finances are not a reason to not meet Code.~~

~~Mr. Lee stated that he is does not believe replacing the sign cabinets with smaller cabinets on the existing stone bases would be an aesthetic solution.~~
~~Mr. Genges agreed that a smaller sign on the large bases would not be attractive. If the motion fails, one sign would have to be removed and the other sign cabinet made larger.~~
~~Ms. Husak clarified that one sign cannot be 20 square feet and eight feet in height. Those numbers must be divided between two signs. The maximum size permitted for one sign is 15 square feet and 6 feet in height.~~
~~Ms. Call stated that if the motion to approve the Master Sign Plan fails, the applicant would be permitted either one sign that is 15 square feet and 6 feet in height or two signs with a total of 20 square feet and a total of 8 feet in height. They could work with staff to achieve that.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with one condition:~~

~~1) The applicant revise the sign face design to eliminate the use of vinyl letters, and instead to use acrylic push-thru letters with a minimum .25-inch relief, subject to staff approval at sign permitting.~~

~~Vote:~~ ~~Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, no; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Call, no.~~
~~[Motion failed 3-3.]~~

3. The Corners, Phase 1, 20-095CU/FDP, Conditional Use/Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a Final Development application for the construction of ±23,500 square feet of commercial space in three buildings, approximately 2,000 square feet of patio space, a 3.8-acre public park, and all associated site improvements. This is also a request for a Conditional Use for a restaurant drive-thru. The site is west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Blazer Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Report

Ms. Husak stated that this a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of ±23,500 square feet of commercial space in three buildings and approximately 2,000 square feet of patio space, a 3.8-acre public park and all associated site improvements. It is also a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for a restaurant drive-thru. The site is west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Blazer Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District. The Final Development Plan is the last step in the process, so if approved, the applicant will be eligible to file for building permits.

History
City Council approved Ordinance 70-19 on December 2, 2019 for the rezoning of approximately 13.5 acres west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Paul Blazer Parkway from OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (The Corners) for the future development of up to 70,000 square feet of commercial and office uses and a public park. At the same meeting, City Council also accepted the Preliminary Plat for the site. The Final Plat for the Corners development was recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 5, 2020 and accepted by City Council on April 13, 2020. The site is located within the planning area of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which was adopted by City Council on September 10, 2018, as an amendment to the Community Plan. Numerous public meetings with stakeholders and neighborhood residents were held during that planning process. The City owns the site. It was purchased based on an economic development strategy to allow the City to build a Smart parking lot for Cardinal Health to locate a facility within the adjacent building vacated by Nationwide. In May 2018, the City initiated an RFQ (Request for Qualifications) to identify a suitable developer to collaborate on the development of this 10-acre site, west of Frantz Road and east of the Cardinal Health offices and associated Smart parking lot. The Daimler Group was the selected developer and their team has collaborated over the past two years with the City on this proposal, which is unique for this site and these uses. The City is the applicant for this project. As part of Ordinance 70-19, a Planned Unit Development Text was approved by City Council that includes all permitted uses and development requirements, addressing among other items the appropriate development pattern, landscaping, and signs. This proposal adheres to that development text. It includes two stormwater retention ponds on the west side, which will address stormwater retention for The Corners and the Smart parking lot. They also will be an amenity in the public park included in the center of this development. The buildings comprise 70,000 square feet of commercial, retail and office use. Shared parking exists throughout the site.

Proposal
The applicant is proposing to develop Phase 1 of the Planned Unit Development, which will consist of the public park and three commercial buildings in the northeast portion of the site with a mix of office space and commercial (restaurant & retail) space. A drive-thru and patio spaces are also included in this phase. All associated site improvements, including but not limited to drive aisles, parking, landscaping and lighting are included in this proposal. Access will be provided from Frantz Road, Rings Road and Blazer Parkway, providing circulation throughout the site. Building A, tucked in the corner, is the smaller building with 2.260 square feet. It will have a pocket park. Buildings B and C are located more to the north along the Frantz Road frontage. Building B will have 12,660 square feet; Building C, at the Frantz Road entrance, will have 8,280 square feet. All buildings can accommodate outdoor patio spaces. [Renderings shown]. Building A will be a restaurant with drive-through, patio and a public park. The drive through use requires a Conditional Use approval by the Commission. The stacking for the drive-through has been moved toward the rear of the building. The architecture for The Corners in the development text is described as Rural, Contemporary. The cues are being taken from the open space and Field of Corn on the south side of Rings Road, but it also has modern elements, such as overhangs, metals and many windows. Detailed elevations have been provided, which show metal roofing, board and batten siding and sign locations for future tenants. The architecture for Building B, a commercial/retail building, has evolved since the Preliminary Development Plan, as reflected in the Minor Text Modifications requested. Building C also will be a commercial/retail building of similar architectural character, materials and colors as the other two buildings. [Frantz Road frontage views of Building B and C and location of entry feature sign shown.] A 3.88 acre public park will be located in the

center of the site, between the two stormwater retention ponds and the commercial buildings. The park will have a circular design and include seating and landscaping. Planning staff has met biweekly with the applicant and Engineering and Parks staff on finalizing the design. The City will be responsible for maintenance of the public park.

Following review of the applicable criteria, staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions; approval of the Minor Text Modification with three modifications; and approval of the Final Development Plan with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Paul G. Ghidotti, The Daimler Group, 6840 Macneill Drive, Dublin, stated that a large team is with him tonight, including: Carter Bean, the lead architect; Steve Kolwicz, POD Design, land planner; Katie Baumann, EMHT, civil engineer; and also a couple of his partners. This ground has sat unused for many years. Originally, this development proposal contained a residential component. However, they were encouraged to identify a different plan, and the residential component was replaced with a public park concept. They have been working on that concept for approximately a year, and tonight, they hope to have the proposed park improvements approved and be able to proceed with construction of the three road accesses yet this year. Fortunately, a primary retail anchor has been identified, and it is the type of retail that everyone desires. It is important that the first retail be the right user. This is a well-designed plan. The drive-thru is one of the smartest designs he has seen. Planning staff has worked with them many hours on this project, and it is a testament to a public-private partnership working together to create a great project.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated that the architecture is attractive; all the massing has a brown finish with white trim, with indications of some elements to break up the massing, such as awnings. A layer of personality will come with the tenants. However, with some of the larger buildings, it would seem that some material changes between the six shells, such as stone or use of another color, would break up the series of masses. Is there a reason that approach was not taken?
Mr. Ghidotti responded that they initially considered that approach, and they still could do so. However, collectively, they all really liked the barn concept, which would have one color.
Mr. Supelak stated he is not advocating for a different approach. However, using the stone as an integrated material with the barn vernacular could break up the massing.
Mr. Ghidotti stated that outdoor seating areas will be included with each of the buildings, which will be helpful, as well. It is important to design the patios based on what retail locates in the end use.

Carter Bean, lead architect, The Daimler Group, Inc., 1533 Lake Shore Drive, Columbus, OH 43204 stated that there was significant conversation about variety in the development. Traditionally, a rural farmstead will have a collection of buildings with similar characteristics, colors and materials. This is only one-quarter of the development. They foresee the other quadrants being developed with variety. They did not want to be carried away in this particular section due to the story that would be told with the collection of compatible buildings.

