Docusign Envelope ID: D9C7C964-C72A-8C69-81B2-84E6BBDFBB2B

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 9, 2026 | 6:30 p.m.

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

2. Monterey Village
26-028FDP **Final Development Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood and BSD-C, Bridge Street District – Commercial.
Location:	Both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/26-028

MOTION 1: Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the Parking Plan.

VOTE: 6-0

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent

MOTION 2: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the following Administrative Departures:

HISTORIC MIXED USE BUILDING TYPE

1. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Impervious Lot Coverage** to allow 90% lot coverage for Block 1 where a maximum of 85% is permitted.

Docusign Envelope ID: D9C7C964-C72A-8C69-81B2-84E6BBDFBB2B

2. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Mid-building Pedestrianway** to allow a building length of 161' for the western part of Building 1 where a maximum of 150' is permitted.

VOTE: 5-1

RESULT: The Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	No
Dan Garvin	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent

MOTION 3: Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the following Waivers:

LOTS AND BLOCKS

1. **Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) Maximum Block Size** to allow a future lot length of ±542 feet and a block perimeter of ±2,112 feet for Block 1, and a block length of ±964 feet (to Clover Court) with an incomplete perimeter for Block 2 where a maximum block length of 300' and the maximum block perimeter of 1,000' are permitted.

HISTORIC MIXED USE BUILDING TYPE

2. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Building Zone (RBZ)** to allow Building 4 to be located outside the required RBZ.
3. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(3) Parking Location** to allow parking along the sides of Buildings 3 and 4 where parking is only allowed at the rear of buildings.
4. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(b) Minimum Building Height** to allow each of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 and the western bay of Building 2 to be one story in height where a minimum of 1.5 stories is permitted.
5. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(b) Maximum Ground Story Height** to allow a ground story height of 16' for Buildings 1, 2, and 7; ±24'-8" for Building 3; ±28-10" for Building 4; ±28' for Building 5; and ±24'-4" for Building 6 where a maximum of 12' is permitted.
6. **153.062(O)(9)(b) Maximum Upper Story Height** to allow an upper story height of ±16'-8" for Building 7 where a maximum of 12' is permitted.
7. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(6) Roof Types** to allow flat/parapet roofs on parts of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and mansard roofs (with no dormers or cross gables) on parts of Buildings 3 and 7 where a pitched roof is required unless permitted with approval.
8. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Façade Materials** to allow the use of fiber cement panels, poly-ash composite siding, stucco, and terracotta tiles as primary building materials where permitted primary materials are stone, brick and wood siding.

Docusign Envelope ID: D9C7C964-C72A-8C69-81B2-84E6BBDFBB2B

9. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Mid-Building Pedestrianways** to allow exclusion of mid-building pedestrianways for Building 2 (200' in length), Building 5 (193 feet in length), and Building 7 (172 feet in length) where they are required for buildings great than 150' in length.

BUILDING TYPES

10. **153.062(E)(3)(c) Roof Materials** to allow Spanish (clay) roof tiles at Building 7 where cedar shake, slate or metal are required.

PARKING STRUCTURE BUILDING TYPE

11. **153.062(O)(11)(a)(2) Impervious Lot Coverage** to allow 90% lot coverage in Block 2 where a maximum of 80% is permitted.

OPEN SPACE TYPES

12. **153.064(G)(1)(a) Maximum Size** to allow a 2,100 square foot Pocket Plaza on the east side of Monterey Drive where the maximum size permitted is 1,200 square feet.

SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

13. **153.065(B)(7)(c)(1) Required Loading Spaces** to allow a single on-street loading space where 2 are required.
14. **153.065(D)(5)(c) Surface Parking and Circulation Area Landscaping** to allow tree grates/deciduous trees to fulfill this requirement for the parking area south of Building 1 where options include landscape islands with a maximum run of 12 parking spaces, interior tree lawn, or consolidated island.

VOTE: 5-1

RESULT: The Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	No
Dan Garvin	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent

MOTION 4: Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. That the necessary right-of-way at the north end of the added tract be dedicated to the City.
2. That the streetscape details of all public streets, including intersection widths and radii, loading zone parameters, and transitions to existing street conditions be coordinated with the City.

Docusign Envelope ID: D9C7C964-C72A-8C69-81B2-84E6BBDFBB2B

3. That modifications be made to the design of the surface parking south of Building 2 and/or to the entrances on the south elevation of that building to allow for proper pedestrian circulation in that area per the intent of the Bridge Street District and the Historic Transition Neighborhood.
4. That an intuitive pedestrian path be provided between the development site and Corbins Mill Drive through the shared parking area on the parcel to the west.
5. That bicycle parking be incorporated in the open space areas and/or in locations visible from the open spaces and the buildings' front doors.
6. That 2-3 electric car charging points be incorporated.
7. That connectivity to the Dublin Cemetery to the east and Monterey Park to the south be provided with locations to be coordinated with the City.
8. That the applicable tree replacement requirements be addressed at the Building and Site Permit stage.
9. That Building 7, including the parking structure, be shifted two feet to the west to maximize protection of the exiting trees along the east property line.
10. That the applicant coordinate with the City and the Dublin Arts Council to create an appropriate buffer from the cemetery expansion site without encroaching unto that site.
11. That the landscape plan be updated to meet all applicable requirements and provide appropriate buffering.
12. That the applicant continue to work with City staff on refining the architectural details, including the parking structure, and submit an Amended Final Development Plan for review and approval of the remaining architectural development standards and any other site or landscaping updates.
13. That a photometric plan and light fixture cut sheets be provided at the Building Permit stage to verify compliance with all applicable requirements.
14. That the applicant continue to work with the City Engineering staff on all utility and site-related issues, including the design and configuration of the stormwater detention needed for the site for both public and private improvements to properly account for known capacity concerns in the existing storm sewer system.

VOTE: 6-0

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes
Victoria Newell	Absent

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB125C5BED6456...

Bassem Bitar, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning

21. The applicant continues to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

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

Mr. Alexander returned to the dais.

Case #26-028FDP
Monterey Village
Request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood, and is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation
Tyler Puhl, The Wood Companies, 2536 West Lane Ave, Upper Arlington, addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. He opened by acknowledging the partnership with Mr. Bitar and his staff throughout the process and expressed enthusiasm for what he characterized as a game-changing retail project for the City of Dublin and the west side of State Route 315. He noted that the applicant's forty-four years of experience building the Short North in Columbus informed the urban design approach here, and that the opportunity to be one's own neighbor across the entire site distinguishes this project from that prior experience.
Mr. Puhl enumerated the major changes since the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) as follows: an increase in the size of the town square by twelve and a half percent, made possible by the acquisition of the adjacent property at 48 Corbins Mill Drive; the resultant ability to push the site boundary to the west, providing additional parking and reducing vehicular intrusion near the existing single-family home on the south; an expansion of Building 8; the relocation of the parking garage off the southern property line from eighteen feet to fifteen feet from the property line; and the elimination of a left-turn lane.
Mr. Puhl identified four discussion items he wished to address directly with the Commission. The first was the garage buffer from the property line. He stated that the staff report recommends maintaining an eighteen-foot buffer, whereas the applicant is requesting that the code minimum of fifteen feet be accepted. He explained that the motivation for the change was to widen the sidewalk along the eastern edge of the garage from ten feet to a dimension more appropriate for the level of street retail activity envisioned. He described a meeting with a tree consultant conducted on-site the previous day, during which the consultant assessed the existing hackberry trees along the property line. The consultant concluded that the difference between a fifteen-foot and eighteen-foot buffer is nominal, provided that specific protective measures are followed, including close-in root protection, protection of critical root zones, fencing, vertical mulching, growth regulation, root trenching, post-construction soil aeration, arborist monitoring, and regular watering. Mr. Puhl stated that the applicant does not wish to lose any trees along the cemetery and requested that the Commission consider whether the fifteen-foot buffer, which is allowable by code, is acceptable.
The second discussion item was the garage-to-cemetery connectivity. Mr. Puhl expressed support for the concept of connectivity between the development and the Dublin Cemetery but raised concerns about the practicality of routing pedestrians through the parking garage to access the cemetery grounds. He noted that the experience of walking through a garage to emerge directly onto grass, without paving, with a significant elevation change, without ADA compliance, and onto

the backside of gravestones, would not be a dignified or enjoyable approach. He also raised concerns about the impression that a garage, even a well-maintained one, makes on people visiting a cemetery. He proposed instead that the City consider creating a real, dedicated entrance at the south end of the site on the east side of Monterey Drive, with signage and appropriate paving, to draw people from the town square into the cemetery as a pleasant destination in its own right.
The third discussion item was the Corbins Mill pedestrian pathway. Mr. Puhl expressed support for creating a pedestrian pathway from the development to Corbins Mill Drive, but noted that the acquisition of 48 Corbins Mill was made for defensive traffic management purposes, specifically to provide a secondary vehicular egress so that patrons are not trapped in a queue on Monterey Drive waiting to turn onto Bridge Street. He stated that the purchase would result in a financial loss for the applicant and that imposing a heavily designed or burdensome pedestrian pathway on the site could jeopardize the acquisition. He proposed a striped pedestrian path through the parking area leading from the town square to Corbins Mill Drive, connecting to the sidewalk on the south side of the existing quilt shop building, as a practical and achievable solution while the site awaits eventual redevelopment.
The fourth discussion item was the architectural conditions language. Mr. Puhl asked that the conditions, where possible, be specific about what elements require refinement rather than broadly requiring architectural details to be reworked, so that the applicant has clear direction and can move forward efficiently toward an Amended Final Development Plan submittal.

Staff Presentation
Mr. Bitar presented the staff analysis, noting that this is a Final Development Plan application representing the third step in the Bridge Street District approval process. He explained that staff is recommending that the applicant return with an Amended Final Development Plan to finalize certain architectural details, with most of the outstanding items being those summarized by Mr. Puhl.
Mr. Bitar described the location of the site as immediately to the west of the Dublin Cemetery, noting the City-owned parcel at the southeast corner that is proposed to be traded for an equivalently sized tract at the southeast corner of the site for cemetery expansion purposes. He described the addition of the 48 Corbins Mill Drive parcel to the application since the PDP, noting its L-shaped configuration extending to West Bridge Street, and the resulting implication that a portion of the existing pavement is within what should be the highway easement and must be dedicated as right-of-way.
Mr. Bitar described the zoning context, noting that the site carries split zoning because the quilt shop parcel falls within the Bridge Street Commercial district, though the buildings themselves remain on the properly zoned portion of the site. He reviewed the surrounding zoning districts, including the Historic Public designation of the cemetery, which triggers a fifteen-foot buffer minimum, and the single-family residential use to the southwest, which also requires buffering.
Mr. Bitar described the evolution of the project from a retail-only Concept Plan presented in June 2025, through a Preliminary Development Plan featuring mixed-use buildings with office uses on the second floors of buildings along Bridge Street and the east side of Monterey Drive. He noted that conditions from the PDP have been substantially addressed, including enhanced sensitivity to the residential parcel to the southwest.
Mr. Bitar described the street network, noting that Longshore Drive and Mooney Street extensions will function as public streets dividing the block into two rectangular blocks. He discussed the streetscape design approach, noting that along Bridge Street the applicant is following the signature street standards including brick sidewalks, planters, and granite curbs, while along Monterey Drive they are deviating from the standard in a manner consistent with the adjacent Historic District by using brick sidewalks and asphalt on-street parking rather than the reverse. He

noted that staff would continue to coordinate on the transition between these street typologies to the south. He mentioned that a traffic signal is warranted and planned at the Monterey Drive and new East-West Street intersection, consistent with the traffic study submitted with the PDP.
Regarding administrative departures for the stie plan, Mr. Bitar described two minor departures: one for the western component of Building 1, which at 161 feet slightly exceeds the 150-foot maximum building frontage before a mid-block pedestrian way is required; and one for impervious lot coverage on the west side, which at ninety percent is just above the eighty-five percent maximum permitted for the parking structure building type. He expressed staff's comfort with both, given the context.
Mr. Bitar described four waivers: one for the maximum block size and perimeter on the west side, where the block will eventually extend to Corbins Mill and cannot be completed in the interim; one for the equivalent issue on the east side, where the cemetery precludes block completion; one for the required building zone along Monterey Drive, where Building 4 does not meet the ten-foot maximum setback from the property line because of the town square; and one for parking to the sides of buildings 3 and 4, as opposed to only to the rear. He expressed staff's support for all four.
Regarding the building pedestrian way waivers, Mr. Bitar noted that Buildings 2 and 7 also exceed the maximum frontage thresholds, at approximately 200 feet and 171 feet respectively, and described the layout constraints that make compliance impractical, while noting staff's support for waivers in those cases.
Mr. Bitar described four conditions related to the site plan: the right-of-way dedication for the Corbins Mill parcel frontage; modifications to the building entrances and parking configuration near Building 2, where limited pedestrian space exists between the parking stalls and the building; cemetery connectivity to be resolved in coordination with the City; and stormwater management details to be finalized with the Engineering Division.
Mr. Bitar described the submitted parking plan, which divides parking into zones and includes on-street parking, a 295-space garage, and parking at the 48 Corbins Mill parcel designated as Zone D. He noted that the total required parking, after code-permitted reductions for transit proximity and shared parking, is 473 spaces. The applicant is currently showing 476 spaces including the 57 anticipated from Zone D, which may ultimately be slightly reduced due to landscape requirements. Mr. Bitar expressed comfort that the intent of the parking requirements will be met. He also noted that the code requires loading spaces for buildings over 25,000 square feet, that two buildings exceed that threshold, and that the applicant is proposing one on-street loading space with a requested waiver, which staff supports. He identified the need for a pedestrian connection between Zone D and the main development as a condition to be addressed. He noted that bicycle parking concerns raised in the staff report had since been clarified, with all bicycle parking to be located on the first floor of the garage or outside, and that staff would continue to work with the applicant on placement near open spaces and building entrances. He recommended that the applicant consider two or three EV charging stations.
Regarding open space, Mr. Bitar described the east-side pocket plaza adjacent to the garage entrance and the town square as the two qualifying open space types, both of which are permitted within the Historic Transition Neighborhood. He noted that the development well exceeds the open space area requirement. He noted a waiver needed for the pocket plaza exceeding its maximum size limit, which he supported given the layout. He described the condition requiring work on cemetery connectivity and a condition regarding connectivity to the Monterey Park tennis courts.
Mr. Bitar described the significant trees around the perimeter and within the site, noting that a substantial number must be removed due to grading, building locations, parking, and utilities. He described the code requirements for tree replacement and the exemptions available within the BSD code for trees located where buildings or public streets are required. He noted that other areas,

including the town square and parking lots, are not exempt from replacement requirements and would need to be addressed through new planting, fee payment, or other agreements. He expressed concern about the loss of the existing buffer on the western side of the property.

Mr. Bitar addressed the garage buffer question, noting that the existing hackberry trees are quite large, that their canopy overlaps the garage footprint, and that some structural elements appear to extend beyond the fifteen-foot line. He expressed staff's view that the balance between the wider sidewalk and the health of the trees deserves careful consideration, framing the staff recommendation of eighteen feet as an effort to protect the trees rather than a categorical prohibition of fifteen feet.

On the landscape plan, Mr. Bitar identified several areas requiring attention: the northern edge of the Corbins Mill parcel, where landscaping opportunities exist to soften the appearance and buffer the adjacent gas station; the need for additional trees in the parking area along the west side of the site; the commitment to a six-foot cedar fence along the southwestern residential parcel boundary with preserved trees, shrubs, and an allowance for additional neighbor landscaping; the absence of parking lot landscape islands meeting code requirements in certain parking areas; and the need for a creative buffer treatment at the south property line near the garage ramp, in coordination with the City and the arts community. He also noted the need for updated landscape standards documentation.

On lighting, Mr. Bitar noted that no photometric plan had been received and recommended that one be provided at the time of permitting.

On architecture, Mr. Bitar confirmed that staff is recommending certain elements be finalized at the Amended Final Development Plan stage while acting on others this evening. He described the two building types in use: the Historic Mixed-Use type and the Parking Structure type. He noted that the buildings surrounding the town square, while as tall as two-story structures, are technically one-story buildings with high ceilings, which require waivers since they fall below the minimum 1.5-story requirement. He described the ground story height waiver needed for all buildings, as the proposed sixteen-foot ground floor height exceeds the twelve-foot code maximum.

Mr. Bitar described the proposed primary materials for each building group. Buildings along Bridge Street and on the east side of Monterey Drive will feature brick on the ground floor and fiber cement composite siding on the upper floors, painted white. He stated that most of these materials have been approved in prior applications in the District, and expressed comfort with the waivers needed. He noted that certain details, including transparency requirements and entrance locations, will be finalized at the amended FDP stage.

For Buildings 3 and 4, Mr. Bitar described proposed materials including stucco and terracotta tiles at the base, neither of which is listed as a permitted primary material, and noted that the roof types proposed, including flat roofs and a mansard-style element, require waivers from the pitched-roof requirement of the code. He expressed comfort with all of these given the overall design intent.