Ms. Call stated that the staff report indicated that "the desire of the neighborhood is for a preference for an architectural theme for this PUD with 'a contemporary interpretation of the traditional, rural and agricultural structures of the area.'" Ms. Call requested details about the Building A drive-thru, queue lane, menu board, etc.
Ms. Husak stated that vehicles would travel through the western travel lane and queue into the drive-thru lane, accommodating as many as 14 vehicles. There will also be a bypass lane. There will be no other circulation around the building, only the L-shaped drive through lane. Along the eastern, Frantz Road frontage, there will a small patio space for the user and a pocket park.

Ms. Call stated that the queue lane is well designed. Vehicles in that lane will not block parking spaces.
Mr. Fishman stated he is thrilled with this plan. This is not just a strip center, and he loves the park. The architecture style does have significant straight lines, but he believes landscaping will soften its lines. It has been indicated that Building A will have a pocket park. In a previous instance, a public space next to a restaurant evolved into an extension of a restaurant's patio. It will be important to demark that space as a public park. He commends Daimler and the City for the result of what he recognizes was an arduous process.

Mr. Grimes referred to the Minor Text Modification that would allow additional secondary building masses, and the permitted secondary forms or masses that can be incorporated. Is that intended to be a broad or a restrictive language?
Mr. Bean described the roof elements. Although the primary element is a pitched roof, a smaller, secondary flat roof component will be included.

Public Comment

The following public comments were received:

Mary Daney, 5775 Settlers Pl., Dublin, OH 43017
The Corners building elevations as presented look quite industrial/commercial. It's lacking the neighborhood charm that could warm up the space! Given that it is so close to several neighborhoods, and across from one of Dublin's famous landmarks, it makes sense to make it more visually appealing to locals. Awnings, shingles, benches/outdoor patios, extensive landscape, warmer-feeling exterior materials are just a few ideas to help bring an approachable feel to the space. If the aesthetic is to go more farmhouse, adding barn doors could be a nice touch. Thanks for your consideration!

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Pl., Dublin, OH 43017
A water feature under the park pavilion would be nice for visitors. Something similar to the water wall fountain planned for Riverside Crossing Park at Bridge Park. The farmhouse architecture is great. However, the early renderings of the project showed many more natural materials. The use of stone is non-existent in this plan. Stone is timeless and will ensure the project stands the test of time. Stone in the middle of Buildings B and C would break up the massing of the large buildings. White Hardie barn siding could also be a nice way to add some variation to the exterior -- perhaps white siding on the North "barn" of Building B and South "barn" of Building C. The white "end-caps" may tie the two buildings together more. The metal roof is missing dormer windows. This would make add more interest to an already expansive roof. Incorporating dormers and Barn doors would add the neighborhood charm this plan is currently lacking. Buildings B and C should be slightly further apart with benches and a water feature between the 2 patios. Families would gather between the patios after dinner.

Patrick Murtagh, 4189 Haymaker Ln., Dublin, OH 43017
Overall, the development plan looks really nice. It would be great to see some outdoor seating options for any of the commercial space that will be utilized for restaurants; also, a water feature in the park or some local art would be a nice touch.

Bill Reed, 4670 Bridle Path Lane, Dublin, OH
I want to let you know how upset I am about the Corners project. I just cannot believe that Dublin would consider cheapening our wonderful neighborhood like this! It will lower the property values, increase crime and ruin the whole ambience of Dublin. I am so proud of the field of corn and having this project across the street will ruin this wonderful art display. This will only be a few blocks from my property. Please consider NOT approving this! Please do not ruin our neighborhood! Thanks for your consideration.

Betts Carpenter, MD, PhD
I want to express my concern about this project. Please do not ruin our wonderful neighborhood! This will increase crime and decrease our property values. Please do not be influenced by developers and destroy our neighborhood. I live in Llewellyn Farms. Thanks so much for your consideration.

D. Glen Vanderbilt
Re: Corners project plans
Thank you for the reply and links. If I read the drawings correctly, it looks like a major feature of the commercial development is a drive thru diner. Really? Do the planners really think we need another one of those? What about all of the empty restaurants on Tuttle? The land on the SE corner of the property is not filled with ground plans or features. Nor do I see it labeled for anything. Do you know what the plan is for that? Can it be green space?

David Venne, 56 S. Riverview St., Dublin, OH 43017
I would appreciate an increase in the number of bike racks available in the development. I see two areas with bike racks. Outlook+Loop and Building A. Perhaps the designer would be able to include a bank of racks between Buildings B and C. It would be a missed opportunity to have a development right on the multi-use path to not adequately accommodate users. Additionally, I hope the developer considers ways in which to reduce the environmental impact of their development. The roofs of B and C look like they would support solar arrays or skylights to reduce energy usage. I suggest the addition of a bank of vehicle chargers for EVs somewhere in the parking lot. The City has ChargePoint units around the City. It would be beneficial to expand this network whenever additional parking is added to the area. Thank you for your time.

Beth Wicker, 5827 Coventry Lane, Dublin, OH 43017
I would like to express concern over the inclusion of a drive-thru in The Corners mixed retail space planned at Frantz/Rings Rd. The presence of a restaurant drive-thru in close proximity to our neighborhood at Rings/Dublin Rd. increases potential for excessive traffic, noise, littering, loitering, late night disturbances, etc. There are several drive-thru options for drivers to access located nearby that do not disrupt local neighborhoods. Including a drive-thru in this new development which is geared toward "serving nearby companies and neighborhoods" takes away from the appeal of a walkable, family-friendly amenity.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy referred to the public comment about EV chargers. Are there any requirements that they be included with new developments?
Ms. Husak responded that they are not required.
Ms. Kennedy inquired if there is any requirement that would require a local art element to be included.
Ms. Husak responded that there is no such requirement.
Ms. Kennedy stated that she was impressed with the package submitted because consideration was given to light pollution into the adjacent neighborhood, including the incorporation of glare shields. She appreciates that Mr. Ghidotti has called out and responded to the concerns of the neighborhood residents.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City has been interested in starting a tradition of incorporating outdoor art elements. This would be a good place to do so. In regard to the comment about EV chargers, Tesla will do so at no cost, if the land is provided for it to be placed within.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a very attractive, well-designed project. The landscape design is well developed. A wealth of details have been provided, including seating, bike rack specs, awnings, pocket parks, circulation access and generous patio space opportunities. He posed the opportunity for breaking up the masses. They do have stone in their palette; a couple of choice locations of stone could break up the massing. There are some long rooflines, so perhaps a series of dormers or adjustments to the roofline could help break up the roofline. He appreciates the fencing detail provided.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is very impressed with this plan. It is obvious that a significant amount of time was invested. He would hesitate responding too quickly to the EV suggestion, and a Tesla supercharger may not be desirable. He does not believe this is necessarily the best time or format in which to take up that issue. It can be considered a little later.

Mr. Grimes stated that this an incredible project. Walking along the east side of Frantz Road and seeing this development -- a little bit of country with midrise buildings behind -- what a great way to break up the view of what is currently a sweeping field. This phase will set a precedent for what the rest of the development will look like. It is an interesting project with a good amount of public space. Perhaps incorporating an art element in the bigger park space will be possible, although it is not an option for this phase.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she loves this project. She is not advocating for the EV element. She mentioned it only to give the City an opportunity to respond to the public comment suggestion.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is thrilled with the project, as well. He admires the result of all the work and planning invested. An EV element was only a suggestion. The vertical landscaping indicated will be fantastic.