Mr. Bitar raised a specific concern about the western facades of Buildings 4 and 5, which are service areas but are visible from the public realm. He noted that the applicant is proposing a concrete masonry unit product designed to resemble brick, with public art, trellises, and shutters to break up those elevations, and invited the Commission's input on the adequacy of that approach. He noted a request for assurances about the longevity of the color retention of the CMU material. For Building 5, he described a stretch of otherwise blank brick on the south elevation facing the new public street, which had been divided with piers and storefronts on the east side but which warrants further attention. For Building 6, he described display windows that, while not technically transparent, serve to break up the facade and noted that a waiver would be required. For Building 7, he described the garage-integrated structure, its frontage on Monterey, its facades around the

pocket plaza, and the east and south sides facing the cemetery and the cemetery expansion parcel, all in the CMU brick-look material. He expressed appreciation for the honest design approach while noting that the scale of the parking structure against the cemetery is somewhat stark, and stated that there are opportunities to break down the massing creatively given the requirement for a secondary material on a structure of this size. He shared a photograph taken from within the cemetery showing the existing trees and the position where the garage wall would appear, noting that the structure would be visible even in full foliage.
Mr. Bitar noted that Building 8, the jewel box structure at the front of the public square, was the least detailed in the submission and that staff looks forward to reviewing those materials further.
He described the material board, which features multiple colors of brick including painted brick, the CMU brick-look product in gray, terracotta tiles, clay tile roofing, composite siding in multiple colors, fiber cement panels, and stucco. He stated that a clay tile roof proposed on Building 7, while not listed as a primary material, is supported by a waiver. He noted that the applicant has shown variety in roof lines and penetrations across the building groups and invited the Commission's feedback on whether building variety requirements are considered met.
Mr. Bitar summarized that two administrative departures and fourteen waivers are recommended for approval. He confirmed that all Final Development Plan criteria have been met, either outright or through conditions, administrative departures, or waivers, and recommended approval of the parking plan, the two administrative departures, the fourteen waivers, and the Final Development Plan subject to the stated conditions.

Commission Questions
Mr. Alexander asked whether the lot coverage calculations included the open space. Staff confirmed that they did. He asked whether the trees along the east property line would need to be limbed up to accommodate the garage structure, and staff indicated that some limbing would likely be necessary. Mr. Alexander asked the applicant whether adding a level to the parking garage had been considered to reduce surface coverage. Mr. Puhl responded that the team had not pursued that option out of concern about overwhelming the cemetery with additional height. Mr. Alexander asked whether the team had considered using shared parking at the adjacent Casto shopping center. Mr. Puhl acknowledged that this had not been formally pursued, but that employee parking there could make sense and he would explore it.
Mr. Alexander observed that the architectural elevations had meaningfully improved since the Preliminary Development Plan and praised the work done in response to Commission and staff feedback. However, he raised a concern about the front elevation of Building 7 along Monterey Drive, noting that what had previously shown offsetting planes in the facade now appeared as a flat surface with applied material changes that resembled wallpaper rather than genuine architectural massing variation. He requested that the applicant explore reintroducing offsets in the facade plane. Mr. Puhl confirmed that this was something the team could look at. Mr. Alexander also raised a question about sustainability, noting that the City describes itself as the most sustainable, connected, and resilient global city of choice, and asked how the development, which creates a significant impervious heat island, was advancing that goal. Mr. Puhl responded that the primary sustainability contribution of the development was walkability — allowing residents and visitors to park once and move through the area on foot — and acknowledged that geothermal or solar elements were not feasible at this stage. In response to a follow-up question, he indicated that pervious pavement was something the team could investigate, though it carried higher costs.

Mr. Garvin asked the applicant whether the arborist had provided a specific estimate of tree loss associated with the difference between 15 and 18 feet of setback. Mr. Puhl indicated that a detailed

species list was available but that generally the maples in that area would fare well while the black walnuts would be more vulnerable. Mr. Garvin expressed concern about the east wall of the garage facing the cemetery and asked what ideas had been considered to screen or mitigate that edge. Mr. Puhl confirmed that the team was looking forward to returning with an Amended Final Development Plan that included a full rendering and a landscape plan to soften that edge. He also spoke to the design philosophy of using a single material on the garage, arguing that in historically grounded districts, restraint in material use can be powerful when paired with good landscaping. Mr. Garvin expressed his general support for the project, noting the welcome departure from all-residential proposals, and identified the garage-cemetery interface and the presence of blank walls as his principal remaining concerns.

Ms. Harter raised a concern about the concentration of head-in parking visible from Monterey Drive, noting that it contrasted with Dublin's more typical parallel street parking approach and felt heavy in character. Mr. Puhl explained that head-in parking was critical to the viability of the retail program, using a teaser parking analogy to describe how the visual availability of convenient parking attracts patrons who then stay longer. He described the building bump-outs along Monterey Drive as designed to screen that parking from the pedestrian realm as much as possible. Ms. Harter asked whether the existing library parking to the north could serve overflow needs as part of a broader walkability strategy. Mr. Bitar confirmed that the long-term vision for the Bridge Street corridor included improving walkability and pedestrian connections so that parking areas could be shared more naturally across destinations. Ms. Harter also inquired about the siding profile being used on the buildings, noting that a wider lap profile might be more historically appropriate. Abbie Stiers, The Columbus Architectural Studio, 405 North Front Street, Columus, clarified that the siding selected was a thicker product — a Borrel Ash material with a true wood-like profile — applied in a four-inch size consistent with historic precedent. Mr. Bitar indicated that actual material samples would be reviewed at the Amended Final Development Plan stage. Ms. Harter also asked whether noise from the development had been considered in relation to the surrounding neighborhood, and Mr. Puhl stated that the team had strict lease provisions limiting exterior speakers and late-night operations, drawing on experience in the Short North.

Mr. Chinnock asked for clarification on Zone D parking and whether it was a formal part of the parking count. Mr. Bitar confirmed that Zone D represented shared parking from 48 Corbins Mill Drive and was included in the total, though the final count might be slightly lower than the theoretical 57 spaces once landscape requirements were factored in. Staff confirmed comfort with the overall parking approach. Mr. Chinnock also raised the pedestrian access concern behind Building 2, noting a pinch point between parked vehicles and building entrances. Staff acknowledged this and suggested options including recessing doorways or removing one parking space to accommodate landscaping and pedestrian flow. Mr. Chinnock asked about the parapet height on the top level of the parking garage, specifically whether parked cars on the rooftop level would be visible from the cemetery. Mr. Puhl confirmed that the parapet height of 4 feet 6 inches would prevent cars from being visible above the parapet.

Ms. Damaser confirmed that she understood the tree replacement plan to be largely set, with the Amended Final Development Plan addressing landscape refinements rather than a fundamental redesign. She reiterated her concern about tree loss and urged the applicant to preserve as many trees as possible. She expressed appreciation for the design changes made since the Preliminary Development Plan, particularly the improved transition from the historic district to the surrounding

commercial context. She noted her support for the white building palette in principle, though she shared Mr. Alexander's interest in seeing further articulation on Building 7.

Mr. Way raised a concern about the courtyard corners along Monterey Drive, noting that the plan appeared to have privatized both the north and south corners of the town square with fenced outdoor dining areas, disrupting the continuity of the ground-level retail edge. Mr. Puhl stated that this was not the intended design and that a revised plan addressing those corners would be presented at the Amended Final Development Plan stage. Mr. Way also noted that renderings showed outdoor dining tables along West Bridge Street but that no outdoor dining area appeared to be allocated in the site plan. Mr. Puhl confirmed that discussions with staff were underway regarding a sidewalk dining encroachment agreement within the public right-of-way, consistent with other approved arrangements in the District. Mr. Bitar confirmed that as long as adequate sidewalk width for pedestrian circulation could be maintained, such an agreement was feasible.
Mr. Way raised the issue of the ADA parking layout within the garage, noting that some ADA spaces appeared to be located near stairwells rather than elevators, which seemed counterintuitive. Ms. Stiers confirmed that the ADA parking layout had already been revised since the submittal to relocate most spaces near the central entry and elevator, with one exception at the second-floor office entrance accessed via the ramp.
Mr. Way returned to the question of tree preservation, noting that the plan showed trees along the east and west edges of the site with very limited room to survive given the proposed construction footprint. He encouraged the applicant to consider systems that facilitate root growth under paving and to look at whether minor adjustments to building walls could create additional buffer space, particularly along the east side of the garage and the west edge near the existing house. Mr. Puhl acknowledged this goal, reiterating that the arborist had provided a protocol for maximizing tree survival within the available setback.
Mr. Way raised a question about building length waivers for Buildings 1 and 7, observing that minor plan adjustments could potentially eliminate the need for those waivers. Deputy Director Bitar acknowledged that Building 1 was only marginally over the threshold and that the placement of the garage entrance and the plaza location on Building 7 made the waiver reasonable. Mr. Way also observed that the east facade of Building 2, adjacent to the cemetery buffer, presented a logical opportunity for a pedestrian pathway connecting to West Bridge Street, which would both improve access from the east and partially address the mid-block connectivity requirement that currently necessitated a waiver. Mr. Puhl confirmed support for a sidewalk connection along the east side of Building 2. He noted that a similar connection along the west side of Building 1 would be more complicated due to utility and easement constraints, but agreed to explore it.
Mr. Way asked the applicant to address the Corbins Mill connectivity requirement more specifically. Mr. Puhl reiterated that the acquisition of 48 Corbins Mill Drive was financially challenging and that a striped pedestrian path through the parking area was the most the team could commit to at this time, while promising that full pedestrian connectivity would be realized when the parcel was eventually redeveloped. Mr. Way acknowledged this but emphasized that the commission viewed the Corbins Mill connection as a long-standing planning priority for the area, and that the development should lay the groundwork for that link even if the full buildout was incremental.

Public Comment
Mr. Way opened the floor for public comment.

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin, representing the Waterford Village neighborhood, stated that a majority of neighbors remained supportive of the development but that significant

concerns about pedestrian safety and traffic impact persisted. She reported that neighborhood representatives had met with city staff following the last Planning and Zoning Commission hearing. Specific requests discussed included a flashing stop sign or flashing pedestrian crossing at Monterey Drive and Clover Court, which the City found unwarranted at that time but offered to address with a highly visible crosswalk treatment instead. The neighborhood had also requested a traffic deterrent at the southern end of the development to prevent cut-through traffic into Waterford Village. The City indicated there was insufficient space for a small roundabout as proposed, and the neighborhood was preparing additional documentation, including video data on stop-sign compliance, to support future requests. Ms. Salva also expressed support for the secondary exit via Corbins Mill, noting that without it, the neighborhood would likely become a cut-through for development traffic.

Mary Ann Clark, 146 Corbins Mill, Dublin, expressed concern on behalf of Corbins Mill residents that increased traffic from the development would impact a street with narrow sidewalks, school buses, and residential on-street parking. She requested that if a Corbins Mill access point were created, it be designed as a right-turn-only egress to West Bridge Street to limit traffic volumes on the residential street.

Gene Bostic, 7143 Coffman Road, Dublin, spoke in support of the development on behalf of the Dublin Cemetery, expressing appreciation for the property dedication that would allow cemetery expansion. He described a vision for a modern memorial garden on the new parcel, featuring scatter areas, inscribed stones, and natural landscaping rather than a traditional cemetery format. He expressed hope that the project would proceed and indicated that he anticipated returning to the Commission in future years with additional cemetery expansion proposals.

With no further members of the public wishing to comment, Mr. Way closed the public comment period.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Alexander expressed general support for the project and its urban design approach. His principal reservation was the degree of impervious surface coverage given that the site starts from a blank slate, in contrast to situations where applicants are constrained by existing conditions. He expressed openness to the all-white building palette, noting that treating a single building composition in one color was historically appropriate. He emphasized the value of genuine massing variation over surface-applied material changes to achieve architectural variety.

Mr. Garvin expressed support for the project and affirmed his appreciation for the use mix, specifically noting that a non-residential-only development was refreshing. He reiterated his two principal concerns: the visual impact of the parking garage on the cemetery, and the presence of blank walls on the back-of-house facades. He asked that those elements be carefully addressed at the Amended Final Development Plan stage.

Ms. Harter thanked the applicant and acknowledged the improvements made since prior hearings. She emphasized the importance of maintaining ongoing communication with adjacent neighbors and the cemetery throughout the construction and operational phases. She noted that the amount of surface parking remained heavier than ideal and encouraged the team to continue exploring ways to reduce or better screen it.

Mr. Chinnock expressed strong overall support, complimenting the team on the quality of the architectural design and their responsiveness to prior feedback. He indicated his general openness to the 15-foot garage setback and emphasized that the Commission's priority should be pedestrian access, noting a willingness to sacrifice parking spaces if necessary to improve pedestrian connectivity. He raised the growing importance of the west-facing facades of buildings 4 and 5 as the site's relationship to Corbins Mill expanded through parcel acquisitions, and urged the team to treat those as significant facades in the amended Final Development Plan.

Ms. Damaser expressed support for the project and reiterated her appreciation for the design improvements. She urged continued engagement with the neighborhood on safety concerns and expressed a preference for seeing the garage-to-cemetery buffer and landscape treatment resolved carefully. She expressed openness to a reduction in parking requirements if it allowed for more permeable surface and open space.

Mr. Way expressed consistent support for the project since its first introduction to the Commission, describing it as something genuinely unique to Dublin's development landscape. He identified connectivity — both pedestrian and vehicular — and the cemetery garage interface as the central concerns for the Commission. He stated that the Dublin Cemetery should be understood as a park asset, and that the garage facade along that edge must reflect that relationship. He confirmed that he does not support the addition of a condition specifying 15 or 18 feet for the garage setback, preferring to allow staff and the applicant to continue working through those details through the engineering and permitting process.

Following discussion, the Commission offered consensus that the 14 conditions as recommended by staff adequately captured the outstanding items discussed during the hearing, including the garage-cemetery interface, the Amended Final Development Plan architectural review, pedestrian connectivity, landscaping, stormwater management, and right-of-way dedication. The record was noted to reflect commission support for the pedestrian walkway along the east side of Building 2 connecting to West Bridge Street, which staff confirmed was consistent with the conditions as written.

Mr. Puhl sought clarification on whether the building footprints as approved tonight would be considered fixed for purposes of site plan submission. Mr. Bitar and Mr. Boggs cautioned against codifying specific numerical constraints in the conditions, noting that minor engineering refinements through the platting and permitting process would inevitably necessitate small adjustments and that strict conditions could create unnecessary complications. The Commission affirmed general comfort with the footprints as shown, while acknowledging that the parking garage setback remained a matter for staff and the applicant to resolve collaboratively. Ms. Rose noted that site permit submission could proceed following tonight's approval, but that building permit issuance would require completion of the plat process and resolution of property ownership and right-of-way issues related to the city-owned parcel.

Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the Parking Plan.

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

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the following Administrative Departures:

1. Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Impervious Lot Coverage to allow 90% lot coverage for Block 1 where a maximum of 85% is permitted.
2. Section 153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Mid-building Pedestrianway to allow a building length of 161′ for the western part of Building 1 where a maximum of 150′ is permitted.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Alexander, no.
[Motion carried 5-1.]

Mr. Garvin moved, Ms. Harter seconded approval of the following Waivers:

LOTS AND BLOCKS

1. **Section 153.060(C)(2)(a) Maximum Block Size** to allow a future lot length of ±542 feet and a block perimeter of ±2,112 feet for Block 1, and a block length of ±964 feet (to Clover Court) with an incomplete perimeter for Block 2 where the maximum block length is 300′ and the maximum block perimeter is 1,000′.

HISTORIC MIXED USE BUILDING TYPE

2. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Building Zone (RBZ)** to allow a Building 4 to be located outside the required RBZ.
3. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(a)(3) Parking Location** to allow parking along the sides of Buildings 3 and 4 where parking is allowed at the rear of buildings.
4. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(b) Minimum Building Height** to allow each of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 and the western bay of Building 2 to be one story in height where a minimum of 1.5 stories is permitted.
5. **Section 153.062(O)(9)(b) Maximum Ground Story Height** to allow a ground story height of 16′ for Buildings 1, 2, and 7; ±24′-8″ for Building 3; ±28′-10″ for Building 4; ±28′ for Building 5; and ±24′-4″ for Building 6 where a maximum of 12′ is permitted.
6. **153.062(O)(9)(b) Maximum Upper Story Height** to allow an upper story height of ±16′-8″ for Building 7 where a maximum of 12′ is permitted.
7. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(6) Roof Types** to allow flat/parapet roofs on parts of Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and mansard roofs (with no dormers or cross gables) on parts of Buildings 3 and 7 where a pitched roof is required unless permitted with approval.
8. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Façade Materials** to allow the use of fiber cement panels, poly-ash composite siding, stucco, and terracotta tiles as primary building materials where permitted primary materials are stone, brick and wood siding.
9. **153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Mid-Building Pedestrianways** to allow exclusion of mid-building pedestrianways for Building 2 (200′ in length), Building (193 feet in length), and Building 7 (172 feet in length) where they are required for buildings great than 150′ in length.