Mr. Ghidotti suggested that they work with staff to see if there is a good site on which to locate an art element -- perhaps in the larger park to the west. In addition, they are willing to work with staff on the possibility of breaking up the massing with some differing materials. Finally, if they can afford to incorporate a couple of EV smartchargers, they would love to do so.

Ms. Call stated that adding landscaping or awnings to the long stretches of the buildings would be very helpful. She believes the Commission is comfortable with the developer working with staff regarding the building articulation and siting of an art piece.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Conditional Use.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modifications:

1) To allow additional secondary building masses such as projecting bays and entrance features;
2) To permit secondary forms or masses that may incorporate pitched and/or straight parapet rooflines; and
3) To permit beadboard as a façade material and restrict fiber cement materials to a smooth surface finish to promote a contemporary aesthetic.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following five conditions:

1) That the parking plans be updated to reflect the required number of bicycle parking spaces;
2) That the developer continue to work with staff on the final layout and species selection for the park landscaping;
3) That the developer work with staff to assure adherence to the text and the landscape code during the permitting stage of this proposal;
4) That the applicant work with staff on the utilization of an art piece; and
5) That the applicant work with staff on the building materials and articulation.

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

4. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-096CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request for facade improvements, new signage, and associated site improvements at an existing bank that needs modernization and remodeling. The site is located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Post Road and is zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for a Concept Plan review for facade improvements, new signage, and associated site improvements at the existing Heartland Bank, which is located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Post Road. Following approval of the Concept Plan, the applicant may work with staff to develop a Preliminary and Final Development Plan for submission to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Those two steps can be combined if determined appropriate by the Planning Director. The 0.82-acre site is an outparcel to the Dublin Plaza Shopping Center. [Photographs of all elevations shown.]

Proposal
The applicant is proposing a modernization and remodel of the entire exterior of the existing structure. The renovation concept replaces the combination of flat and hipped roofs with a modern, simplified flat roof system. The drive-thru overhang will be rebuilt, extending the flat roof from the building toward West Bridge Street. The building will be primarily clad in a new exterior material with a wood aesthetic. The applicant has not finalized an exterior material choice, however, has provided one potential material for reference. The siding is an aluminum panel product with a wood grain texture and light cherry color. Staff is recommending that the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure appropriate cladding materials are chosen. The existing brick veneer walls will be opened up on the north and west sides with increased glass for a more modern, open appearance. All the remaining exterior glass, which is not insulated, will be replaced with a new glazing system. The remaining exterior brick masonry will be painted a dark grey/black color to coordinate with the new color scheme. The existing square wood posts on the east and west sides will be replaced with steel I beam columns that extend up to hold the overhang. With the exterior modernization, the applicant is proposing four new signs for the site. A new monument 4.5-foot high ground sign will be located at the northwest corner of the site. The sign structure is clad in a material that appears to match the proposed building material in a slightly darker color. The sign would have white lettering. Staff is concerned with the proposed location close to the intersection of West Bridge Street and Frantz Road, potentially within easements and the required sight triangle. There are also three wall signs proposed, one on each of the east, west and north sides of the building. On the west side, the applicant is proposing an approximately 135-square-foot wall sign that includes the bank name and the institution's logo in a vertical format. The lettering is proposed to be white, using the cladding as the background. The north-facing sign is a horizontally oriented sign with only the institution's name. The 36-square-foot sign will be located on the drive-thru overhang, facing West Bridge Street. Finally, the east-facing sign will consist only of the institution's logo. The sign dimensions are not identified, but it appears to be significantly smaller than the other signs proposed. It is also located on the drive-thru overhang, facing the neighboring McDonald's property. Staff has reviewed the application with the applicable criteria and recommends approval with four conditions.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the siding on the building that appears to be cedar is actually aluminum.
Ms. Call noted that aluminum is not permitted as a primary material, only as a secondary material.
Mr. Ridge stated that the applicant has not finalized the cladding material; however, the aluminum siding has been proposed as the primary cladding material. A condition has been recommended that the applicant work with staff to select an appropriate cladding material.

RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Dayton Legal Blank, Inc., Form No. 30045

70-19

Resolution No. _____ Passed _____, 20_____

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ACCEPTING THE PLAT FOR THE CORNERS SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, application for approval of the plat for The Corners subdivision 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 and accept all rights of way, easements, and other interests dedicated to the City therein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, 7 of the elected members concurring that:

Section 1. The City Council hereby approves and accepts the plat for The Corners subdivision, 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 2nd day of December, 2019.

_____
Mayor – Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk of Council

- Repayment schedule from the City to the developer for the remaining balance of the public improvements and the elimination of the minimum service payment. In refining the model, staff believes that the TIF can support a $250,000 repayment rather than a $229,000 repayment in the first three years. Thereafter, the repayment would be scaled down to $200,000 for the next three years, with a $100,000 final payment. As originally proposed, the City will still reserve the right to prepay at any time without penalty.

Staff believes that these proposed revised terms will deliver a project that aligns with Council's desire to promote development of the Frantz Road corridor as well as support the principles of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. Staff therefore recommends approval of the business terms of both the real estate transfer and development agreement and the infrastructure agreement with the Daimler Group, and further seeks authorization to revise the final agreements consistent with Council's direction. The developer's representative, Paul Ghidotti, as well as members of the project and legal teams are available to respond to any questions.

There were no questions.
Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

Ordinance 68-19
Amending Ordinance No. 83-00 Passed June 19, 2000, as Subsequently Amended, To Supplement the Public Improvements to be made to Benefit the Property Identified in that Ordinance.
Mr. Stiffler stated that no changes have been made to the Ordinance since first reading.
There were no questions.
Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.

Ordinance 69-19
Declaring the Improvement to Certain Parcels of Real Property known as The Corners Development to be a Public Purpose and Exempt from Taxation; Providing for the Collection and Deposit of Service Payments and Specifying the Purposes for which those Service Payments may be Expended; Specifying the Public Infrastructure Improvements directly benefiting the Parcels; Authorizing Compensation Payments to the Dublin City School District and the Tolles Career and Technical Center; and Repealing Ordinance No. 83-00.
Mr. Stiffler stated that no changes have been made to the Ordinance since first reading.
There were no questions.
Vote on the Ordinance: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

Mayor Peterson noted that staff has requested that Resolution 70-19 be considered immediately following the rezoning ordinance. The staff report will address both the rezoning and plat acceptance together.

Ordinance 70-19
Rezoning Approximately 13.5 Acres, More or Less, Located West of Frantz Road, North of Rings Road and South of Paul Blazer Parkway from OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (The Corners) for the Future Development of up to 70,000 Square Feet for Commercial and Office Uses and a Public Park. (Case 19-081Z/PDP)

Resolution 70-19
Approving and Accepting the Plat for The Corners Subdivision.
Mayor Peterson introduced the Resolution.

Ms. Husak noted that the Ordinance was introduced on November 18 and an amendment was made to clarify the architectural language in the development text – more closely aligning the intent of what the architecture ought to be as it transitions to the west. These are the only changes made.