BUILDING TYPES

10. **153.062(E)(3)(c) Roof Materials** to allow Spanish (clay) roof tiles at Building 7 where cedar shake, slate or metal are required.

PARKING STRUCTURE BUILDING TYPE

11. **153.062(O)(11)(a)(2) Impervious Lot Coverage** to allow 90% lot coverage in Block 2 where a maximum of 8% is permitted.

OPEN SPACE TYPES

12. **153.064(G)(1)(a) Maximum Size** to allow a 2,100 square foot pocket plaza on the east side of Monterey Drive where the maximum size permitted is 1,200 square feet.

SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

13. **153.065(B)(7)(c)(1) Required Loading Spaces** to allow a single on-street loading space where 2 are required.
14. **153.065(D)(5)(c) Surface Parking and Circulation Area Landscaping** to allow tree grates/deciduous trees to fulfill this requirement for the parking area south of Building 1 where options include landscape islands with a maximum run of 12 parking spaces, interior tree lawn, or consolidated island.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes;.
[Motion carried 5-1.]

Mr. Garvin moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. That the necessary right-of-way at the north end of the added tract be dedicated to the City.
2. That the streetscape details of all public streets, including intersection widths and radii, loading zone parameters, and transitions to existing street conditions be coordinated with the City.
3. That modifications be made to the design of the surface parking south of Building 2 and/or to the entrances on the south elevation of that building to allow for proper pedestrian circulation in that area per the intent of the Bridge Street District and the Historic Transition Neighborhood.
4. That an intuitive pedestrian path be provided between the development site and Corbins Mill Drive through the shared parking area on the parcel to the west.
5. That bicycle parking be incorporated in the open space areas and/or in locations visible from the open spaces and the buildings' front doors.
6. That 2-3 electric car charging points be incorporated.
7. That connectivity to the Dublin Cemetery to the east and Monterey Park to the south be provided with locations to be coordinated with the City.
8. That the applicable tree replacement requirements be addressed at the Building and Site Permit stage.
9. That Building 7, including the parking structure, be shifted two feet to the west to maximize protection of the existing trees along the east property line.
10. That the applicant coordinate with the City and the Dublin Arts Council to create an appropriate buffer from the cemetery expansion site without encroaching unto that site.

11. That the landscape plan be updated to meet all applicable requirements and provide appropriate buffering.
12. That the applicant continue to work with City staff on refining the architectural details, including the parking structure, and submit an Amended Final Development Plan for review and approval of the remaining architectural development standards and any other site or landscaping updates.
13. That a photometric plan and light fixture cut sheets be provided at the Building Permit stage to verify compliance with all applicable requirements.
14. That the applicant continue to work with the City Engineering staff on all utility and site-related issues, including the design and configuration of the stormwater detention needed for the site for both public and private improvements to properly account for known capacity concerns in the existing storm sewer system.

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

~~COMMUNICATIONS~~

~~Mr. Bitar reminded commission members of the joint training session with the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Architectural Review Board scheduled for the following Thursday evening at the Development Building, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. He noted that Mr. Boggs would begin the session, followed by a presentation from a planning consultant on meeting management and conflict resolution, drawing on material recently presented at the APA conference.~~

~~Ms. Damaser raised a clerical matter regarding the previously approved June 11 meeting minutes. She questioned a word (anachronistic) on page 8 under Commission Discussion. Mr. Garvin stated that the word as recorded was not necessarily incorrect given the context, and the Commission agreed to authorize a clerical correction at staff's discretion.~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Harter seconded to authorize Ms. Maxwell to make a clerical correction to the June 11 meeting minutes if necessary.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 6-0.]~~

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:37 pm.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council

Docusign Envelope ID: 8E4391A2-D5A7-88A7-8089-36E1C673A2AE

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 5, 2026 | 6:30 p.m.

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

2. Monterey Square
25-093PDP **Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal:	Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood, and is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.
Location:	191 and 201 W. Bridge Street and PIDs: 273-000205, 273-000207, 273-000209, 273-000210, 273-000211, 273-000212, 273-000213, 273-000214, 273-000215, 273-000216, 273-000217
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-093

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

1) The applicant shall continue to coordinate with City staff on finalizing the streetscape details of all streets, including the W. Bridge Street/Monterey Drive intersection design and number of left-turn lanes, and the treatment along the south side of the new Neighborhood Street.
2) The applicant shall work with staff to explore reducing the width of the drive aisles.
3) The applicant shall work with staff to explore increasing the width of the buffer along the west side to allow screening of the adjacent single-family residential property and preservation of trees on both sides of the property line.
4) The applicant shall work with staff to explore providing a buffer along the south side of the site east of Monterey Drive to meet the required setback and provide screening for the cemetery expansion.
5) The applicant shall continue to work with the City Engineering staff on the design and configuration of the stormwater detention needed for the site for both public and private improvements to properly account for known capacity concerns in the existing storm sewer system.
6) The applicant shall explore all available alternatives to retain as many healthy/desirable trees as possible.

Docusign Envelope ID: 8E4391A2-D5A7-88A7-8089-36E1C673A2AE

7) The applicant shall consider adding a true upper story above at least some of the buildings around the town square.

8) The buildings' massing, roof forms, facades, and design details shall be refined to further complement the interior layout and reflect traditional design patterns.
9) Fenestration or further articulation shall be added to all blank walls.
10) Additional design elements that provide a sensitive backdrop to the cemetery shall be added to the east and south facades of the parking structure.
11) The applicant shall work with staff and the Dublin Arts Council, as applicable, to identify location(s) for public art for inclusion in the Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 7-0

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB123C5BED0456...

Bassem Bitar, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with a text modifications to allow outdoor recreational courts. The 6.63-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District - Vista Community Church.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Harter seconded tabling of Case #25-090AFDP

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

Case #25-093PDP
Monterey Square – Preliminary Development Plan
Request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood, and is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation
Mark Wood, 3055 Glenwood Parkway, Columbus, thanked the Commission and expressed excitement about sharing updates to their Monterey Village development plan. He stated that their goal was to advance a development that would be both a destination-worthy development and a prized community asset for Dublin residents. He described the vision as a high-character, pedestrian-focused community gathering spot featuring sophisticated yet approachable retail, where he would want to spend time with his family and friends.

Tyler Puhl, President, Wood Company, 2536 West Lane Avenue, Columbus, explained their goal was not to create just another commercial development but a true village center that always felt like it should have been in Dublin. He emphasized the organizing idea was envisioning the public space as a community gathering space, layered with first-class architecture and historic materials familiar to visitors, shoppers, and residents.
Mr. Puhl detailed the project, stating they were proposing 140,000 square feet broken down into small buildings to create a built-over-time feeling. He explained the development would intentionally transition from a two-story atmosphere along Bridge Street down to the square, then flow to one-story backs of buildings F and E2 into the residential neighborhood. He highlighted they were dedicating or making non-developable almost three-quarters of an acre, demonstrating their commitment to working with Dublin.
He described their vision for Monterey Drive as a neighborhood main street that Dublin does not really have, different from High Street which has significant vehicular traffic. He noted parking would be secondary but usable, with the project designed to grow into future connections toward Corbins Mill. He explained they had added more second-floor space per the Commission's previous feedback, with buildings A, B, and C along Bridge Street intended for office space serving small users and professional services. The garage design had changed from two stories to three stories, creating opportunities for second-floor office or retail/restaurant uses.
Mr. Puhl outlined changes from the Concept Plan, including elimination of the service road behind the garage to create an 18-foot buffer zone for tree protection near the cemetery, increased height and second-floor use along Bridge Street, expansion of Monterey Drive's right-of-way from 50 to 60 feet, addition of a pedestrian cut-through in building E, false second stories around the square, and nearly 200 percent increase in pedestrian space in the square by removing the roadway.

He presented various renderings showing the two-story expression with white brick and white stucco materials in the style of Palisades Village in California, transitioning to more historic materials on the back of the site. He highlighted special features including decorative stairways with tile risers and interesting railings, similar to Highland Park Village in Dallas. The streetscape would feature concrete curbs without pavers on the roadway but with brick pavers along sidewalks matching the Dublin church frontage.
Mr. Puhl emphasized the central green space as the anchor of the project, with the code minimum of 2,500 square feet being exceeded by ten times. He expressed concern that adhering too closely to code requirements might push them toward a one-story pitched roof outlet mall, which nobody would want. He stressed their willingness to invest in creating a lasting environment focused on architectural quality, open space, and pedestrian-focused walkability.

Staff Presentation
Mr. Bitar gave the staff presentation. He explained that this is a part of a multi-step review process. He noted the Commission had seen a Concept Plan in June during the non-binding feedback stage, and this Preliminary Development Plan requires determination and approval but is not the final step. Following approval, the project would move to Final Development Plan stage with Preliminary and Final Plats.
Mr. Bitar described the site location on both sides of Monterey Drive south of Bridge Street, including a City-owned parcel at the southeast corner where a gas station once stood. The proposal includes trading the City-owned parcel for land at the southeast corner for future cemetery expansion. He explained the various zoning districts surrounding the site, with the cemetery to the east in Historic Public zoning, three parcels fronting Corbins Mill in the Bridge Street Commercial District; and the southern cemetery portion in Bridge Street Public.
He reviewed the future land use designation as Mixed-Use Village, intended to create a pedestrian-oriented district respectful of the adjacent Historic District, with principal uses being office, retail, civic, single-family commercial, and food establishments. Supporting uses includes multi-family, with the form being one to three stories, emphasizing open space and walkability with parking as secondary.
Mr. Bitar reciewed the feedback from the Concept Plan review, noting the Commission had supported the overall layout and open space and appreciated the communication with neighbors. Concerns had been raised about the primarily retail/restaurant focus, which lead to the addition of office components. Traffic and connectivity concerns had also been discussed, including the potential need for a signal at the Bridge Street and Monterey Drive intersection.
He detailed changes, including a traffic study that indicates a signal would be warranted; the 18-foot buffer on the east side with no curb cuts to preserve trees and respect the cemetery, and adjustments to street characteristics. He acknowledged staff's preference would have been for the parking structure on the west side but understands the site geometry challenges. The east-west connector is now designated as a public street rather than private, and streetscape elements differ slightly from Bridge Street District standards but remain consistent with the surrounding Historic District.
Mr. Bitar reviewed compliance with plans and code requirements, noting all proposed uses were permitted within the Historic Transition Neighborhood. Parking calculations indicate compliance with code requirements pending finalization of a parking plan at Final Development Plan stage. He identified several potential waivers including block length and perimeter exceeding limits; required building zone requirements for building E1; minimum front property line coverage falling slightly short for buildings E2 and F; lot coverage exceeding limits especially on the east side; parking structure setback concerns; and pedestrian way spacing requirements.

He discussed open space provisions, with the town square meeting plaza open space type requirements and exceeding minimum open space size. The code's promotion of connectivity among open spaces was achieved through pedestrian ways creating connections from Bridge Street through the development to the park.
Regarding landscaping and tree preservation, Mr. Bitar noted many healthy trees on site would need removal to create the urban streetscape, but code promotes preserving as many as possible. He encouraged examining opportunities to preserve more trees, especially along the west property line where pavement comes within feet of the property line and underground storage tanks might affect critical root zones. He noted there is a minimum 10-foot buffer requirement for the single-family residential structure on the southwest corner.
For building types and architecture, Mr. Bitar explained the historic Mixed-Use building type had minimum requirements of one and a half stories and maximum of two and a half, with the proposed buildings along Bridge Street and east side meeting the requirements except for the smaller components. Buildings around the square would technically require height waivers, as they are one story with false second floors. Most buildings exceed the maximum 12-foot, first-story ceiling height with proposed 16-foot ceilings, which requires waivers.
He expressed staff concerns about the proposed buildings around the square having significant unused upper floor space and recommendsg the applicant consider creating usable space, either for office or limited residential units to provide evening activity and different peak parking hours. He noted there are concerns about blank walls on building backs and suggested additional articulation beyond the proposed ivy treatments.
Regarding materials, Mr. Bitar noted the Historic Mixed-Use building type lists brick, stone, and wood siding as primary materials with specific percentages required. The applicant has proposed additional materials that might be appropriate pending further detail review.
Mr. Bitar concluded that staff believes the 15 criteria for Preliminary Development Plan review were either met or would be met with conditions and future waivers and recommends approval with 10 conditions.

Commission Questions
Mr. Garvin asked staff to clarify areas considered "too busy" architecturally. Mr. Bitar explained the concern was about exterior buildings and interior buildings working together cohesively, particularly regarding future signage and individual building entrances. Mr. Garvin asked about treatment at the dead-end by building C where the southern street had been removed. Mr. Puhl acknowledged this needed attention for the cemetery border. Regarding articulated roofs, Mr. Puhl stated that variation in roof types added interest to the project. When asked about ivy on the cemetery-facing garage side, Mr. Puhl clarified the garage would be masonry on all four sides with ivy intended for the retail building backs.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the different architectural approaches on the Bridge Street and Monterey Drive elevations was intentional. Mr. Puhl confirmed it was purposeful, with Monterey Drive featuring more identifiable historical building types, while Bridge Street would have a fresh, white California-inspired theme. Mr. Alexander asked about creating continuity around buildings and consistent fenestration. Mr. Puhl explained concerns about retailers covering windows with black coverings in back-of-house areas, preferring solid building materials unless retailers specifically wanted customer-facing rear entrances. When asked about alternatives to ivy for breaking up flat surfaces, Mr. Puhl said they were in early stages but welcomed suggestions.

Ms. Harter asked about proposed wood shingles and whether they were similar to those being replaced elsewhere in the City. Mr. Bitar confirmed wood shingles were proposed particularly for building H, noting Dublin has other locations where people now want to replace them. She inquired about the learning curve for on-street parking along Bridge Street. Mr. Bitar explained this would be part of the corridor study with careful vetting if implemented. Ms. Harter asked about straight-in parking efficiency versus other configurations. Mr. Bitar confirmed perpendicular parking was most efficient for the site, with parallel requiring more space and diagonal necessitating one-way circulation.
Regarding the Bridge Street cemetery sidewalk improvements, Mr. Bitar confirmed this would be part of the study including streetscape elements and planters. Ms. Harter asked about public access to the decorative stairway. Mr. Puhl explained it would be open to the public as the best pathway to the second-level garage, with a door to second-floor office space allowing workers to access ground-floor amenities. She confirmed no phasing was planned, with Mr. Puhl stating that they want to deliver every building at once for a proper grand opening. Ms. Harter noted the importance of continuing neighbor outreach and suggested reaching out to nearby businesses like Kroger.

Mr. Chinnock expressed concern about the timing of Route 161 and Bridge Street improvements relative to creating a pedestrian-eager community area without safe access. Ms. Wawszkiewicz from Transportation Mobility confirmed they would coordinate phasing and support all transportation modes along the corridor despite pinch points like the cemetery. She noted the goal was creating a holistic corridor rather than an island.
Mr. Chinnock asked about tree preservation along the cemetery buffer. Mr. Bitar clarified some trees would be removed per the preservation plan, but they wanted to maximize what could be saved. Regarding mansard roofs, Mr. Bitar explained staff was simply noting code provisions about dormers when mansard roofs face streets, not recommending for or against waivers at this stage.
Mr. Chinnock asked about building access vision, particularly for buildings A and B. Mr. Puhl explained they wanted two real entrances - active Bridge Street frontages and convenient parking access, similar to their Short North buildings. Regarding the heavy retail weighting, Mr. Puhl believed Columbus was under-retailed with no new shopping built in 30 years. He felt the west side of Route 315 needed retail other than Bridge Park's 95 percent restaurant mix. They intended to control results by never selling, over-investing upfront, and managing intensively.
When asked about limiting hours, Mr. Puhl noted all their Short North leases restrict operations past 11:00 PM or midnight except one establishment 100 feet up. Food sales must comprise at least 50 percent of total sales, as they want to avoid becoming their own bad neighbor.

Ms. Damaser asked about the vision for the transitions to the park uses on the south. Mr. Puhl acknowledged difficulty determining existing conditions due to invasive honeysuckle but asked the Commission to consider the totality of circumstances including the 18-foot east buffer, dozens of new trees, and central green space. He noted the two west-side properties were zoned for redevelopment, making large permanent setbacks potentially problematic in 20 years.
Regarding plaza trees, Mr. Puhl explained they were working with landscape architects to source mature trees from nurseries, budgeting for the largest possible to avoid twig-like plantings. Ms. Damaser questioned the modern California look next to the church and historic buildings. Mr. Puhl stated that they saw the design as creating something new and different for Central Ohio, avoiding color monotony with fresh white materials and pitched roofs, referencing Palisades Village as having historic character inside despite a modern exterior.
Mr. Deschler asked about repurposing trees with extended root bases. Mr. Puhl stated that that he understood it was expensive with less than a 50% success rate. Regarding mixed-use with potential

residential lofts, Mr. Puhl indicated they had not investigated that due to neighborhood promises against residential, noting residential needs a critical mass of 15-25 units with private parking, which would consume retail space.

On parking, Mr. Bitar confirmed preliminary review showed compliance with code allowances for shared parking and mixed uses. In response to Mr. Deschler's question, uderground parking had been considered but rejected at over $50,000 per space. Employees would ideally use top garage floors in least competitive spaces, though controlling the parking of restaurant employees remained challenging.
Regarding Corbins Mill access timing, Mr. Bitar explained the planned section would be built now as a public street rather than future conversion. Mr. Deschler raised concerns about school district coordination for student safety. Mr. Puhl acknowledged they should discuss this with the School District before construction, noting the development was designed to welcome children with deleted roads in the square for safety and planned amenities like ice cream shops.
Mr. Deschler asked about traffic signal impacts on already problematic Bridge Street rush hour traffic. Mr. Burrell explained they would fully coordinate signals for efficient operation with real-time phasing technology, treating all six corridor signals as one system. Ms. Wawszkiewicz clarified the proposed full traffic signal at Monterey Drive would include pedestrian walk signals on all three legs.

Mr. Way asked about cemetery boundary fencing. Mr. Bitar confirmed no current fencing existed except the historic stone wall along Bridge Street, with only trees marking other boundaries. Mr. Puhl confirmed people could move between the development and cemetery. He added that they view the cemetery as an asset. Mr. Way inquired about garage treatment facing the cemetery. Mr. Puhl explained ventilation requirements prevented covering openings but they could consider vines on columns. When asked about maintenance access without the former road, Mr. Puhl indicated that it could be managed effectively, avoiding maintenance paths that might damage the 15-foot critical root zone.
Regarding garage parapet height, Mr. Puhl confirmed it would be about four feet above the parking surface as a concrete crash wall, making parked cars difficult to see from the cemetery with tree coverage. Mr. Way asked why the north-south walkway jogged at building A. Mr. Puhl explained keeping building B as a single tenant restaurant required the shift to prevent the building becoming too large.
Regarding the west property line trees, Mr. Puhl confirmed most would be removed, explaining their need for parking spaces made even a six-foot buffer effectively 18 feet of lost space. He had met with the homeowner, promising a nice fence and protection from car headlights, but emphasized the properties that were in the Bridge Street District overlay were likely to redevelop. He asked the Commission to consider the totality of the plan including east side preservation, square trees, and other plantings.
Mr. Way asked about preserving two large 23-24-inch trees in the courtyard. Mr. Puhl expressed concerns about their critical root zones conflicting with necessary sidewalks and planters, preferring open lawn for programming possibilities. As 40-year Short North property owners thinking long-term, they wanted trees to grow and replace older ones properly over time. Mr. Way suggested having an arborist evaluate if preservation was possible with proper grades and root growth systems.

Mr. Alexander asked about sustainability practices. Mr. Puhl indicated that would be part of the next step, with engineers hired to explore options including cisterns for rainwater collection. Solar

panels had been considered for lowering tenant utility costs and increasing base rent potential, but no federal programs currently supported this. Flat roofs were designed to potentially accommodate future photovoltaics hidden behind pitched elements.

Public Comment

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin, spoke representing Waterford Village. She reported there was 74% community support per resident surveys. Respondent expressed appreciation for there being no residential component and for the maintainenance of one-and-half story heights around the square to match their quaint, quiet community. While 88% favored the design, safety and traffic management concerns remained. Ms. Salva emphasized the need for a traffic light at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street for any development to proceed. She requested a secondary exit point to prevent cut-through traffic through their neighborhood to Frantz Road. She suggested a one-way exit through the wooded area behind the park down the large hill. Additional requests included physical deterrents around tennis courts next to the development, stone pillars identifying Waterford Village as a private community, and flashing crosswalk lights at Clover Court and Monterey Drive where residents access their neighborhood park. She expressed a desire for assurance from the developer that potential parking garage issues, like loitering or racing, would be addressed.

Keith Barnes, 279 Clover Court, Dublin, praised working with Tyler Puhl over several months, finding the Wood Companies credible, transparent, and incorporating neighborhood input. He believed the proposed plan would contribute to Dublin's uniqueness as an excellent transition into old Dublin. He reiterated traffic as the overriding resident concern, noting existing difficulty turning from Monterey Drive onto Bridge Street when traffic backs up to Frantz and Post roads.

Mr. Barnes explained Dublin's increasing popularity with many choosing the I-270 to Route 33/Bridge Street exit over the I-270/Sawmill Road exit, which contributes to cut-through traffic. He detailed Waterford's sidewalk situation with only partial coverage and a single sidewalk requiring children to cross at the largely-ignored four-way stop at Clover Court where near-misses with children have occurred frequently despite police attention.

He supported the exit-only plan through City property by the tennis courts, believing it would not infringe on the park while addressing safety concerns. He noted the current danger from Monterey Drive traffic passing the well-utilized community park with limited parking. Mr. Barnes praised the Wood Companies as quality investors who do not flip properties, maintain high-end tenants, and renovate remarkably, making them a good long-term community partner. He stated that they had been exceptionally transparent and incorporated neighborhood ideas.

Mike Skalak, 249 Olde Spring Lane, Dublin, explained that school children in their neighborhood get bused to school one quarter-mile away due to the crossing danger, preventing children from walking home and stopping at the nearby retail. He thanked Mr. Bitar for the traffic study residents had long requested. He opposes any residential at this location and noted any development would impact trees given the current overgrown honeysuckle condition. He prefers new plantings over attempting to save trees. He advocates for pedestrian-friendly design without fences and hedges that block the desired paths people naturally take.

Mary Ann Clarke, 146 Corbins Mill, Dublin, stated Dublin sorely lacks cute storefront shops that add community character. As a Corbins Mill resident, she understands the need for cut-through access but requests consideration of their narrow street with sidewalks close to traffic before sending more vehicles their way. She suggested making the exit right-turn only at the signal at Bridge

Street, and consideration of the older residents walking dogs and children at bus stops on a street not designed for the current traffic levels.

Commission Discussion
Mr. Garvin expressed strong support, appreciating the project's fit with the Future Land Use and Envision Dublin Plan. He values matching the church's sidewalk style as a good transition to Kroger's setback. He stated that he felt concerns about the back parking row were addressed and pending property development made it difficult to plan around. He appreciates the added office as true mixed-use absent residential use. He supports future waivers for pedestrian ways, block lengths, and E1 setbacks. He is comfortable with all conditions as written.

Mr. Deschler inquired about eminent domain discussions for the Corbins Mill connection property. Mr. Boggs indicated that no conversations had occurred, nor was he aware of any plans for such. Mr. Deschler supported the project but shares traffic safety concerns, hoping for a favorable City resolution. He supports all 10 conditions and emphasized constant traffic concerns warrant updates on the latest projects.

Mr. Alexander stated that he strongly supported the project's unique focus on public space as primary rather than an afterthought. He appreciates the two-story wall definition around the space and well-integrated pathways to the central object building. He likes the mixed-use incorporation and two-story Bridge Street massing.
His reservations are that the Bridge Street elevations do not meet the Historic Transition District zoning standards nor Dublin's unique character with the proposed California styling. He supports keeping Condition 8 about perimeter building elevations needing attention. Otherwise, he supports the project.

Ms. Harter expressed her support for the project, appreciating the public engagement. She viewed it as a gateway that would slow traffic with schools, post office, and shopping creating appropriate feel. She emphasized the importance of walkability. She noted school classes visit the cemetery and this development would provide a nice area, exposing children to their beautiful community. She encouraged exploring window additions and art opportunities on blank walls, and considering noise impacts on neighbors from deliveries and operations.

Mr. Chinnock stated that this project is an example of the process working well with responsive applicants and supportive residents after multiple community comments. He thanked staff for their excellent work but emphasized the critical timing for Route 161 improvements including signals and safety features before proceeding too far. He appreciated the applicant being aware of vacant retail concerns given the amount proposed. Regarding Condition 8, he noted the unique site requiring attention to both interior and exterior perimeter elevations, especially the cemetery-facing garage.
He considered the Bridge Street elevations excellent transitional designs between various building types rather than attempting to match Historic Dublin, since they are not adjacent to but near the Historic District.

Ms. Damaser stated that she saw the area transitioning from the Historic District side rather than from Bridge Park, with Kroger being so different no transition was needed. She appreciates the neighbor support, which demonstrates the groundwork invested. She will look to the City to address

traffic concerns and understands concerns about Monterey Drive becoming a through street. She reiterated the transition concerns for south and east sides into parkland areas.

Mr. Way expressed continued support, noting listening to neighbors was crucial after multiple unsuccessful previous development attempts at the site. He felt the 10 conditions covered all discussed items. Discussion ensued about whether conditions needed adjustment, with commissioners debating mandatory language in conditions 2, 3, and 4 about drive aisle width, buffer increases, and tree preservation.
Mr. Puhl expressed concerns about 22-foot drive aisles being too tight compared to Short North standards and dramatically changing site plans with mandatory 6.5-foot residential setbacks. After discussion, the Commission agreed to modify conditions 2, 3, and 4 to state the applicant shall work with staff rather than mandatory requirements, acknowledging emergency access needs and other constraints.
Discussion continued about mandatory language in condition 9 regarding blank walls. Mr. Garvin supported keeping it for requiring further articulation on the particularly blank south side. The Commission agreed the language was appropriate given the "or further articulation" option.
Mr. Way raised adding an 11th condition about coordinating with Dublin Arts Council for public art locations. Mr. Boggs suggested language about working with staff and Dublin Arts Council to identify public art locations for presentation at the Final Development Plan step. The Commission agreed to add this condition.
After final wording adjustments confirmed by legal counsel, the applicant confirmed acceptance of all 11 conditions.

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

1) The applicant shall continue to coordinate with City staff on finalizing the streetscape details of all streets, including the W Bridge Street/Monterey Drive intersection design and number of left-turn lanes, and the treatment along the south side of the new Neighborhood Street.
2) The applicant shall work with staff to explore reducing the width of the drive aisles.
3) The applicant shall work with staff to explore increasing the width of the buffer along the west side to allow screening of the adjacent single-family residential property and preservation of trees on both sides of the property line.
4) The applicant shall work with staff to explore providing a buffer along the south side of the site east of Monterey Drive to meet the required setback and provide screening for the cemetery expansion.
5) The applicant shall continue to work with the City Engineering staff on the design and configuration of the stormwater detention needed for the site for both public and private improvements to properly account for known capacity concerns in the existing storm sewer system.
6) The applicant shall explore all available alternatives to retain as many healthy/desirable trees as possible.
7) The applicant shall consider adding a true upper story above at least some of the buildings around the town square.
8) The buildings' massing, roof forms, facades, and design details shall be refined to further complement the interior layout and reflect traditional design patterns.
9) Fenestration or further articulation shall be added to all blank walls.

10) Additional design elements that provide a sensitive backdrop to the cemetery shall be added to the east and south facades of the parking structure.
11) The applicant shall work with staff and the Dublin Arts Council, as applicable, to identify location(s) for public art for inclusion in the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

~~COMMUNICATIONS~~

~~Mr. Bitar distributed information about training opportunities with various planning organizations, including American Planning Association and Urban Land Institute conferences. He requested quick responses for April conferences requiring early registration and hotel reservations.~~
~~He noted the next scheduled meeting on February 19th had no applications. He asked whether commissioners preferred canceling the meeting or having staff presentations on current efforts like transportation mobility projects, Signature Trail updates, or other initiatives. The Premier Sports Complex was deemed premature for discussion with a Council work session scheduled two days before the February 19 PZC meeting.~~
~~Mr. Deschler and Mr. Garvin indicated conflicts that evening. Ms. Harter supported holding the meeting to stay updated on upcoming items. Mr. Chinnock suggested traffic updates be provided given the frequently expressed concerns. After polling, consensus was determined to proceed with the meeting if staff could prepare a sufficient agenda.~~

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council

Docusign Envelope ID: 25E97F38-4E68-4732-B7C9-042EB5050138

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 5, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

3. Monterey Drive **Concept Plan**
25-043CP

Proposal:	Request for review and non-binding feedback for a commercial development consisting of approximately 93,900 square foot of retail and eating and drinking space and associated site improvements. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood.
Location:	191 and 201 W. Bridge Street and PIDs: 273-000205, 273-000207, 273-000209, 273-000210, 273-000211, 273-000212, 273-000213, 273-000214, 273-000215, 273-000216, 273-000217
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-043

RESULT: The Commission was generally supportive of the project including the layout and open space. Members were also appreciative of the applicant's communication with the neighbors. There were concerns raised about the lack of mix of uses with suggestions for incorporating some residential and/or office uses. Concerns were also voiced about traffic, and the need for an additional access point, but the Commission was not supportive of taking away park space to accommodate that access. Some suggestions included additional height on the buildings on Bridge Street, and a pedestrianway through Building E to break up its mass.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB1251CBBED6456...
Bassem Bitar, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning

Case #25-024AFDP
OhioHealth Temporary Helipad – Amended Final Development Plan
Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to allow a temporary helipad for the Ohio Health Dublin Methodist Hospital. The 13-acre site is zoned Planned Commerce District (PCD) - Perimeter West and is located at 6805 Perimeter Drive.

Case #25-018AFDP
Glick Road Pool – Amended Final Development Plan
Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the construction of a new pool equipment building, renovation of existing pool, replacement of a fence/pool barrier, and new access point from Glick Road. The 16.19-acre site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Muirfield Village and is located at 6716 Glick Road.

Ms. Call asked if any member wished to have either case removed from the consent agenda. There was no request to remove an item from the consent agenda.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as follows:

- Case #25-024-25AFDP – Minor Text Modification and Amended Final Development Plan with the following conditions:
    1. Upon removal of the temporary helipad, the site shall be restored to existing or better conditions including but not limited to pavement, parking spaces, landscape islands and trees within the islands, and lighting.
    2. The orange jersey barrier is replaced with a concrete barrier prior to approval of a building permit.
    3. The required tree replacements are installed on site within one year of removal.
    4. If the existing use or number of employees changes that require parking over the 402 spaces prior to December 31, 2029, OhioHealth shall coordinate with the City of Dublin to obtain necessary approvals.
    5. The applicant continues to coordinate with Engineering during the site plan review process.
- Case #25-018AFDP – Amended Final Development Plan with the following conditions:
    1. The applicant continues to work with Engineering to ensure stormwater management requirements are met prior to issuance of a building permit.
    2. The applicant continue to work with Engineering to finalize the proposed access drive including material specifications and width requirements.

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

CASE REVIEW

Mr. Alexander recused himself from the following case.

Case #25-043CP
Monterey Drive – Concept Plan

Request for review and non-binding feedback for a commercial development consisting of approximately 93,900 square feet of retail and eating and drinking space and associated site improvements. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood, and is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Wood, The Wood Companies, 939 North High Street, Suite 206, Columbus, provided an introduction to The Wood Companies. He stated that the Wood Companies was founded by his father nearly 45 years ago and he was a pioneer in developing the Short North. They have a long-term vision for how they develop and base their development on quality. They do not develop to maximize short-term value but commit to the highest design standards and timeless architecture. When reflecting on what he liked most about his work, Mr. Wood shared that it is the ability to work with great retailers to create experiences with their buildings. Their buildings contribute to the community the way they should. They are committed to making this a Class A development in every way. They will not have late night establishments. They manage their own properties. The goal is to be a cherished part of the community for years to come.