The Resolution is for the acceptance of the proposed preliminary plat, which typically accompanies legislation for a PUD rezoning. The applicant is proposing, together with the City, to subdivide the land into three lots – the existing parking lot that the City will retain ownership of, the park in the center that the City will retain ownership of, and the remaining lot is the parcel to be developed by Daimler in the future.
The rezoning and the preliminary plat were recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 19. Staff recommends approval of the two items as well.

Ms. Fox asked about scale and massing in the development text for the two-story office buildings that serve as a transition. The language states it may be monolithic in scale and massing. That seems somewhat narrow. Are the buildings being limited to being monolithic, or is there flexibility?
Ms. Husak responded that the PZC would have flexibility to determine appropriateness, given the language "may" be monolithic.
Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes noted that the discussion at Council focused on complementary architecture. Was that captured in the text?
Ms. Fox responded that has been included. She just wanted clarification about the monolithic aspect.

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

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

Ordinance 71-19
Establishing Appropriations Based on the 2020 Operating Budget of the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2020.
Mr. Stiffler noted there are no changes since the first reading.
Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.

Ordinance 72-19 (Amended)
Amending the Annual Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2019.
Mr. Stiffler noted two items:

- In the packet was a memo with additional information on the advances contained in the ordinance and how they will impact the General Fund balance policy. It is important to point out that the fund balance and the General Fund expenditures in the timeline provided in the memo are all estimates and are included for representative purposes.
- The ordinance has been amended since introduction. The amended ordinance requests $145,000 in the Accrued Leave payout instead of the $90,000 previously requested. Since the time the ordinance was drafted in mid-November, additional information has come to light, as outlined in the memo. It is necessary to make this additional appropriation request.

He offered to respond to any questions.

Ms. De Rosa commented that she had discussion with Mr. Stiffler about the policy discussion that began at the last meeting about the end of year fund balance and the minimum required per policy. As Mr. Stiffler noted, the timeline presented in the memo puts the General Fund balance at approximately 54.9 percent, bringing it back up in February, should there be a bond issuance and bond proceeds. That timing could change, as well as the amount. It would still be a useful thing next year to look at the policy in terms of advances made based on a future bond issuance. Given the conversation that has taken place, it appears the fund balance will continue to rise because of the way the revenues are trending. But she does believe this policy matter should be discussed in a future meeting. Perhaps at the next meeting, could staff provide information on the

~~Ms. Alutto thanked Mr. McDaniel for his attention to this and for being so responsive to her request that this occur before the end of the year.~~
~~Mayor Peterson moved to appoint Mr. Reiner to serve as the Council Liaison on this newly formed committee.~~
~~Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.~~
~~Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes, Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.~~

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

OTHER

- The Corners at Frantz and Rings Road - Update

Mr. McDaniel stated that this includes updates to provide information to Council in advance of introducing any legislation. He would welcome any feedback and thanked staff and Daimler for putting this informative presentative together.
Ms. Husak stated that Planning is preparing to bring forward a rezoning for 13.5 acres on the west side of Frantz road north of Rings Road. The area is part of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which serves to reposition the Legacy office parks with a goal to create a walkable, mixed-use environment with amenities. The site is shown in the Community Plan Special DCAP Area Plan as MUR, Sub-District 2 (North of Rings), which recommends corporate office uses with supporting retail services in the interior of the sub-district, and a limited amount of multi-story residential (density not to exceed 30 du/ac) as a secondary use to office. Similar to the OSU project, the Zoning Code has not yet been updated to reflect this District and the site retains the current zoning of OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District. All the proposed uses included in this Concept Plan are permitted within the ID-1 District. Due to the timing of this proposal, the applicant and staff have agreed that a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development District (PUD) is the appropriate mechanism to ensure that the needs of the facility can be met. About 70,000 square feet of space in phases will be developed. There are four-subareas proposed:

- Subarea A includes the existing storm water management areas as well as a park in the center of the site; and
- Subarea B, B1, B2 and B3 are the areas along Frantz that are commercial.

Ms. Husak shared some reference images of the proposed architectural character that could be considered in this development.
Ms. Goss provided more detail on each subarea.

- Subarea A is about 4 acres of park and open space areas. The City will retain ownership of the park and be responsible for its maintenance.
- Subarea B1 runs parallel to Frantz Road and is about 6.5 acres. Staff estimates that there will be 47,000 square feet of restaurant and retail space.
- Subarea B2 and B3 are dedicated office space at approximately 1.5 acres and 1.7 acres respectively.

Ms. Goss stated that this total development will be $15.4 million in improvements to the site. The total cost to the City for the park and all required improvements is $3,365,000. She stated the expectation is that Daimler will begin building infrastructure on the site (Subarea B1) in the year 2020 with approximately $3 million in improvements in 2021, $4 million in improvements in 2022, and $3.4 million in improvements in 2023, totaling $10.4 million minimum project value. The City will be receiving property tax on the full valuation of the improvements beginning in 2024. Staff has taken a conservative approach when calculating the TIF, figuring in the $10.4 million minimum project value only. The City would transfer ownership of subareas B1, B2 and B3, as proposed in the development agreement to Daimler Group upon Council approval of the final development plan and all related agreements.
Mr. Stiffler reiterated the City's costs relating to the park. The City intends to use $1.6 million in cash in the Rings/Frantz TIF to pay the monthly construction draws. The developer will provide up-front funding for the additional $1.75 million needed. The City will make reimbursement to the developer in the amount of $230,000 per year for ten years. These payments are expected to be made using funds from the Rings/Frantz TIF

and the new TIF for the site. This project does not impact the 2020-2024 CIP as TIF dollars are being used that are not allocated for any other purpose. Additionally, no debt will be issued for the development of this project.

Mr. McDaniel reviewed the steps that would need to be taken for the approval of this project -- rezoning, agreements, creating and modifying TIFs, etc. He also summarized that this is within the DCAP and furthers the goal of providing amenities to the area while balancing the comments of the nearby residential areas.

Mayor Peterson stated that there has been a great deal of neighborhood feedback that has evolved into the perfect project. He stated that this is what TIF dollars are intended for.

Ms. Fox agreed and stated that this is a notable project that is hoped to kick start the renewal of the Metro/Blazer area. She commended the Daimler Group for listening to the residents. She reiterated how important the buy-in is from everyone. She is particularly pleased with the architectural style proposed. Using TIF money for the green space that will draw people in is appropriate. She would like to see the green space be very usable.

Ms. De Rosa stated that she knows it has been a lot of work and she is very appreciative. She believes it is a positive step forward.

Mr. Reiner stated he is pleased that there are no apartments. He believes it will increase the vitality of the area.

Ms. Alutto stated that the Community Plan focus was appreciated.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that she would like to see attention to these ponds to make them viable eco-systems. She is looking forward to programming this park and it will be a wonderful opportunity to open it up for events such as the Fourth of July Fishing Derby.

Mr. Keenan asked if there was a crosswalk.

Ms. Fox stated there is a crosswalk at Rings and Frantz.

Mr. Keenan stated there should be one from Waterford.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the legislation will be advanced at the next meeting.

- ~~Community Plan Refresh~~

~~Ms. Rauch stated that staff has conducted an audit of the Plan and provided a summary of updates over the past six years, identified needed updates, additional information to incorporate, proposed timeframe, cost, staff capacity, and review process for each chapter. Ms. Rauch provided the following background:~~

- ~~the current Community Plan was adopted on July 1, 2013 and can be found on the City's website in a digital version;~~
- ~~the goal of the Community Plan is to act as the overarching policy guide for the natural and built environment throughout the City; and~~
- ~~it is divided into a series of topic specific chapters related to foundation, community character and environment, land use, transportation, community facilities, historic preservation, fiscal health, demographics, utilities, and implementation. Each of these chapters includes an analysis of the existing conditions and future opportunities that translate to implementation strategies.~~

~~Staff does not anticipate a major update to the Plan as was done in 2007. She proposed how staff would go about reviewing each chapter and when these reviews would take place. She indicated that staff would take the chapters that are in need of review out of order as indicated below. She also provided a timeline. She believes it could take 18-24 months to conduct the review and it would begin in the second half of 2020. The schedule would be as follows:~~

City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 19, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

4. The Corners **PID: 273-010749**
19-082 **Preliminary Plat**

Proposal:	A Preliminary Plat for the subdivision of ±24 acres into three lots for the future development of approximately 70,000-square-feet of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is currently zoned Office, Laboratory, and Research District.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of Frantz Road and Rings Road.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the Subdivision Regulations.
Applicant:	Paul G. Ghidotti, The Daimler Group
Planning Contact:	Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/19-082

MOTION: Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Call seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat with the following condition:

1) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

VOTE: 7 - 0

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

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP
Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager

~~Ms. Call moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval of the following variance from the Subdivision Regulations:~~

~~1) To permit the creation of Lot 1 at 1.23-acre instead of meeting the Zoning Code required 3-acre minimum.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.~~
~~(Motion passed 7-0)~~

~~Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Wilson seconded approval of the preliminary plat for University Boulevard, Phase 2 with the following condition:~~

~~1) The applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.~~
~~(Motion passed 7-0)~~

[Cases 3 and 4 were considered together.]

3. The Corners, PID: 273-010749, 19-081, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a proposal for a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan of a ±13.5-acre site from OLR to PUD to facilitate the future development of an approximately 70,000-square-foot office and commercial center and a public park.

4. The Corners, PID: 273-010749, 19-082, Preliminary Plat

This is a proposal for a Preliminary Plat for the subdivision of ±24 acres into three lots for the future development of approximately 70,000-square-feet of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is currently zoned Office, Laboratory, and Research District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council regarding a rezoning with preliminary development plan for a 13.5-acre site for the future construction of up to 70,000 square feet of office and commercial space and a public park. Secondly, there is a request for review and recommendation to City Council for a Preliminary Plat to subdivide 24 acres into three lots for the future development of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Frantz Road, south of Blazer Parkway. The plat contains a parking lot, which the City constructed and owns. The boundaries for the development are Rings Road, Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway. Preceding the Informal Review for the development on June 20, there was a long public process with the DCAP Plan, which has informed some of the proposed development on this site. The City has entered into an agreement with the developer to develop this site. Many public meetings preceded tonight's meeting. The rezoning will include the two retention ponds, the park and buildings along Frantz, Blazer Memorial Parkway to the north and Rings Road to the south. Phasing is required to be

included in the preliminary development plan. None of the access points were included in the first phase, nor access to the parking area. The site lines will be revised to ensure adequate access in and through the site before this plan goes forward to Council. Three new subareas will be created. The park will be one subarea. A large amount of development will be located on the east side of the access drive, primarily retail, commercial and restaurants. On the other side of the drive could be office or commercial uses. The applicant has included commercial or office uses for the subarea located along Rings Road, excluding any type of auto-oriented uses. The buildings are relatively small, so a grocery could not be located there. Patio spaces and open spaces are included throughout the site. Even though the DCAP does permit residential for this district, it is not included in this proposed rezoning. Sign requirements are included in the text. The architecture style will be the same "rural feel" as was presented for the Informal Review in June. The City will develop the public open space, which will be programmed in a future CIP budget. The plat includes The Corners development, the park space, retention area, and the existing City parking lot, of which the City will retain ownership. The City also will retain ownership of the ponds and the park. There are three lots in the plat. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan with the following conditions:

1) That the preliminary development plan be revised to accurately reflect all Subareas, as outlined in the text, prior to Council review;
2) That the applicant revise the development text to address the maximum permitted encroachment of building canopies, awnings, eaves, and projecting signs along the Frantz Road frontage; and,
3) That the applicant revise the phasing plan to include adequate circulation in Phase 1.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat with the following condition:

1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that in Subarea B-1, the Permitted Uses include all administrative and business offices, professional offices, organizations and associations uses permitted in Dublin Code Section 153.026. However, Section 153.027 is commercial and neighborhood uses, which would include a grocery store, bakery, and farm market. These are the uses we had hoped to see in this development, but they are not included. Why is it restricted to Section 153.026, when the more attractive uses are in the following Code section?

Ms. Husak responded that Section 153.026 is included because it addresses the office uses. The second paragraph covers the additional uses she has referenced without having to include that Code section. If unclear, the Code section can be included.

Ms. Fox stated that Section 153.026 also allows for some uses that she would not expect to see here, such as institutions.

Ms. Husak responded that is the reason it specifically states all administrative, business and professional office uses. That eliminates the conditional uses.

Ms. Fox stated that is not clarified. It states "uses under 153.026," so it would appear to include them all. She would request that for later ease in implementation, clarification be made.

Ms. Newell concurred.

Ms. Fox inquired the reason that Permitted Uses was limited to simply business and office in Subarea B3, as identified by Section 153.026(a). Could a mixed use be permitted, such as office on second level and retail below?

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 Macneil Drive, Dublin, 43017, Daimler Group, stated that accompanying him tonight are Architect J. Carter Bean and Land Planner Steve Kolwicz. In looking at the DCAP, that plan referred to was a transition step from retail moving to the west. It seemed that office use should be there, as the retailers do not want to be in that location. This area presents the best opportunity for build to suit, owner-occupied office sites in the entire development. This location is a good space for the professional office user – along the pond, with good access on Blazer Parkway.

Ms. Fox stated that she does not disagree but did not want to limit it.
Mr. Ghidotti stated that they have no objection to expanding B3, if it would not have a negative impact on their traffic impact study. They do not want to re-do that study.
Ms. Fox responded that she was not requesting that use be included, rather questioning the reason for the limitation.

Ms. Fox inquired about the setback requirements. The DCAP calls for a 30-ft. setback. What the Commission is looking for is energy at the street, patios, etc. If they are already finding that placing patios in front results in canopies and awnings encroaching in the setback, is a 30-ft. setback sufficient?

Mr. Ghidotti responded that 30 feet is a workable setback. It still allows them to have outdoor seating areas at either the north or south end of the building and wrap it around closer to the street.

Mr. Fishman stated that 35 feet would be appropriate. There are large trucks travelling Frantz Road, next to people sitting in patios drinking coffee. That is his complaint about SR161 in downtown Dublin where people are sitting in the outdoor space at Starbucks while semi-trucks pass.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that this space would not be similar. They have lost so much of the proposed density in the last year and a half with this project that they are hoping the project still works. Retailers like density and activity. If they continue to shrink the plan, have larger setbacks and lose parking space, they will lose development area as well.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important for the City to create a landscape design in conjunction with this development. The DCAP calls for spaces to linger and the use of placemaking principles. The Daimler Group is designing their piece, which must interact with the City's piece. If the City does not have a plan that directly relates, it will not appear cohesive. Is the City's Parks and Recreation Division working on a plan?