Tyler Puhl, President, The Wood Companies, 939 North High Street, Suite 206, Columbus, stated that this is a very invested community. They met with the community and found it very helpful. The Wood Companies has been developing for a long time, and they see Commission meetings not as hurdles but as part of the collaborative process. The big idea is to create a walkable village with a massive community gathering space that is shaped by great streetscape with buildings that are constructed with lasting materials and architectural charm. The City owns the corner lot at West Bridge Street and Monterey Drive. They are discussing a trade with the City for more cemetery space in exchange for that corner parcel. The proposal attempts to copy the downtown Dublin layout with gridded streets of similar length. Some of the streets are really alleyways and service roads. The center of this development is the loop that will invigorate this community and be a game changer for the City of Dublin. [Site plan displayed.] They are trying to create an environment where every door for a retailer looks on Bridge Street or on each other and at the square to give a sense of enclosure. Code requires building lengths be of a specific length and perimeter and all are in compliance except Building E. Pedestrians will only see the center area, which is 215 feet. They are confident they can work with staff to identify something that works there. Adding a pedestrian route through that building is not ideal because they have a pedestrian way to Bridge Street, through the garage to the cemetery and to Monterey Park. There is nothing to access through Building E other than some back parking and a private property owner's property. They wanted to create enclosure and access is very important. They tried to create a lane on Monterey Drive. They are hopeful that the City of Dublin can work to put in a signalized intersection at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street. Through meetings with staff, there was agreement to try to add an access road out of the northeast corner of the site to create a relief valve. There could potentially be an extension to Corbins Mill at some point in the future. In this area, the plan is currently out of compliance with a Traffic Code requirement prohibiting head-in parking on a Dublin street. The thought was that they could use the parking now, then when that property [Corbins Mill] turns over, they can repaint the parking and make it a street. Connectivity is important. Service areas are located on the outer perimeter of the site for trash and utilities. They want to slow traffic as this development is intended to be pedestrian-oriented. Creating parallel parking along Monterey Drive will slow traffic. Even though it widens the street and takes more land, they view it as

necessary. From an architecture perspective, this is a true village of buildings and not a strip mall in disguise. The storefronts will vary. They will be 20- to 30-foot bays of interesting retail segments with materials like stucco, brick and wood that have worked in downtowns for centuries. They will use interesting roof materials to hide rooftops units and a garage. It also creates a variation making the storefronts feel like different buildings that have been there for different amounts of time. [Inspirational images displayed.] With regard to open space, they are devoting 15,000 square feet of expensive land to create this space. They will have market stalls in the open space that are inspired by old school New York newspaper stalls that are temporary installations that can bring artists and small retailers into a great center. They have a 1,300 square foot building that will be the focal point of the development. This will have a romantic sense of small-town downtowns with children eating ice cream and adults having coffee. The applicants have tried to create quick, convenient parking locations. There will be flat parking plate with an elevated level above that so that it does not feel like a garage. It is a flat plate with massive openings on each side so it will feel like covered parking. The buildings are turned to hide surface parking as much as possible. There is angled parking around the village square. It is a character-driven element that adds parking but maintains a slow pedestrian area. Parking on site is in compliance with Code under the shopping center designation. They are in the process of hiring national brokers out of Texas that have assured them that there is adequate parking. Their desire is for the majority to be non-food retail which creates less volume of parking. They have had some community engagement. They met with the community and they did not want height, apartments or traffic going south on Monterey Drive. This project has taken those concerns into account. They are open to a solution going south on Monterey that works for everyone. The applicants and neighbors would like a traffic signal at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street and they would love for Bridge Street traffic to slow earlier. Parallel parking would slow traffic, as would narrower lanes along Bridge Street. They would also like to see the sidewalk in front of the cemetery expanded. They feel they have a strong project that will be a long-standing community asset.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that something new with this project is the recent code change that made all Concept Plan reviews non-binding feedback regardless of whether there is a development agreement. Specific design details have not been determined. This is the bigger picture idea. As the application progresses, details will be evaluated. Considerations for this review are land use and densities, general site layout, open space, relationship to community, etc. The site is in the Bridge Street District (BSD) on the south side of West Bridge Street. As indicated by the applicant, there is a City-owned parcel at the southeast corner of West Bridge Street and Monterey Drive, which is proposed to be traded for cemetery expansion. [Photos of site as existing displayed.] The site is vacant other than the Shell gas station. There are substantial trees along the perimeter of the site and a few within the site itself. It is located in the Mixed-Use Village Future Land Use character area, which promotes a combination of uses including office, retail, commercial, and residential. It is intended to complement the historic district nearby and recommends building heights of one to three stories that have a complementary character to the historic buildings. It promotes a walkable environment with open spaces and plazas and narrow streets with buildings fronting the sidewalks. There is also a special area plan for the BSD with similar priorities allowing for a transition from the Historic District to the larger retail to the west. It also transitions from the busier Bridge Street to the neighborhood to the south. The special area plan promotes two to three story buildings with vertical mixed use. Future connectivity to Corbins Mill is portrayed. Within the BSD Code, there are neighborhood standards for every area within the overall BSD which call out

specific allowances for building types, open space types and other details. The application is very similar to what the Community Plan promotes. Mr. Bitar referenced the Bridge Street Network Plan and stated that Bridge Street is classified as a corridor connector street and also a principle-fronted street which means there is an expectation that the buildings fronting it would be of a certain scale, character and importance. Curb cuts would be highly scrutinized. The site plan is designed to convey a walkable block system even though some of the streets are service drives and technically do not meet the block requirements because those require frontage on a public street. However, the intent is generally met. The layout includes a parking structure on the east side that would partially be over the first-floor retail. Code has many requirements for parking structures that would be taken into consideration at future stages. The BSD has specific standards for right-of-way, and this plan is different in that it reflects more of a walkable environment. As this project moves forward, Transportation and Mobility staff will work to make sure applicable standards are met. The curb cut along West Bridge Street will have to be scrutinized. It is close to existing turn lanes. The applicant would have to provide calculations to see if a signal is warranted. On-street parking on Bridge Street is not permitted but the City is undertaking a study of that corridor in the next few months. Connectivity and circulation seems to function similarly to what the plan envisioned. The open space is a unique setting that seems to fit under public square open space type. More details are needed on how that will be programmed because there are limits to how many enclosed structures can be on a property. City Council will determine if the trade for the cemetery parcel occurs. The layout of parking would have to be examined because head-in parking is typically not permitted on a public street. [Character images shown.]

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin asked for more details about the west side of Building E. Mr. Puhl stated that the west side is not intended to be customer facing. Mr. Garvin asked if the applicant had considered additional height along Bridge Street. Mr. Puhl stated that they would consider it. They would love to have office on the site. They would come back with a more detailed vision at next steps. Mr. Garvin asked where the cut-through to the cemetery goes. Mr. Puhl stated that they would work with the City to create a clear direction for pedestrians. Mr. Garvin referenced the eastern entrance to the parking garage and asked if there are issues with cars and pedestrians there. Mr. Puhl stated that they would not put the pedestrian path into the path of vehicles. The garage entrance can be moved. Mr. Garvin asked about parallel parking on West Bridge Street. Mr. Puhl stated that they have 30 feet between their property and the street. They would like to see some of that dedicated for pedestrian movement or parallel parking. They would like to see the street narrow there to slow down traffic.

Mr. Chinnock asked how the applicant can make Building E feel less massive. Mr. Puhl stated that it will feel like 20-30' storefront bays. Someone standing at the center of the building will not see how long the building because it will not be visible in its entirety through the pedestrian ways. Mr. Wood stated that they can accomplish that with rooflines and recessed indentions so they feel like separate buildings. They do not want to promote a pathway to the back, because that area is more service-oriented. Mr. Chinnock asked about building heights. Mr. Puhl stated that everything will be under the two-story minimum. There could be more height along Bridge Street. Mr. Chinnock asked how the second level of the parking garage will be screened. Mr. Puhl answered that the back side would be a masonry façade. In response to Mr. Chinnock's question about the height of the masonry wall, Mr. Puhl stated that they would provide that detail in their next submission. Mr. Chinnock asked if the applicant has a plan if the market does not support

this amount of retail and restaurant. Mr. Puhl stated that in order to get this financed, they will have to be 40-50% pre-leased. Their current developments in the Short North are 100% full. Mr. Puhl stated that if they find they cannot do a high-quality development with a lot of tenant velocity, they will not move forward with the project. Mr. Chinnock asked if the work would be phased. Mr. Puhl stated that is not the intent. They need a volume of people, and a phased approach would limit the users that would be interested. Mr. Chinnock asked what would happen if the land swap was not approved. Mr. Puhl stated that it would greatly affect their ability to move forward.

Mr. Deschler asked if the detail of a traffic signal should be discussed at this point in the review process. Mr. Bitar stated that it is premature to discuss the warrant for a traffic signal or curb cut. Mr. Deschler asked for the City's position on the applicant's comments regarding traffic. Mr. Bitar stated that the BSD Special Area Plan promotes connectivity to the west. Even if a traffic signal is not warranted, that egress would be an escape valve so that there is an alternate route rather than going through the neighborhood. A traffic signal would greatly assist with that but technical data is required to make that determination. Mr. Deschler asked why access to Corbins Mill is not currently planned. Mr. Puhl stated that they have gotten mixed reactions to access that would go through the park. Mr. Deschler asked what kind of retail is anticipated for the development. Mr. Puhl stated that since the recession, non-grocery retail has not been built. They think this is a high demographic area with great access and apparel shoppers want to be in the Columbus area. The Columbus metro area has an MSA size where there should be two shopping areas. They are anticipating apparel, fitness, quick service food (especially along Bridge Street), and full-service restaurants. They are avoiding late night establishments all together. Mr. Wood stated that in the Short North, they have advocated against late night happenings and are proud of their track record with destination and community retail. Mr. Puhl stated Northstar, Brassica and Jeni's were in their portfolio.
Mr. Garvin asked if any previous partners expressed interest. Mr. Puhl answered affirmatively. Mr. Deschler asked for more information about the late-night establishments. Mr. Puhl stated that restriction would be written into leases. They are not interested in the bar scene. They want this to be a high-quality development for families. Mr. Deschler asked if the applicants have any other ideas about the parking behind building E. Mr. Puhl stated that the goal is that it would be for employees only. Mr. Wood stated that it is not intended to be a consumer-facing experience.

Ms. Harter asked for more information on the kiosks in the green space. Mr. Puhl stated they are intended to be "found experiences" that could differ from week to week. They love the idea of a farmers' market and a Christmas market. The intent is that the space be a unique and programmed situation. Ms. Harter asked about the pedestrian experience along Bridge Street. Mr. Bitar stated that there are guidelines for the frontages along Bridge Street that recommend a wider sidewalk. The guidelines do not include on-street parking on Bridge Street but the City is looking at undertaking a study on that corridor. Mr. Puhl stated that the doors would face Bridge Street, and they want that to feel like the front door. The applicants are in support of benches and seating. They are all in favor of making Bridge Street a very comfortable place. Ms. Harter asked the applicant to expound on their intention of making the space walkable and connecting to area amenities. Mr. Puhl stated that adding sidewalks and signage and the raised concrete pathways can show and encourage people to walk to the site. Ms. Harter asked if the City is open to creative pathways to the park. Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively and added that all of those mobility initiatives will be part of the study.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission has seen many proposals for this site. He asked where the one-story and two-story buildings were planned to be. Mr. Puhl stated that those determinations have not been made yet, but the goal would be to make it look like different buildings with different heights that have been developed over time. If there was demand for office space, they would use the second floor for more programming, but right now, the second story is more about volume of space and interest from the pedestrian level. Mr. Way stated that in Historic Dublin, there is a tendency for offices on second stories. Mr. Puhl stated that the issue with office right now is that many lenders are not approving it. The Community Plan presents this site as Mixed Use Village. The area plan suggests mixed use along Bridge Street and residential behind it. This does not follow those patterns, and the community has strong feelings about that. He asked if the applicant could envision residential being integrated into this plan. Mr. Puhl stated that they want to pay attention to the wishes of the community, but they are mainly residential developers. They would investigate that possibility if there was community support. Mr. Way stated that the Commission's job is to support the Community Plan. Right now, the plan is all retail. He shares Mr. Chinnock's concern regarding what would happen if the market would not support the retail. He is glad to hear that the applicant is open to a mix of uses. Mr. Way asked about a graphic shown that indicates a potential connection to Corbins Mill that jogs through the park. Mr. Puhl stated that alternative was shown because the City owns that land and could make it happen right now. Straight access could take decades because of land ownership. Mr. Way stated that he is not supportive of taking away parkland to build roads.
Mr. Deschler sought confirmation that 64 Corbins Mill Drive is privately owned and occupied. Mr. Bitar answered affirmatively. Mr. Puhl stated that they have reached out regarding possible sale but have not made contact with the property owner. Mr. Deschler asked what the standard is for eminent domain for a project like this. Mr. Boggs stated that the City has eminent domain authority that would ultimately be a City Council decision. Mr. Puhl stated that they are not advocating for someone being pushed out of their home. Mr. Deschler stated that he does not know that a project in this area will move forward with this kind of density without a release valve. He is also not in favor of moving the parking lane.
Mr. Garvin sought confirmation that 48 Corbins Mills Drive is Red Rooster property, and they are not supportive of an access there either. Mr. Bitar answered affirmatively.
Mr. Way referenced the garage and stated that would be a logical place for a second level. Mr. Puhl stated that they thought that design was a good way to meet parking needs.

Public Comment

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she is representing Waterford Village. They met with Mr. Puhl recently and in general, a majority of those attendees were in favor of this proposal. There were some positives and some concerns. The positives were that there is no residential component. Traffic is concerning, especially if there were to be a large density of living units. They also enjoy the green space presented in the middle. The potential expansion of sidewalks on Bridge Street would be better for them to move around in a safer environment. The community also appreciated that The Wood Companies would keep ownership of the project. The neighborhood was concerned with the parking garage in general; however, there would be 24/7 security that they hire out. With the business being closed at 11:00 p.m. at the latest, unwanted behavior would not be happening and that would keep their quiet neighborhood safe. Traffic is a concern. They do not see how any project can happen here without a light at Bridge Street and Monterey Drive. They are also concerned about traffic exiting through their neighborhood. It has already become a cut-through if Bridge Park is backed up. They want to prevent that becoming

worse. There was discussion regarding putting something on Monterey Drive where the neighborhood begins as a deterrent to drivers. They would like to further those discussions to keep their neighborhood safe from all the extra cars.

Keith Barnes, 279 Clover Court, Dublin, stated that they live next to the park. This development would be very visible to them. They have been part of every meeting where there has been a proposed change, and this is by far the best one. People are very supportive of this project. What this group is proposing fits this historical transitional neighborhood better than anything they have seen in the past. Their neighborhood is a cut through. Development across the bridge to the right will invite more people down Bridge Street. The park is to the south of this piece of property and this is the only way over to the park. There is also only one sidewalk on Monterey Drive. Parents with families have to cross Monterey Drive to access the park and any increase in traffic is dangerous. Any increase in traffic is a concern for the neighborhood. Comparing this to a previous project by Crawford Hoying, this is more desirable because of the reduced building height, and this will provide a place for neighborhood families to go. He is fully in support of it. There is a creek that flows along the park that can get full. Anytime more concrete is laid, more runoff is created. He would hope that the City and the Commission will work with The Wood Companies to come up with a plan, because this is going to be a good fit for their neighborhood and for Dublin. They are very proud of Old Dublin and this will transition into that beautifully. The company has a reputation for quality which is consistent with what has been done in Dublin.

Mary Ann Clark, 146 Corbins Mill Drive, Dublin, stated that she is also concerned with the traffic. Many elderly live there along with a lot of families with young children. She asked the Commission to please consider that this is a residential street. She suggested a good barrier be placed between the park and the development where the tennis courts are. The architecture is great. The idea is great. She would like to protect the integrity of the neighborhood park and to make sure there is a natural barrier between parked cars and the park itself.

Eric Rudd, 170 Monterey Drive, Dublin, shared his views of the proposals presented for these properties over the past 10 years as a Waterford Village and Monterey Drive resident since 1972. This proposal seems to offer the community the best from a land use and economic standpoint. There are a few things he is not a fan of, including the two-story parking deck, and the cut-through from Corbins Mill to the southwest side. Trees may shield view of the garage in summer, but they will be looking at a parking deck when leaves are not on the trees. Regarding the cut-through, people will find any potential shortcut. People currently cut up Waterford Drive to get to Franklin Street. There is a need to begin long-term traffic surveys on Monterey Drive, Waterford Drive, Franklin Street and Bridge Street to determine remedies for backups at Bridge Street to eliminate the increased traffic on Monterey Drive to the south. Drivers running the stop signs at Clover Court and Waterford Drive are a great concern for the safety of children and adults. He thinks the building lines are too close to the curb. Sidewalks should be widened to four to six feet between the boulevard strip and the storefronts to allow sufficient space for pedestrian traffic. On-street parking spaces are going to be a problem for fire and rescue and snowplows. The plan shows a merge lane at north end. It would be better to put a right and left turn lane northbound because that is where the bottleneck is. The intersection of Monterey Drive and Bridge Street is always blocked despite signage. The short stacking distance between Bridge Street and the northern entrances to the parking lots will be problematic with traffic backups.

Chad Fairchild, 270 Clover Court, Dublin, stated that he and his neighbors are generally supportive of this proposal. He has been in the neighborhood for almost nine years and some of the plans presented have been less than exciting. The creek runs through his backyard as well as many of his neighbors, and many of them deal with flooding. He suggested the potential for parking passes or some sort of enforcement to ensure that parking in front of homes is protected. Traffic-calming measures like a small roundabout or speed humps would be beneficial.

One additional comment was received electronically and provided to the Commission.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin stated that he is supportive of the proposed land uses. Given the traffic concerns, this is a good solution. Proposing less than the standard height and the usage keeps the density lower. He does not see clear solution to an outlet for traffic. He agrees with some of the sentiments shared about taking away parkland for a road. He is not supportive of the eminent domain suggestion. He is supportive of the proposed site layout. His concern is the road or alleyway behind Building E. He would rather find a way to make it something that does not need to be hidden. He likes the idea of the public square, the outbuildings and the architectural design. It is important to keep the quality of finishes high. He echoes the Commission's concerns about the need to have this development be full and vibrant. There is opportunity to add height on the Bridge Street side. That adds continuity along that corridor. The treatment on the back side of the garage will be important.

Mr. Chinnock thanked the applicant for their presentation and thanked the public for attending. It is encouraging to see the process working. It shows the value of listening to the public. Generally, he is supportive of the project. His concerns have been raised. Questions remain behind site access, the land swap, connection to the school, and traffic signal. The project is going in the right direction. He is not in favor of removing parkland to access the site. As this moves forward, it would be great if there was a way to not be so reliant on retail. He suggested the applicant consider activation of the streetscape. There are a lot of nice opportunities to make this feel like part of the community. With so much internal focus, the Commission needs to understand how this looks from inside the site.