Ms. Husak responded the intent is that when the rezoning goes before City Council for consideration, their materials will include the development agreement and estimated costs of an associated landscape project.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to see a tentative design plan.
Ms. Husak clarified that, at this point, the rules for the development are being established. With the future Final Development Plan, the Commission will see every building, parking lot and access point, as well as the park development.

Ms. Fox inquired if the loss of density the applicant referred to was the result of the parking requirements.
Mr. Ghidotti responded that it was the loss of the uses to the west, which were shown at an earlier November meeting and no longer included that impact the density.

Ms. Fox inquired if the parking numbers were based on current City Code, or are they relaxed due to the fact that this is a walkable environment.

Ms. Husak responded that it is that, as well as the intent to have uses with different parking peak times. The patios are permitted not to have any dedicated parking spaces.

Mr. Fox inquired the reason that the architectural styles have changed from the front to the back of the development.

Ms. Husak stated that there was conversation about how to transition into an office building. They are permitting the office use not to adhere to that particular style.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that it will be a different use, likely Office use to the west, but also a transition from the retail frontage.
Ms. Fox inquired if there would be elements that will enable all to relate. Rings Road faces the Field of Corn. Because that is a signature corner, the architecture was chosen with the intent that it would relate to the sense of the overall area. On Rings Road, will it seem odd that the front reflects that sense of area, and the back will look contemporary? She inquired if the applicant had considered a 3-story building at the rear.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that they would not be able to provide parking for a 3-story building.

Ms. Call inquired if parks are typically developed by the City when open space requirements are met on a parcel.
Ms. Husak responded that they are not.

Ms. Call inquired if, typically, parks are provided by the property owner.
Ms. Husak responded that this park was the result of a neighborhood request. The developer was not required to provide open space.

Ms. Call stated that because this is preliminary, the only request she would make relates to parking. Because this plan is underparked per City Code, with the Final Development Plan, she would request that the staff report provide comps on a shared parking agreement. Parking needs are also based on the number of people who want to visit an attraction. She would also request information be provided on the possibility for adjacent parking rather than on the drive lane itself, which circles the Field of Corn. The land is City-owned, and there appears to be space for it.

Perhaps if some parking spaces could be provided there, it would reduce the demand on this development's parking.

Mr. Wilson stated that with the Informal Review, the Commission was shown a clear path from Blazer Parkway to Rings Road. Now, it appears to be a labyrinth. Are there only two ways to access this site?
Ms. Husak responded that there are three access points -- from Rings, Frantz and Blazer. At the June meeting, it seemed that the majority of Commissioners preferred that there not be a direct travel path through the site.

Mr. Wilson stated that with the curves, there will be a need for stop signs for the traffic moving through that space.
Ms. Husak responded that when the Final Development Plan details are provided, the circulation will make better sense.

Ms. Kennedy stated that with the Informal Review, Commissioners commented that they did not want a high level of busy traffic next to the City park area. She was pleased to see the traffic route broken up with the revised plan to avoid the potential for speeding traffic next to an area where children might be playing.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that it was for other purposes, as well. There is a desire to create a strong connectivity within the site that extends to the Cardinal Health site. They want to encourage the 3,000 Cardinal Health employees to visit this development during the day or at the end of the day. Speeding vehicles would discourage that desired pedestrian traffic. The pedestrian connections on the east side of the site, on the frontage and the east-west connection between the ponds to Cardinal Health are very important to this development.

Mr. Fishman inquired about traffic turning at Frantz Road.
Mr. Ghidotti responded that it would be right in/right out traffic only.

Mr. Fishman inquired about the timing of the park development. The park is an integral part of this development to the residents. He requested that information be provided for the next review.
Ms. Husak responded that when this plan goes before Council, it is likely they will address the timing needs. Presently, this project is not included in the CIP.

Mr. Fishman stated that if the traffic on Frantz Road increases, there might be future need for a turn lane. However, there is no opportunity for one to be added.
Mr. Ghidotti responded that Engineering will not permit a cut onto Frantz Road; the developer already made that request. The traffic impact study did not support even a left turn into the site.
Mr. Fishman clarified that he was referring to a dedicated right turn lane from Frantz Road to the site.
Ms. Call inquired if a turn lane from Frantz to Rings Road already exists.
Ms. Newell responded that there is none at that location. There is one further south.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that, currently, the southbound right turn movement is shared with the through lane on Frantz Road. There are three opportunities to turn right into this development – at Blazer, in the middle access to the site, and at Rings Road. If one of the three becomes congested, it will balance out on Frantz Road.

Mr. Supelak inquired the reason for the phasing.
Mr. Ghidotti stated that it is to make the park work. Once the park is constructed, the access points must be available. They are hoping to have the text approved. With that assurance, they can begin to market the site and attempt to secure the type of users that are desired. They have been reluctant to do so, because the plan has evolved. Once the text is approved, they have already engaged a marketing firm that focuses on specialty type retail. If the park was ready, and they had one of the frontages ready to go, those details would be provided in the Final Development Plan. When the first development comes in, they will need the three access points. The infrastructure needs to occur simultaneous with the development.

Public Comment

Mark Martin, 4211 Rings Road, Vice President, Llewellyn Farms Homeowners Association, Dublin requested confirmation that with this revised plan, there would be no gas station or apartments. Ms. Newell responded that is correct.

Mr. Martin inquired if the retail uses would be located along the main roads and office buildings to the rear near the ponds.

Ms. Husak stated that the retail is on the Frantz Road frontage. There is also a building that is permitted flex space, either retail or office. All the buildings are permitted to have some office use; a 50-50 mix is permitted.

Mr. Martin thanked everyone for listening to the residents' concerns and making the changes.

Terry Downing, 278 Longbranch Drive, Dublin, inquired if there was any update related to the timing of this development. At an earlier public meeting, residents were informed that it would be 5-10 years out.

Ms. Husak stated that the DCAP has a 5 – 15 year vision. This project is ahead of the zoning that will come with the DCAP. The intent is that this plan will be zoned by the end of this year. The market will drive the actual development.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff is in the process of drafting the zoning code amendments for the DCAP. The draft will be completed and the review process will begin within a couple of months.

Ms. Downing stated that she is concerned about the intent not to have like tenants with the same peaks in parking, due to the limited parking. There is already a traffic issue due to the Cardinal Health site, and now there will be additional traffic. She would request that the City consider ways to prevent parking and speeding traffic on her street. The residents on the street already experience issues whenever there are traffic backups. They appreciate the Commission considering the residents' concerns expressed at the previous public meeting.

Ms. Newell thanked the residents for their comments.