Mr. Deschler echoed many of Mr. Chinnock's comments. He is generally supportive of the layout. He would like to see some type of mixed use, whether it be residential or office. He likes the open space. He shares concerns about access and utility services. Traffic is his major concern. It seems like there will be significant things that need to be done to address the traffic. Without having another access, it will create so much traffic on Monterey Drive that it will become unbearable for the residents. He is also concerned about a traffic signal there. Bridge Street backs up badly from 3:00 to 8:00 p.m., and another traffic signal may make it worse. He is looking forward to the traffic study.

Ms. Harter agreed with her fellow commissioners. This is such an important area. Walkability should be considered with everything. She encouraged the applicant to think of the entire area and to look to Historic Dublin for inspiration. She liked the idea of creating some kind of special way to indicate the entrance to the neighborhood. She is not in favor of moving the park. She is interested in the traffic study.

Mr. Way thanked the community for coming out. This community has come out with each proposal, and the Commission has heard them. It is good to see that they have met with the developer and feel like there is a plan they are willing to work with. This commission will work hard to create something that really fits into the neighborhood. He is supportive of the project and would not do anything different with the layout, including the circulation system. The technical components about traffic still have to be worked out, but how this site functions makes sense. The City looks for placemaking elements like the park in the middle. This spirit of architecture fits into this part of Dublin. The Community Plan recommends a mix of uses. It does suggest residential. They have heard that the community does not want residential, but maybe there could be housing above a shop or something. Office is still a viable opportunity. The Bridge Street frontage needs to have more scale to it. That is an appropriate place to have a second story that will not be retail. The development in front of the parking garage is a logical place to add another story. It would also further screen the parking.

Ms. Call echoed her fellow commissioners. She is pleased with the project and the communication that has happened so far. She agreed with Mr. Way regarding more presence at Bridge Street. She also echoed the comments of multiple commissioners with regard to the mixed-use component. An enormous amount of time is spent on the community plans that only come along once in a decade. The City of Dublin is very conscientious about development. They will never put a project in place that creates a safety hazard for the community. They and their children live in Dublin too. Development brings movement. Every time an applicant brings a project forward there is discussion with public safety staff, transportation and mobility staff, and public works staff. Concerns brought forward this evening center around traffic, open space and water mitigation. All of those items come naturally with development applications. Each of those City departments will be looking at those. City Council said that Dublin is patient. We will wait for the right application. She stated that she thinks this applicant is the right partner at this point in time. She is encouraged by this application and the communication with the Commission, the City and the community.

Mr. Way stated that Block E needs some kind of pedestrian connection through it.

As this is a Concept Review, no action was taken.

~~With no objection from the Commission, the meeting recessed for a short break. The meeting reconvened at 8:20 p.m. with all members returning to the dais.~~

~~Ms. Call stated that because the following two cases pertain to the same project on the same property with the same applicants, they will be discussed together. Separate votes will be held for each.~~

~~Case #25-031Z~~
~~Crown INEOS – Rezoning~~
~~Request for review and recommendation of approval of rezoning a +/-2.95-acre site from PCD Planned Commerce District, Perimeter Center to PUD Planned Unit Development District, Crown Campus. The site is located at 6400 Perimeter Loop.~~

~~Case #25-019AFDP~~
~~Crown INEOS – Amended Final Development Plan~~

Docusign Envelope ID: C1C45882-A2BD-4564-82E2-88819C85719E

RECORD OF ACTION
Planning & Zoning Commission
Thursday, July 18, 2024 | 6:30 pm

2. Monterey Drive
24-086CP **Concept Plan**

Proposal:	Mixed-use development consisting of approximately 19,400 square feet of commercial space, 53 attached single-family units and associated site improvements.
Location:	Both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street.
Request:	Recommendation of approval to City Council of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant:	Crawford Hoying City of Dublin
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-086

MOTION: Ms. Harter moved, Mr. Garvin seconded a recommendation of approval of the Concept Plan to City Council with the following conditions:

1) That taller elements and further refinements be incorporated into the design of the commercial buildings.
2) That the residential building design and materials be significantly enhanced to meet the applicable building type and general BSD building design standards, and to better address the site's context.
3) That the open space system be further refined to include highly usable and interconnected spaces.
4) That the circulation system throughout the site be further developed to address emergency access concerns and provide better integration between the commercial and residential uses.
5) That as many of the existing trees be preserved as possible, including the tree line along the west property line.
6) That the site design details, including lot coverage be refined to address the BSD code requirements as well as the site's unique setting.
7) That the public street right-of-way widths and the streetscape and intersection design details be finalized in coordination with the City's Transportation and Mobility Department.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: Motion carried 5-0 to recommend approval of the Concept Plan to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

Docusign Envelope ID: C1C45882-A2BD-4564-82E2-88819C85719E

2. Monterey Drive
24-086CP **Concept Plan**

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB125C5BED6456...

Bassem Bitar, Deputy Director of Planning

~~CASE REVIEW~~

- **~~24-087AFDP – Neuro Transitional Sign~~**

~~Proposal for an Amended Final Development Plan for a ground sign at the site of a new building. The 1.98-acre site is zoned PCD, Planned Commerce District, Riverside North and is located northeast of the intersection of Hospital Drive and Perimeter Drive.~~

~~Ms. Harter moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:~~

~~1) That the applicant submit an encroachment permit concurrent with the permanent sign permit, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.~~

~~Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes.~~
~~[Motion carried 5-0]~~

- **24-086CP – Monterey Drive**

Concept Plan for a mixed-use development consisting of approximately 19,400 square feet of commercial space, 53 attached single-family units, and associated site improvements. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood, located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation

Russell Hunter, Crawford-Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated that the Commission previously provided an Informal Review of their proposal for this site. Since then, they have revised the plan, incorporating the Commission's earlier feedback. This site, located at the corner of Monterey Drive and Bridge Street is unique. It is a transitional site between Historic Dublin – Core zoning and the residential community to the south. The site has great commercial frontage and offers opportunities for Dublin Cemetery expansion. Adjacent to the residential neighborhood, there is a popular City park. He highlighted the changes that have been made since the Informal Review. They continue to have approximately 20,000 SF of ground-floor road frontage. Previously, they had proposed additional commercial or residential on the upper floors. They have discarded that idea for a couple of reasons. In regard to office use, the office market is not doing well at this time. It is not a viable option to create additional office use when there is available office unleased within the area. They looked at other use options. They are receiving potential interest in the ground-floor spaces, but some of the potential uses are parking intensive. In this transitional site, they do not want to create a parking issue. Instead, they are proposing 1.5-story residential units along Bridge Street and townhomes to the rear. The Monterey Drive units would be subject to current Bridge Street District standards. There will be a new east-west public road, which, per the Thoroughfare Plan, eventually will connect to Corbins Mill to the west. The new road will enable northbound traffic to SR161 to make a west turn onto Bridge Street. Monterey Drive will be the primary road; the new road will be a secondary road. Their buildings will front those roads. This plan will include a development agreement with the City for a property swap for land the City owns along Bridge Street. The cemetery expansion would be enabled by the one-to-one swap. The plan also includes the creation of some open spaces, the expansion of the existing park, and the creation of a gateway experience into the neighborhood. He anticipates this will be an improvement for the neighbors and the community in general. They believe this plan is the right approach for this site

and are interested in the Commission's feedback. They have engaged Architectural Alliance to design the commercial frontage.

Dustin Todd, Archall Architects, 49 E. Third Avenue, Columbus stated this proposal provides parking at the rear of the building and main entrances for the retail on the front. The goal is to extend the Bridge Street walkability of Historic Dublin. There will be one building on each side of Monterey Drive with a covered walkway to the parking at the rear. They are proposing 3,000 SF of exterior patio space, extending the patio experience that exists in Historic Dublin up to this area. They looked at the context of the Historic District when considering the scale, massing and materiality of the proposed buildings. The two buildings will create a gateway to Monterey Drive. The building details will be addressed with the Preliminary Development Plan.

Mr. Hunter reviewed plans for the townhomes. Crawford-Hoying is good at building, but single-family homes are not their particular area of expertise. Consequently, they looked for a partner for the residential component who already has a successful product, but will allow Crawford-Hoying to modify the exterior. They are beginning with a Fischer Homes product and will apply an appropriate vernacular that combines masonry facades with some siding, porches, and standing seam roof. This will provide a nice transition for the Historic Core neighborhood, which is more urban next to residential neighborhood south of this site. They anticipate this may be a product that they will be able to re-create in other areas, as well.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that the Bridge Street District development process includes several steps. This proposal was informally reviewed December 7, 2023; it is now at the Concept Plan stage. Because a development agreement also is involved, the Commission will be making a recommendation of approval to City Council, who will make the final decision on the Concept Plan. If approved, the next steps are the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and the Final Development Plan (FDP). Tonight, the Commission will review the Concept Plan to evaluate how it relates to the Bridge Street District intent, the Community Plan alignment and the Neighborhood District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Bitar described the site. The 6.86-acre site is zoned BSD-HTN: Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood and consists of 13 parcels along both sides of Monterey Drive, south of its intersection with W. Bridge Street. The individual parcels are owned by Dublin Development LLC, except the parcel at the southeast corner of W. Bridge Street and Monterey Drive, which the City of Dublin owns. A Shell gas station and convenience store currently occupy the two parcels at the southwest corner of the intersection. The rest of the site is vacant, with a previous gas station located on a City-owned parcel and the previous duplexes located on the southern parcels demolished in recent years. Several stands of mature trees are located on the site, especially along the west and south property lines and across the rear of the parcels that front W. Bridge Street. The Dublin Cemetery borders the site to the east and extends along a portion of the southern property line. Monterey Park is located to the south of the site, west of Monterey Drive. To the west of the site are a Marathon gas station, a home goods store, and a single-family residence, all fronting Corbins Mill Drive. Sells Middle School is located across W. Bridge Street to the north. The proposal is for a land swap of the parcel that the City owns for land the applicant owns, which the City would use for expansion of the cemetery. The BSD-HTN district permits a variety of uses that are complementary to the adjacent historic district. These include both the commercial uses (retail/eating and drinking) proposed along the W. Bridge Street frontage and the townhomes

proposed to the south. The site immediately to the east of this site and the school located on the north side of Bridge Street are zoned HP - Historic Public. The site is within BSD-HTN, Historic Transition Neighborhood District, which has its own set of standards. This district complements the HD Historic Core district by accommodating a variety of building types within a block street network and uses consistent with that district. It accommodates uses similar to those in the HD Historic Core district. The HTN zoning allows an extension of the walkable mixed-use character of the HD Historic Core district. The HTN district requirements establish open space patterns and location requirements for building types, provide additional residential opportunities, and extend the small-scale commercial activities of the HD Historic Core district. The site lies within the Bridge Street District street network. The site currently has access via W. Bridge Street (a Corridor Connector/Principal Frontage Street) and Monterey Drive (a Neighborhood Street). Principal Frontage Streets (PFS) are designated to ensure a continuous, pedestrian-oriented block. Development along a PFS should include front-facing building facades and limited conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The BSD Special Area Plan includes the Future Land Use recommendations, which identify the site as a mixed-use village center. It includes potential connectivity that highlights the Historic District to the east. A new east-west public street extending from Monterey Drive to the west property line would be constructed as part of the development and accommodate 10 on-street parking spaces. This is consistent with the BSD Special Area Plan recommendations, which include a Neighborhood Street eventually extending further west to Corbins Mill Drive.

At their December 7, 2023 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on an informal proposal for a mixed-use development at the site that included:

- Two buildings along the W. Bridge Street frontage with a total of 20,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor, and two alternate upper floor options: one additional floor with a total of 20,000 square feet of office space, or two additional floors with a total of 40 multi-family residential units.
- 40 single-family attached (townhome) units organized around two new east-west streets with rear alley garage access.
- Open space along the east property line, approximately one acre of which would be dedicated to the City for cemetery expansion in exchange for the City parcel along the W. Bridge Street frontage.
- Surface and on-street parking.

PZC members provided the following feedback:

- Support for upper-floor residential uses in the buildings fronting W. Bridge Street to activate the street frontage and reduce the need for surface parking.
- General support for the development of single-family attached condominiums on the rest of the site as a transitional use between the existing single-family detached uses to the south and the busier Bridge Street corridor to the north.
- Improvements in the design and possibly the massing of the single-family attached structures are needed over the character images that were provided.
- Support for the overall site layout.
- Need for further refinement of the traffic management details, open space location and design, and various other details.

A traffic impact study (TIS) was completed when the comprehensive Bridge Street rezoning was approved several years ago, so this application would not require a new TIS.

Mr. Bitar indicated that the revised proposal is generally consistent with the Informal Review version with the following notable exceptions:

- Reduction in the height of the buildings at the W. Bridge Street frontage from 2-3 stories, to 1.5 stories (one occupied story), thus also eliminating the previously proposed office or multi-family residential uses on the upper floors.
- Reduction in the number of east-west streets from two to one (public) street.
- Increase in the number of single-family attached units from 40 units to 53 units.
- Change in the proposed location of the cemetery expansion and public and private open spaces.

The northern portion of the site is proposed to be developed with four commercial buildings fronting W. Bridge Street (two on each side of Monterey Drive). The total building area would be 19,416 square feet, which would be supplemented by 2,960 square feet of patio space. A total of 145 surface parking spaces would be located to the rear of the buildings with vehicular access gained through curb cuts along Monterey Drive. Pedestrian access from the parking lots to the front of the buildings would be provided through covered pedestrian ways between the buildings. The proposed commercial buildings are proposed to follow the Historic Mixed Use building type. The minimum height for this building height is 1.5 stories, and the maximum is 2.5 stories. As noted above, the applicant is proposing 1.5-story buildings. Given the character and scale of Bridge Street, staff recommends that taller elements be added to the design to complement the majority of historic structures along that roadway. Staff also recommends additional refinements at PDP, such as further articulation of the pedestrian ways and adjustments to the allocation of materials and colors to reflect the massing of nearby historic buildings. Additional details, including roof pitches, transparency requirements, etc., will be examined at PDP to verify Code compliance with building type and design standards. The proposed 3-story townhome buildings comprising 53 units fall under the Single Family Attached building type, which is permitted in the BSD-HTN district, with a minimum height of 1.5 stories and a maximum of 4 stories. The overall site organization is in the form of blocks. If this proposal advances, there will need to be further discussion about the circulation around the buildings, per the Fire Department. The open space has been relocated from the east side of the site to the south side to enable the cemetery expansion. Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and recommends approval of the Concept Plan with 7 conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Concept Plan were to move forward, the number of units would be locked in.
Mr. Bitar responded that they would not.
Mr. Alexander inquired when the east-west connection would occur.
Mr. Bitar responded that it is dependent on if and when the adjacent property owner decides to redevelop their parcel. This proposal includes only the section of the road that would be on this particular property.
Mr. Alexander inquired if that would impact the viability of the proposed project.
Mr. Bitar responded that the development works without that connection; however, it will be greatly improved at the point at which the connection is added, due to the lack of a traffic signal at the intersection of Monterey Drive and Bridge Street.

Mr. Alexander stated that the staff report indicates that the project would be better integrated from a transportation perspective if there were more connections between the commercial and the residential components. He requested additional clarification.
Mr. Bitar responded that the Fire Department has some concerns about circulation within the site and the ability to access some of the residential buildings that do not have street frontage. If this is a truly mixed-use development, the commercial and residential elements should be better integrated.
Mr. Alexander stated that the staff report also points out a height issue and the recommendations refer to vertical accents. He noticed that with their initial proposal, the buildings looked more like 20th century buildings with 2-story facades. Is that the direction staff prefers, even though programmatically, that is not the applicant's direction of interest?
Mr. Bitar stated that across the street is the 1919 school building, which has 3 stories and a parapet. Staff is not suggesting a building of that type or a flat roof, but it could incorporate a 2nd floor or some elements that address the scale of Bridge Street.
Mr. Alexander observed that the height of the proposed building compared to what exists in the district is deceptive. The height of the Oscars building is 22 feet; the 72 N. High building height is 20 feet. This proposed building is 32 ft. 6 in. The former Brazenhead building was nearly 28 feet. The proposed 1.5-story buildings are quite tall.
Ms. Call stated that this is a transitional neighborhood, so the perspective depends on from what and to what we are transitioning. The Historic District has 1 to 2-story structures, but other parts of the BSD neighborhood, such as Metro Center, have taller buildings.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the last time the Commission discussed this project, it talked about potential solutions for the connection at Bridge Street and Monterey Drive, such as a traffic signal and other forms of pedestrian and traffic mitigation. The discussion also included a new road connecting to Corbins Mill. The applicant has admitted that it is very risky for traffic to turn west from Monterey Drive onto Bridge Street. He is having difficulty contemplating recommending approval for this project when there is no understanding of what will be happening at Bridge Street, the future connectivity plans and the timing thereof. As the situation exists today, this project should not be approved. It would be incredibly irresponsible of the Commission to allow this to proceed without addressing the Monterey Drive connection at W. Bridge Street.