Commission Comments

Ms. Fox stated she is aware that the Final Development Plan will provide more details. In order to draw the Cardinal Health employees to this development, it is imperative that the City work with the developer to create focal greenspace on both sides. Perhaps the walkway could come in and broaden to a focal point with a fountain or other placemaking elements that would encourage the public to linger. The public should be drawn to the development for lunch and to stay awhile. In Metro Place, the office workers walk during their lunch hour, but have no place to go. It is the City's responsibility to develop that component, but she encourages staff to work with the developer to create a cohesive look.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the proposed conditions.
Mr. Ghidotti responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to recommend approval to City Council for the rezoning and preliminary development plan with the following amended conditions:

1) That the preliminary development plan be revised to accurately reflect all Subareas, as outlined in the text, prior to Council review;
2) That the applicant revise the development text to address the maximum permitted encroachment of building canopies, awnings, eaves, and projecting signs along the Frantz Road frontage;
3) That the applicant revise the phasing plan to include adequate circulation in Phase 1;
4) That the development text be revised to limit the office uses in Subarea B to the office uses in the Zoning Code Section 153.026(A)(2) and the professional uses in Section 153.026(A)(3) ;
5) That the text be revised to allow the uses in the Neighborhood Commercial District in Code Section 153.027(A); and
6) That staff provide shared parking data comparing the proposal to others in the City with a Final Development Plan.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Call seconded to approve the preliminary plat with the following condition:

1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

~~**Communications**~~

~~Ms. Rauch stated that staff is in the process of making the updates to the Historic District Code and Guidelines. Ms. Fox and Ms. Kennedy, who were not present at the previous meeting for that~~

City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 20, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission discussed the following proposal at this meeting:

2. Daimler Development Concept **PID: 273-010749**
19-047INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	To rezone approximately ten acres at the intersection of Frantz and Rings Road from Office, Laboratory & Research District to Planned Unit Development for a commercial, mixed-used center including office, restaurant/retail and open space.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of Frantz Road and Rings Road.
Request:	Informal review and feedback on a possible future development application.
Applicant:	Paul Ghidotti, The Daimler Group
Planning Contact:	Vincent Papsidero, FAICP
Contact Information:	614.410.4682, vpapsidero@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/19-047

RESULT: The Commission provided informal feedback regarding the proposed design concepts and were supportive of the redevelopment of the site. The Commission was supportive of the proposed architectural concept and the high-quality design desired for this site. The members encouraged the applicant to look for an opportunity to connect with the Field of Corn site. They liked the proposed pedestrian connectivity and encouraged the applicant to ensure it was well maintained throughout the site and to the surrounding development. The Commission shared that the proposed park areas effectively reached the streets to draw people into and through the site. The members encouraged the applicant to pursue an internal drive that is well designed and does not promote cut-through traffic.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
William Wilson	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Interim Planning Director

~~Mr. Jones stated that he has completed many health care buildings, and he sympathizes with health care architects. Often the inside drives the design of the outside. Their primary mission is to take care of senior citizen clients with the best possible setting and care. This will be a world-class rehabilitation hospital, unparalleled in the country. The 22-foot wide corridor on the inside is driving the design of the outside. These patients will spend most of their time inside, and very limited time outside in the campus. They appreciate the Commissioners' comments, and are excited about becoming a part of this community.~~

~~There was no public comment.~~

3. Daimler Development Concept, PID: 273-010749, 19-047INF, Informal Review

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a request for an informal review and feedback on a proposal to rezone approximately ten acres at the intersection of Frantz and Rings Road from Office, Laboratory & Research District to Planned Unit Development District for a commercial, mixed-used center including office, restaurant/retail and open space.

Case Presentation

Mr. Papsidero stated that this in an informal review of a Concept Plan, which is anticipated to lead to a rezoning of the PUD. This concept is part of a larger strategy related to the retention of Cardinal Health in the nearby six-story office building. The City acquired this 10-acre parcel, which is part of a larger tract of land, with the intention of constructing a City-owned parking lot to lease to Cardinal Health with an expectation of developing the site to provide some amenities for the Cardinal Health workforce.

Site
The site is currently a large, open field. The previous large pond on the site was removed to enable construction of the parking lot, and new, smaller ponds and landscaping were added. The goal is to more heavily landscape the ponds and make them an aesthetic feature for the City. To the north of the site is a Tech Flex, one-story office building; across Rings Road is the McDowell property, which is farmed; to the south is the "Field of Corn" public art installation; and to the west is the office building.

Dublin Corporate Area Plan
Staff has been working with the developer to ensure that the Concept Plan is consistent with the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The goals are:

- Repositioning "legacy" office sites by encouraging new, complementary investment
- Creating walkable, mixed use environments with commensurate amenities
- Use of open space as an organizational and focal element
- Placemaking

This site falls within the Mixed Use Regional Sub-District 2, which recommends:

- Corporate offices with supporting retail services
- Limited amount of multi-family (max 30 du/ac)
- This specific site should accommodate a mix of uses as a neighborhood center

The plan identified 12 different sites within the planning area, and provided some detailed policy guidance. Specific to this site (Site 9), the plan recommends:

- Neighborhood-oriented retail and restaurant uses (no bars) for Frantz Road frontage
  The "no bars" provision was a result of one of the last public community meetings. The community did not support the idea of more intensive bar-specific restaurant uses, only a traditional restaurant, in this location.
- Second story office uses
- Site design should allow direct pedestrian linkage from the Frantz Road sidewalk through the site to the properties to the west

This proposal is for a Mixed-Use Neighborhood Center, which will include retail/restaurant outparcels, office uses and a City park on the 10-acre site [aerial views shown]. Daimler has proposed two concepts (Concept A and Concept B) for PZC's feedback. [Differences in the concepts were reviewed.]

The proposed architecture of the commercial buildings is "modern farmhouse." The park will be designed by the Dublin Park and Recreation Department and would be owned and managed by the City. A public process would be followed to determine the best park amenities for the neighborhoods and the nearby office park.

Staff has proposed the following discussion questions to guide the Commission's discussion and feedback:

1) **Does the proposal sufficiently address the policies and land uses set forth in the Dublin Corporate Area Plan?**
2) **Does the Commission prefer the distribution of uses in Concept A or in Concept B?**
3) **Will the arrangement of land uses support the placemaking and streetscape enhancement goals for this site?**
4) **Does the Commission support the proposed architectural character of this development?**
5) **Other considerations by the Commission**

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification of the pedestrian and vehicular connections through the site.
Mr. Papsidero clarified that the north-south line is the vehicle connection; the thin, double-arrow east-west lines depict the pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if these concepts were shared with the public.
Mr. Papsidero responded that broad concepts were shared at a public meeting several months ago. The concepts shown tonight are the next-step concepts. They are posted on the web.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the non-bar restaurants would have liquor permits.
Mr. Papsidero responded affirmatively. They will not be bar-only entities, but they will be higher-end restaurants that serve liquor.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Papsidero clarified that the City is the applicant; the co-applicant is the Daimler Group.

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 Macneil Drive, Dublin, 43017, stated that staff and the Daimler Group hosted a public meeting on November 27, 2018 at the Dublin Community Recreation Center to introduce the project objectives. Approximately 50 stakeholders attended the meeting, which included a brief presentation to introduce the project and share initial concepts regarding possible land uses and architectural character. The presentations and Q&A were followed by an open house where attendees were invited to share their thoughts. Presentation boards with conceptual land uses, architectural character images, and ideas for open space/streetscape treatment were also available for the public's comment. Attendees were asked to provide feedback using green dot stickers to vote on images/aspects of the concepts that they liked, and red dots to indicate dislike. This development proposal reflects the feedback collected at that meeting. He reviewed the differences in the concepts. He invites the Commission to share their feedback using staff's suggested questions. The next time he will be before the Commission is for the rezoning application.

Public Comment

Sven Christianson, 5765 Settlers Place, thanked the City for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan. He appreciates that this is a PUD. He hopes that the same PUD opportunity is possible when the area next to their neighborhood is developed. Regarding Concept A and Concept B, specifically, he prefers Concept B. The Field of Corn is one of the most visited public art sites in Dublin. Drawing some of those visitors into the nearby retail would be an advantage for those businesses. He would suggest flipping the public park to the other side in the plan, as it would give more visibility.

Ms. Kennedy inquired why he preferred Concept B.
Mr. Christianson responded that currently, visitors to the Field of Corn park off the driveway and leave tire marks in the ground. Moving the parking for those visitors into a nearby retail area would be an advantage for both the park and the shop owners. There has been nothing in this area, and creating this presence on one of the main corridors into Dublin would be beneficial.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if Mr. Christianson preferred a particular shape for the top park -- long versus centrally located.
Mr. Christianson stated that he likes the elongated park; it is a scenic area.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that she loves this plan, particularly Concept A, because every building has access to greenspace - evaluating it from a building occupant perspective. She does like Mr. Christianson's suggestion about making the main entrance more prominent to draw people in. She likes the architectural proposals and those that have already been constructed in the community. She has no concerns about this plan.

Mr. Fishman stated he likes both Concept A and Concept B and has no issues with either. He also likes Mr. Christianson's suggestion to expand the Field of Corn parking. In summary, he is excited about this proposal.

Ms. Call stated that Mr. Ghidotti has caught the vision of Dublin. She does not have a preference between Concepts A or B. She appreciates the consideration to pedestrian access that has been provided into the interior of the parcels. Regarding the comment related to the Field of Corn, there are some opportunities and believes it would be beneficial to have a discussion regarding mitigation of the traffic concerns. Although that issue may be unrelated to this parcel discussion, Dublin has some amazing amenities. It is important to address the issues without overburdening some parcels when it is possible to address them onsite or immediately adjacent to the site.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is supportive of either Concept A or B. He appreciates that the centralized park in Concept A is accessible to all users on the site. However, the parks that extend to the street become an amenity for the rest of the City. City residents are aware of the park because it is not hidden behind the building mass. He agrees with Mr. Christianson's suggestion to connect the vehicular access drive to the Field of Corn. Relative to the placemaking question, the answer may be that Concept B does create a better connection from the Field of Corn to the site in question. Perhaps the drive through the site in Concept B has a more parkway feel. He likes the architecture. In summary, he is satisfied with either concept.

Mr. Wilson stated that he likes Concept B a little better because of the flow of the streets through the site. There is a unique opportunity here to begin absorbing what is around the site, so that it can be part of the neighborhood. We are not imposing the site, but are designing the site within the surrounding space.

Ms. Newell stated that she prefers Concept B. The elongated park along the water features appears to incorporate all into one park. She is supportive of the architecture that is proposed. We like very well designed architecture in the City, which will be discussed in more detail as the application moves forward. She is glad to see this proposal for a PUD. It is the best way to respond to both our residential and corporate residents in the surrounding area and will result in the best project. Mr. Christianson does have some valid comments about the Field of Corn. Generally, however, there are only one or two vehicles there. The layout of the park is being dictated by the need for relocating a curbcut, so flipping the plan would not be an easy solution. Her final comment is in regard to the vehicular pathway through the site. It needs to be treated in a very aesthetic way to get the best development on this site, more than what we would typically for a service drive. When reusing these places with more urban development – alleys often can function with the restaurants at different hours as part of the amenity of the area. That might call for pavers or other amenities that will still permit traffic flow, but they become an aesthetic of the overall development. In the end, that will make a very successful project.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that he believes this could become an A- or B+ plan, or some combination of the two concepts. The market will drive who the end users are, but an attempt will be made to attract those preferred. Over the last year, they have not been able to identify the plan so have not pursued the end users. He does not like two elements about Concept B. He does not like how straight the driveway is that runs north to south. They do not want to create an excuse for someone to avoid the traffic light at Rings and Frantz roads and cut through this site. This site is intended to be very pedestrian friendly, with people playing in the park and programmed events in the park, or pedestrians moving from Frantz Road to the Cardinal Health site. The last thing desired is cut-through traffic.

Concept A has a more circuitous road through it, which will slow traffic. In Concept A, he likes that the office use at the northwest corner of the site gets the benefit of the water. In Concept B, it is tucked between retail and the road. If they want to attract the right office user, they should put that user on the water. The linear park in Concept B will not lend itself well to park activities. He prefers the northeast corner opportunity in Concept B. The park is there, and a restaurant on that corner would have the opportunity for outdoor seating that sits on the park. The pedestrian path extending west to Cardinal Health is intended to be a dedicated pathway from the bikepath on Frantz Road that runs through the park and past the ponds to Cardinal Health. That would be another reason they prefer not to have direct traffic moving north and south. From the streetscape perspective, the intention is to front Frantz Road with building facades and/or parks and/or outdoor seating, bringing the activity to and engaging the street. Finally, Mr. Christianson's comment is excellent. Perhaps they could add a small pocket park across from the Field of Corn, which potentially could be connected to the retail development that looks over the Field of Corn.

Ms. Fox stated that Mr. Ghidotti has created a plan that accurately addresses the DCAP. She is very happy to begin seeing the results of that plan. She likes Concept A and really likes the modern farmhouse architecture style. It relates to the Field of Corn and is unlike any other architecture in the community. Driving through this area and seeing the interesting architecture next to the Field of Corn will draw visitors to the site. She believes there is opportunity to massage the park plan in Concept A so that it is not necessarily one huge park. There is opportunity with the buildings to use the park as the focal point. With a linear park, the background disappears, and there is no intimacy. She is hopeful that the City will dedicate some space for creation of a natural green backdrop on the other side of the linear ponds. Concerning connectivity, she likes the idea that the road is circuitous. Today, it is also important to accommodate walking, biking, Lyft, Uber and shuttle transports.

Mr. Newell stated that she understands the marketing reasons for preferring Option A and understands Mr. Ghidotti's concern about the drive. She still prefers Option B because the park engages the street, and in the end, will create a more inviting place for the community, instead of it being isolated within the center. How the drive is treated, however, is very important. It should not be treated as a regular service drive, so it will not appear to be an optional cut-through path.

Mr. Wilson stated that there is a large amount of green area north of this site, which separates the street from the buildings. With this development, there is an established path for pedestrians and bikers, which we will want to continue.

~~4. Riviera West, 8205 Avery Road, 19-027PP, Preliminary Plat~~

~~Ms. Newell stated that this is a proposal for the subdivision of 13.56 acres, zoned Rural District for 11 single-family lots, two reserves, and a new public street~~

~~Case Presentation~~

~~Mr. Ridge stated this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council a Preliminary Plat creating 11 single-family lots, two reserves and one public street. Preliminary plats are required for the subdivision of land including the dedication of public right-of-way or open space.~~