Ms. Call requested Mr. Bitar to review the other elements in addition to this parcel, which the City will be considering holistically.
Mr. Bitar responded that a new TIS is not needed, because the type of density and uses were all envisioned and studied with the original rezoning. However, the manner in which the intersections will function and the timing of the traffic signals on Bridge Street will be studied further with the Preliminary Development Plan.
Mr. Chinnock inquired if a condition of approval should be added that a plan for resolution of the intersection must be in place before the project is permitted to move forward.
Mr. Bitar responded that since it is part of the typical PDP process, adding that condition to the Concept Plan may not be necessary.

Ms. Call inquired if it would be within the purview of the Planning Commission to add that condition of approval, since City Council would be the approving body.
Mr. Boggs responded that it would not be necessary at this stage of the development process. Engineering will be involved in the PDP and FDP reviews, so any need for traffic-calming elements will be identified and incorporated in the plan during Engineering's review.

Ms. Call requested confirmation that due to the fact that the traffic issue will be part of the existing staff review process, it would not need to be added as a condition of approval to the Concept Plan. Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if traffic speeds would be considered as part of that PDP review.
Mr. Boggs clarified that a change in speed limit would not be included. That would entail a process that is entirely independent of PZC or City Council. The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) requires certain parameters to be met to change traffic speeds. However, traffic calming measures separate from the speed limit might be considered.

Mr. Garvin stated that he was not serving on the Commission during its previous Informal Review; however, that earlier discussion reflected the Commission's support for 2-story residential. There is insufficient demand to make 2-story commercial viable, but what caused them to abandon the idea of 2-story residential along Bridge Street?
Mr. Hunter responded that the change of direction was due to the parking study results. The market demand for ground-floor spaces is greater for a restaurant use than for a retail use. Crawford Hoying conducts its own parking analysis independent of the City's zoning code. If their tenants are dissatisfied, the use is not viable. Having both ground-floor restaurant uses and 20-40 residential units above would have required another bay of parking. They would need to increase the parking bays to 3 bays or 180 feet of asphalt. That did not seem to be the right solution. Their first proposal for 40 units has been increased to 53, in order for the economics of the project to work.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had considered retaining the desired square footage and unit count, but extending the buildings vertically.
Mr. Hunter responded that there might be such opportunities on the corners. These first-floor spaces are significantly taller than most of the ground-floor retail spaces along this corridor, which is noticeable from the street. He wants to avoid deceptive, wasted space. For instance, at Easton, the buildings appear to have second-floor offices, but there is nothing there. He will continue to study this issue.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had considered the pocket plazas that are interior to the site. Perhaps they could be pulled forward to Bridge Street and become a gateway feature.
Mr. Hunter responded that they are trying to maximize the amount of patio space for the Bridge Street tenants. Should the gateway be at Bridge Street or internal to the site where they have proposed it? In their plan, the gateway will be to the residential neighborhood. An argument regarding the gateway location could be made either way. Monterey Drive will be significantly upgraded to meet Bridge Street standards. On the west side, will be a new shared-use path.

Public Comments

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she is a representative for Waterford Village, the neighborhood adjacent to this site and the proposed development. A majority of her neighbors support this proposal. They appreciate the number of units and the fact that the apartments have been replaced with townhomes. The neighbors also appreciate that the commercial space on Bridge Street is one story, not two stories. This site is located across from Sells Middle School, so the residents appreciate 1.0-1.5 level commercial. They also appreciate the grouping of the townhome units on Monterey Drive. Rather than one continuous 3-story building,

there are different pockets and separation of the townhomes. They appreciate the patio spaces. However, they continue to have traffic concerns. The residents deal daily with the existing traffic issue. She does not believe this project can move forward if no traffic signal is installed at Monterey and Bridge Street. With the commercial spaces, there will be an increase in vehicles in this area across from the school. They discussed with Crawford-Hoying the potential for adding an element, such as a roundabout at the entrance into their neighborhood, to deter traffic from coming through their neighborhood. They want to deter 50 additional cars travelling along their street, when they can't exit at Bridge Street. Additionally, there is a water runoff issue on Clover Court; hopefully, that can be addressed. In the past, they have met with other developers interested in the property, and this experience with Crawford-Hoying has been positive. They have been made aware when the applicant was filing a development application with Planning staff. They have surveyed and gauged the perspectives of their neighborhood and provided the feedback to Crawford-Hoying. Subsequently, they have revised their plan. Because their voices were heard, the residents feel more comfortable with the proposed development moving forward.

Ms. Rauch read the following online public comments received regarding this case.

Tony Kirchner, 3275 Lily Mar Court, Dublin:
"While I'm overall supportive of the uses the project proposes, there are some notable alterations I think are necessary to align the proposal with Envision Dublin. To quote Envision Dublin: "The Future Land Use designation under Envision Dublin is Mixed Use Village, which is intended to be a small-scale, pedestrian-oriented district developed with respect to historic building context and character." Meanwhile, the development's most prominent feature are its large dual parking lots. This is hardly a pedestrian-oriented development despite its being within a half-mile walk to The Link, Historic Dublin's restaurants and retail, CML Dublin, Kroger and more. This should be one of the easiest places in Dublin to live without driving every day, but nothing about this design does anything but encourage getting in your car and driving across the street to get coffee at Fox in the Snow. The increase from 40 to 53 units in the back development feels like too many, especially in attempting to call Reserve A public open space and an extension of Monterey Park, when it really serves as the sidewalk and entrance to the homes of Building 5. I cannot imagine park users ever feeling comfortable conducting park activities in the area shown as Reserve A, unless they were actual residents of Building 5. Eliminating Building 5 altogether would make that public space bigger and better, and allow more room for the rest of the development to spread out and not be so dominated by parking lots. It would also eliminate the need for a Code waiver for frontage. The other "public open spaces" appear to be unused corners of parking lots, which seems like a thinly veiled attempt to reach Code requirements rather than provide any sort of valuable open space for the community. I generally like the design of the commercial buildings taking on the character and acting as an extension of the Historic Dublin commercial district. I agree, as well, with the housing type proposed for the south end, but feel some work is needed to bring this development up to Dublin standards, especially considering the district in which it is located. I hope this development can move forward, but it should also be made clear to the developer that certain refinements are very much needed to improve it before it reaches the next stage."

Kevin O'Connor, Red Rooster Quilts, 48 Corbins Mill Drive, Dublin:
"Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present information to you regarding the Monterey Drive at 201 & 191 W. Bridge Street Development. My wife and I are the owners and operators of Red Rooster Quilts at 48 Corbins Mill Dr. We are immediate neighbors of the proposed development, as well as long-time Dublin residents. Unfortunately, I am traveling out of state today for a funeral service and cannot attend the meeting in person. I am happy to meet or discuss my comments

with the Commission or members of the City at a later time, if desired. Our store opened in 2005 and has thrived, thanks to its reputation and the support of the Dublin community. During our almost 20 years, we have remodeled and expanded two separate times. Each time we worked with the City to meet existing code and zoning to make our business an example of what can be done in Dublin, We also have strived to be "good neighbors" to the property owners around us. We do this because it is the right thing to do. This is also what we believe the purpose of the Planning & Zoning Commission's role is: that is, to set standards and guidelines that encourage everyone to be "good neighbors". What we see with this proposal is not in accordance with this principle. Please let me explain: First: the proposal for an east-west public street would have an immediate and direct negative impact to our property. We have been here almost 20 years but now a proposal by a "new neighbor" will dictate what can happen to our property. The extension of the road they propose would allow them to make significant income at our expense. This future road would require the removal of a large portion of our building and decrease the available footprint for any future building due to the size of our lot being decreased. This decrease in total lot size would reduce the building size because of the requirements related to "total buildable" ratios for the lot, green space requirements, and parking requirements, etc. A new neighbor should not be able to require another property to give up something. If their development is creating a traffic issue, it should be their responsibility to mitigate it within the property they have, and this is what I believe the Planning & Zoning Commission's (PZC) role is to determine. It should never be another property owner's responsibility. If they cannot mitigate the issue, their proposal does not meet the intent of PZC. Instead of making "good neighbors," it is facilitating "bad neighbors". Additionally, if the road is a requirement for the development, then because my property is not changing, it will not solve or fix anything; it is a "red herring!" It is being used by them to attempt to show they are mitigating traffic concerns without actually mitigating traffic, because the road will not be extended. We have been here since 2005 and plan to continue to be here! A dead-end road to nowhere does not solve or mitigate anything. This developer needs to find another way to solve this, most likely by decreasing the density of the units so that they do not negatively impact the Monterey neighborhood. Second: The three-story size of the residential units is out of character with all of the immediately surrounding neighbors. While the multi-story buildings behind the Kroger shopping center may not look out of place, the three-story residential structures proposed will be an eye sore. They will be above the tree lines and be seen from the exit ramps of I-270 to the Historic District, and most significantly to the immediate Monterey Drive neighborhood. The occupancy size created by the third story is one of the contributing factors to the legitimate traffic concerns. Third: If this Concept Plan is approved, the developer has indicated that they will be proposing to go directly from "Concept to Final" with this proposal. I believe this is rushed and will not allow for all parties involved, especially the neighbors, to fully evaluate the proposals. Please do not let a new neighbor come into a neighborhood with a rushed plan that will have significant negative impacts on the existing neighbors. While their proposal may be pretty, it does not resolve the immediate threat to the happiness of Dublin or the neighbors. Please require them to take the full amount of time required so everyone can participate and offer input. The Commission is tasked with making Dublin continue to be the City we all love. Please continue to help all of us be the good neighbors we would want to live or work next door to. Thank you for your consideration."

Ms. Call requested that Ms. Rauch describe the provisions of the street network plan for this area. Ms. Rauch responded that the Bridge Street Code adopted in 2012 includes a street network map, which lays out all the existing and future street connections desired within the Bridge Street District. As development occurs, the proposed street connections will occur in a phased approach. Each development is responsible for providing the streets, connections, lots and blocks required

for their particular parcel that would enable that framework to be extended on adjacent future development parcels.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Garvin stated that he would like to see the park extension integrated. There are tennis courts that are walled-in by chain-link fences. Efforts should be made to make the area feel more integrated into the park. He is concerned with the building materials on the side elevations of the buildings and recommends that they ensure high-quality materials are used.

Mr. Alexander stated that he prefers this revised plan to the earlier plan. He likes the manner in which the applicant has taken greenspace and created a buffer to the south. It is more sensitive to the neighboring properties and has the potential to integrate well with the park. It is a more appropriate border for the park than a road. Even though discussion of architecture is premature at the Concept Plan stage, he believes the units need to be changed dramatically when they do not face a roadway. Units facing a roadway have privacy concerns, and units facing a courtyard are much more private. Using one unit type for two very different conditions is not appropriate. Pulte elevations that face streets are done differently than the side elevations that are internal. They have come up with different plans based on the location of the units. He would caution that the plan should not come back with 53 units that look the same. He is generally supportive of the Concept Plan with staff's conditions. He would encourage the applicant to individualize the units.

Ms. Harter thanked the applicant for reaching out directly to the residents. It improves the development process. She is generally supportive of recommending Council approval of the Concept Plan with the proposed conditions. The elements around the Dublin cemetery, pillars, stonewalls and landscaping present opportunities to emphasize within the development. The architecture and color of the units are lacking in diversity and interest. This will be a walkable area, so the exterior elements are important. Perhaps certain elements of the adjacent Historic District could be duplicated, such as street lamps and flower boxes. She anticipates an attractive development.

Mr. Chinnock also stated that he was generally supportive of the Plan. However, significant site circulation and street connectivity issues need to be addressed. He appreciates the effort Crawford-Hoying has invested in hearing the neighborhood's voices.

Ms. Call stated that while the 1.5-story buildings are taller, there are design elements throughout the community that are smaller scale; typically, they are on 2-lane roads. They are part of the mixed-use incorporated into a residential neighborhood. This section of West Bridge Street is in a sleepy residential neighborhood, and the buildings alongside it are in a transition situation. Here, they are not really transitioning to the residential neighborhood. The residential neighborhood is tucked back and hidden from the public realm. From the public realm, the transition occurs with a grocery store. That store is located adjacent to Metro Place, where 5 and 6-story buildings are envisioned. In this transitional neighborhood, this parcel will "set the stage." It will be the first development in this area to re-envision how Dublin will look in 20 years. She appreciates their attempts to address parking concerns and make the development work economically. With restaurant users, banquet rooms and private dining areas on the second level could create a vertical element. The Commission is not suggesting that West Bridge Street should be lined with tall buildings or for Bridge Park to be replicated here. However, this development looks a little sleepy

for its position. It looks like it belongs in a more residential neighborhood, not along a 4-lane roadway. Perhaps placing the patios immediately adjacent to a plaza would provide a landmark area. There could be a gateway into the residential area, but the vision for the overall site would be interesting if the public and private realms integrated. There would still be delineation between public and private, although integrated.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant desired further input.
Mr. Hunter indicated that they had received sufficient feedback.

Ms. Harter moved, Mr. Garvin seconded a recommendation of approval of the Concept Plan to City Council with the following conditions:

1) That taller elements and further refinements be incorporated into the design of the commercial buildings.
2) That the residential building design and materials be significantly enhanced to meet the applicable building type and general BSD building design standards, and to better address the site's context.
3) That the open space system be further refined to include highly usable and interconnected spaces.
4) That the circulation system throughout the site be further developed to address emergency access concerns and provide better integration between the commercial and residential uses.
5) That as many of the existing trees be preserved as possible, including the tree line along the west property line.
6) That the site design details, including lot coverage be refined to address the BSD code requirements as well as the site's unique setting.
7) That the public street right-of-way widths and the streetscape and intersection design details be finalized in coordination with the City's Transportation and Mobility Department.

Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

~~COMMUNICATIONS~~

~~Ms. Rauch reminded Board members of the following:~~

- ~~The development review process previously scheduled on the agenda will be deferred to a future meeting, when all members are present and can provide input.~~
- ~~The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 8, 2024. Although two PZC members will be absent from that meeting, there will be a quorum.~~
- ~~A training session with PZC, ARB (Architectural Review Board) and BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) is scheduled for Thursday, August 22, 2024.~~
- ~~A joint work session with City Council, PZC, ARB and BZA is scheduled for September 3, 2024.~~

~~Ms. Call requested that staff conduct an audit of the definition of greenways in the Envision Dublin Community Plan and the Code and ensure the hierarchy is consistent in both documents.~~
~~Ms. Rauch indicated staff would do so.~~

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5FFABEA6-A3C2-41B1-862E-BBEC0B2DCF68

RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 7, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

2. Monterey Drive Development at 201 and 191 W. Bridge Street
23-127INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	Development of approximately 6.87-acres consisting of single-family attached units, multi-family units, and commercial and office space.
Location:	Both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street.
Request:	Informal review of and feedback on a future development application.
Applicant:	Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying
Planning Contact:	Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/23-127

RESULT: Commission members expressed support for upper floor residential uses in the buildings fronting on Bridge Street as a way to activate the street frontage and reduce the need for surface parking. There was also general support for the development of single-family attached condominiums on the rest of the site as a transitional use between the existing single-family detached uses to the south and the busier Bridge Street corridor to the north. However, there was consensus that the design, and possibly massing, of the structures needed to be improved over the character images provided by the applicant. The overall site layout was viewed favorably, although Commission members noted that traffic management details, open space location and design, and various other details will need further refinements if the project moves forward.

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

DocuSigned by:
Bassem Bitar
FEB125C5BED6456...
Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning

~~**CONSENT CASE**~~

- ~~**Case #23-111AFDP – Overlook at Tartan Ridge**~~

~~A request for approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) to Modify the Development Text Standards for an Existing Residential Development on a 23.98-Acre Site Located Northeast of the Intersection of Hyland-Croy and McKitrick Roads, and Zoned Planned Unit Development - The Overlook at Tartan Ridge.~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of a Minor Text Modification to the Overlook at Tartan Ridge Development Text under Development Standards, Section F (1)(a and b), (2)(a and b)(iii), and (8)(a)(i and ii), setback requirements:~~
~~to extend the maximum building line setback for lots 6-9, 16-18, and 20-24 to be in line with that of the adjacent lots along the straight roadway segments, or as otherwise shown on Exhibits C-2 and C-3;~~

~~and to approve the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with the following condition:~~

~~1) After approval of the AFDP, should concerns arise with the placement of building line setbacks and/or extensions as depicted on the exhibits, the applicant shall work with staff to make minor adjustments to the building lines while meeting the intent of the development standards.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.~~
~~[Motion carried 7-0]~~

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #23-127INF - Monterey Drive Development**

A request for an Informal Review of a Development Proposal for a Mix of Residential, Commercial and Office Uses on a 6.90-Acre Site Zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood, Located on Both Sides of Monterey Drive, South of the Intersection with W. Bridge Street.

Applicant Presentation

Matthew Starr, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated that they have been looking at this particular site for some time. Many development proposals have been made for the site, none of which have materialized. The current owners have had the site for 8 years. Tonight, they are proposing a project that they believe would be appropriate for this site. From their present development at Bridge Park, they have been watching where market needs and demands exist. They are interested in hearing both the Commission's and the public's feedback. They met last week with the neighborhood homeowners association and had a good conversation.

Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated Dublin's Code permits many uses for this historic transition site. There is a 4.5-foot general height restriction for this area, and no residential use is permitted on the ground floor of buildings within the Bridge Street Corridor. The Informal Review is a step early in the development process. There are a few significant items that could make or break the proposed project, so it is important to have this conversation with

the Commission. They have observed other proposals made for the site, which appeared to be attempting to place too much on the site. Although the Dublin Zoning Code permits 4.5-story buildings here, it has not "felt" right. With their awareness of the market, they are also offering a proposal. There would be single-family development to the south on the rear two-thirds of this site, and there would be more dense development to the front of the site. There would be commercial on the ground floor of the structures with either commercial or residential on the stories above. The City-owned Dublin Cemetery site is located on the southeast corner of Monterey Drive and Bridge Street. Their proposal considers an expansion of Dublin Cemetery, perhaps utilizing a land trade to obtain the frontage and the corner piece. Their proposal includes single-family townhomes, similar to those they have developed in Upper Arlington and similar to those being developed by Pulte Homes in Bridge Park. They are interested in developing single family, perhaps townhomes or patio homes. The bigger question is what occurs on the upper stories of the buildings along Bridge Street. There is agreement that there should be active uses on the ground floor. The Code permits residential or office uses above. However, the current market for office space is not doing well; in addition, office uses require additional parking. If they were to develop 2.5-story office buildings on Bridge Street, and one restaurant was included, it would be necessary to add another row of parking to meet the minimum parking requirements of the zoning. Placing 200 feet of asphalt between the buildings and the single-family does not seem appropriate. If they were to develop two or three-story buildings along Bridge Street with retail, commercial and restaurant on the ground floors and residential uses above, the parking would work. They are interested in learning the Commission's opinion on whether that project could be pursued.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that an Informal Review is an optional first step, which provides an opportunity for the applicant to obtain non-binding feedback from PZC at the formative stage of a development concept. Following an Informal Review, the applicant may submit a formal Concept Plan for review and determination by the PZC. If a development agreement between the applicant and the City should be necessary, the Concept Plan would also require City Council review and determination. If the Concept Plan is approved, the next steps are a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and a Final Development Plan (FDP). After review and approval of those plans, the applicant may apply for building permits.

Mr. Bitar provided an overview of the 6.87-acre site, which consists of 13 parcels and is zoned BSD-HTN, Historic Transition Neighborhood. The site is located on both sides of Monterey Drive, south of the intersection with W. Bridge Street. According to information obtained from the Franklin County Auditor, the existing gas station and convenience store on the site were constructed in 1988. As part of the Bridge Street District area-wide rezoning, the site was rezoned to BSD-HTN Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood. The site is adjacent to the Dublin Cemetery to the east, the Dublin Plaza shopping center to the west, and Monterey Park directly south. The individual parcels on the site are currently owned by Dublin Development LLC, except for the parcel at the southeast corner of W. Bridge Street and Monterey Drive, which is owned by the City of Dublin. The southern portion of the site was previously occupied by eight duplexes built at an unknown date, zoned R-2, which were demolished a few years ago. The site abuts the Historic District Public zoning on the east side, where the Dublin Cemetery is located, and the Dublin School site on the north side of Bridge Street. If this site were immediately adjacent to the Historic Core zoning, there would have been greater limits on the building heights. The site is separated from the Historic Core zoning by the church and the cemetery. To the south lies the

municipal park and the Waterford Village community. A Historic Transition District is intended to complement the Historic Core of the City by allowing a similar variety of uses within the district, streets and blocks similar to the Historic Core, and is intended to extend the walkable environment. The Historic Transition District provides larger, adjacent uses and permits additional residential opportunities, as well as a mixture of uses complementing the Historic Core. The Bridge Street District street network system includes several street classifications. West Bridge Street is classified as a Corridor Connector Street and a Principal Frontage Street. Those street designations require the area to promote walkability and limit conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. In this district, residential development is not permitted on the ground floor along West Bridge Street. Monterey Drive is a Neighborhood Street, which is similar to the streets in the Historic Core to the east.

The applicant is proposing to develop the southern portion of the site with 40 townhome units arranged on both sides of Monterey Drive. Two new east-west streets would be added to create a block system, providing frontage to some of the units and allowing for potential future connectivity to the west. An alley system would provide access to garages at the rear of the buildings. Approximately one acre along the east side is proposed to be traded to the City in exchange for the 0.63-acre, City-owned parcel along W. Bridge Street. The intent is to allow for potential expansion of the Dublin Cemetery and to account for the required open space.

The W. Bridge Street frontage is proposed to be developed with two buildings, each with a 20,000-square-foot footprint. Two options are provided, both of which would include commercial uses on the first floor. Option 1 would consist of two-story buildings, with the second floor allocated for office uses. Option 2 would involve three-story buildings, with the two upper floors incorporating 40 residential units. A surface parking lot is proposed along the south side of each building.

Staff has provided the following questions for the Commission's discussion:

1) Is the Commission supportive of upper floor residential uses along the W. Bridge Street frontage?
2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed layout of the site?
3) Is the Commission supportive of the height and massing of the townhome buildings?
4) Any additional considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated the street network information provided by staff shows a potential neighborhood connection from Monterey Drive to Corbins Mill Street. He requested additional information about that connection.
Mr. Bitar responded that the Bridge Street District contemplates future connectivity. The contemplated blocks and street system would allow for that potential connection.
Mr. Supelak inquired if there is any additional information other than what is contemplated in the District.
Mr. Bitar responded that there is no additional information. Currently, it is privately owned land, not owned by this applicant.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the driveway/alleyway adjacent to the west side of the target parcel. The Marathon gas station is located on that corner. Is that also privately owned land?
Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the current restrictions of the zoning and the permitted uses. The zoning would permit residential or commercial on the second floor. What would be Commission's authority in directing one use over the other?

Ms. Call requested the Assistant Law Director to expand upon an answer to Mr. Schneier's question and also provide clarification of the zoning, permitted uses, next steps, and purview of the Commission and City in regard to engineering, a traffic impact study (TIS), public safety and schools.

Mr. Boggs responded that properties within the Bridge Street District (BSD) are already zoned. That differs from other portions of the City where a planned unit development can occur, essentially making its own zoning code for the properties within that PUD. With this application, there is no rezoning that accomplishes the uses proposed in this application, but there are a number of regulations in terms of location of activities, form and other development standards that exist for any application in the BSD. Mr. Boggs reviewed the primary uses permitted on any site within the Historic Transition District. In the Bridge Street District, residential uses are not permitted on the first story of a mixed-use building. The City has no authority to limit a lawful residential use above the first story, although it can impact the form of the building and subsequently, how that second story can be used on the street-facing side, such as balconies and windows. In regard to the City's purview with engineering, traffic, etc., because this site is already zoned BSD-Historic District, no traffic impact study is required. The required TIS already occurred at the time this area was zoned, and the intensity of use took into account the TIS and traffic protections that were designated at that time. There still are some engineering elements, such as curbcuts, that engineering can require. However, a TIS, which would impact the zoning and the use, is not required for properties that are already zoned BSD or have a straight zoning. In terms of impact on the school districts, the City, through its planning processes – future land use plan, area plan, etc. lays out future development opportunities for properties. The school district relies on those plans when they are projecting student populations. The presence or absence of potential students is not really a function of zoning, especially where the uses have already been established for a property. Public safety is also outside of the purview of zoning, although there is an element of public safety in terms of configuration of lots and blocks to ensure they can accommodate public safety vehicles. Whether a particular retail use tends to generate property crime is not a zoning consideration for the Commission. In regard to process, the Bridge Street development review process has 3 steps, all of which come before the PZC. The Informal Review is an optional early step, preceding the other three iterative steps: Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan, and Final Development Plan.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the Commission's purview to specify that a residential property be either rental, condominium or single-family.
Mr. Boggs responded that the Commission does not have purview to mandate owner-occupied, rentals, or a precise mix of property ownership and tenant arrangements. Planning looks only at the use of property.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if a traffic signal should be needed at Monterey and Bridge streets, is the City restricted by the proximity of the traffic signal at Corbins Mill Drive or other nearby signals?
Mr. Bitar responded that he has spoken with the Transportation and Mobility staff. If this project moves forward, the City would look at that intersection. Signal warrants are necessary to signalize an intersection, which involves a specific process. Other details would be considered, as well.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the proposed land trade. Does the plan meet the greenspace requirement? Does the traded space factor into that requirement? If space is used as an extension of the Dublin Cemetery, that would impact the amount of greenspace on this site.
Mr. Bitar responded that the proposed acreage accommodates both an expansion of the cemetery, as well as the open space requirements of this project. The latter would be met even if there were no land trade with the City. However, the details of how that open space is incorporated would have to be defined.

Mr. Way stated that the drawing shows frontage and open space, which is potentially the cemetery expansion space.
Mr. Bitar responded that some portion of it is intended to be cemetery expansion space; those details would need to be defined.
Mr. Way stated he was clarifying that although the drawing shows it as open space, it is not being planned as open space. He inquired if any improvements to Bridge Street in this area are included in this plan.
Ms. Rauch responded that she is not aware of any at this point, but if this plan proceeds, any such improvements would be coordinated with Transportation and Mobility.
Mr. Way stated that he has been told that a multi-use path was being planned for this side of the street.
Ms. Rauch responded that if that should be the case, staff would ensure that this plan is accommodated.

Mr. Way stated that the Bridge Street Vision Plan envisioned that the school building across the street might be eliminated at some point and redeveloped. He believes the Bridge Street Area Plan shows that.
Mr. Bitar responded that he does not have that plan in front of him.
Mr. Way stated that his point is that the north side of the street potentially could change in the future and would probably follow a similar plan of development as is exhibited tonight. Therefore, the Commission should not look only at what is proposed on one side of the street, but how it might fit in with what might occur on the other side of the street in the future.

Ms. Call explained the Envision Dublin Community Plan process and shared that the information might be viewed by the public on the City's Envision Dublin website.
Mr. Way inquired about the greenspace depicted on the west side of the building close to the gas station.
Mr. Hunter responded that it is tentatively patio space for a restaurant, but it is currently undefined.
Mr. Way responded that he assumed it was space being left for such an opportunity. The plan images show outdoor activity space on the front not the side of the building.

Ms. Harter stated that this site is very close to a cemetery. Has staff searched the City's history and confirmed that this site was never part of the cemetery?
Mr. Bitar responded that in the past, there were residential structures on the site. The presumption is that nothing else of historical value was there, but that would be confirmed.
Ms. Harter inquired if the contemplated expansion of the Dublin Cemetery were to go forward, Council be involved in that conversation.
Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter referred to the building frontage and inquired if the building would be entered from the front or the rear.
Mr. Hunter responded that City Code requires the front doors to be on Bridge Street, although there would be opportunities for the tenants to have a secondary rear entrance.

Ms. Harter stated that her assumption is that the townhomes would not have basements.
Mr. Starr responded that as currently contemplated, that is correct.
Ms. Harter inquired if they had considered underground parking for the townhomes.
Mr. Hunter responded that the site is fairly flat, so it would be difficult to add. If the grade is flat, ramps must be incorporated to reach the lower level, which would take up more space. They were able to incorporate lower-level garages in some places in Bridge Park, because the sloped grade permitted it. The townhomes proposed for this flat site would have garages at the back.

Public Comments

Ervin Keith Barnes, 279 Clover Ct., Dublin stated that he lives in Waterford Village. He was one of the property owners who met with the applicants. They shared their proposal and requested community input. He is not speaking for other residents, as the development proposal has not yet been discussed at their homeowners association (HOA) meeting. He has received feedback, however, from some neighbors who are concerned about the traffic. The original TIS was conducted before most of the development that has occurred in Old Dublin and on Bridge Street. The traffic often will back up to Frantz Road. It is virtually impossible and certainly not safe for traffic to turn left from Monterey Drive to Bridge Street. There are four lanes of constant traffic flow on Bridge Street. Assuming 2 vehicles per residence in this development, approximately 150-200 vehicles will be added to the current traffic flow on Monterey Drive. Monterey Drive is used as a cut-through street to Waterford, Franklin Street and High Street. It is also difficult to turn left on Frantz Road. There is a community park in this neighborhood, and there is only one sidewalk to reach the park. From Clover Ct., it is necessary to cross Monterey Drive to reach the park. He has lived in this neighborhood for 8 years, during which time significant development has occurred in Old Dublin and Bridge Street. He is concerned about the level of traffic in this area and safety.

Nicole Salva, 336 Pebble Creek Drive, Dublin stated that she is in charge of the community's civic association. They have not yet had a formal HOA meeting to discuss this topic, but she has shared the Crawford Hoying proposal with the neighbors. She reiterated the traffic and safety concerns for this community of families. There are approximately 220 homes in the Waterford community, so adding 80 residential units would increase their neighborhood by 36 percent, concentrated within this 6-acre area. All of their homes are one or two stories. Historic Dublin has 2.0-2.5 story homes, and they would prefer to see that height restriction continued here. The applicant has proposed townhomes and 40 apartments. They would prefer there to be only owner-occupied residences. This site is directly across from the Dublin School site. No other Dublin schools have apartments directly across the street. They have community activities, and it would be preferable that any new residents build the relationships necessary to be part of their small community. Many apartments will be added in Metro Center, so it should not be necessary to add apartments here. The other concern is the commercial component. This site is directly across from the schools, so it is a concern what type of retail would be included here. They are open to conversation with Crawford Hoying to achieve a suitable development adjacent to their neighborhood, but what is proposed does not yet achieve that.

Kathryn Lecklider, 274 Monterey Drive, Dublin stated that she is supportive of development in this area and understands that it is part of the overall Historic Business District Plan. A rich and walkable business district is the essential reason they moved to this neighborhood. She is optimistic in her support and willingness to partner with Crawford Hoying on this project. This is the first stage of the proposal, and it has many positives. However, at this point, there has not been enough discussion with the neighborhood. She is concerned about the scale and density of the proposed development of an infill project adjacent to one of Dublin's original neighborhoods, built in the 1970-1980s. Less scale, height and density is important; this is not Bridge Park. She understands the allowable zoning height, yet with the Dublin Cemetery to the right and no other 3-story buildings within the Historic Business District, anything over 2.0-2.5 stories will look stark and out of place. 40 townhomes and 40 apartments is an unmanageable residential volume to add to this area, is not to scale and would not blend well with the neighborhood. There are other options. Any development here should look like the original development, not new development. Her biggest concern is the traffic and safety. They live on Monterey Drive and have young children, as do her neighbors. The neighborhood is full of young families with children. This cannot become a cut-through street where their children's safety is compromised. Traffic implications must be comprehensively addressed on the front end or they likely would not occur. She does not believe a traffic signal is necessarily the answer, as it could encourage additional traffic down Monterey. She suggests the City consider terminating Monterey Drive into a cul de sac before the new development occurs, routing any new traffic out to Corbins Mill Drive. This is not an isolated project. Consideration should be given to what else is planned long-term for the Bridge Street Corridor, as significant impacts to their neighborhood and traffic volume will also result from whatever is ultimately developed in the infill anticipated for Frantz Road and Metro Place.

Mary Ann Clark, 146 Corbins Mill Drive, Dublin stated that she is a daily walker through Monterey Park. There is a proposal to add many more residents in their neighborhood, yet there is no proposal to expand the park. The park is used by young families, the elderly and pet owners. Dublin is very supportive of community parks. This proposal w add residents, and at the same time enclose the park so it can never be expanded to accommodate the additional people. She sees no greenspace in the proposed plan, so the additional residents will use the Monterey Park. The residents in the Corbins Mill condominiums are older, and the negative impact should be limited on the quality of life and activities of those residents.

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin stated that there have been remarks about a land swap, and that the property surrendered to the City would still count as open space for this project. That does not sound right, so he is hoping to see that clarified.

Patricia Paolucci, 325 Old Spring Ct., Dublin stated that she has lived in this neighborhood for 15 years. She has watched this community grow, and in many ways, it has been nice. However, the community has too many apartments. She questions if all the apartments in Bridge Park are filled. It is not necessary to add more apartments within this small area adjacent to their community. What the community does need is more greenspace for the park and expansion of the cemetery. She is opposed to this development. The traffic in this neighborhood is a serious issue. She asks the Commission not to overdevelop this beautiful city.

Michael Skalak, 249 Old Spring Lane, Dublin stated that this proposal is better than the earlier proposals for this site. He understands that something will be developed here, but the residents want to make sure that it fits well with their neighborhood. He has spoken with other dads within

the neighborhood. They have expressed concerns about the traffic and the proposed apartments across from the elementary school. Many of those students live in this neighborhood. More school space is needed in Dublin, and adding more people here will exacerbate the problem. He described the impact of the traffic on the walkability of the neighborhood for the families. Walking along Bridge Street past the Dublin Cemetery is very dangerous. Pedestrians on that sidewalk are within 3 feet of semi-trucks traveling down SR161. Adding the traffic signal at Franklin Street was an improvement, but pedestrians crossing to the other side of SR161 encounter obstacles on the sidewalk, particularly in front of the veterinary office. The obstacles make it difficult to walk down the sidewalk to Old Dublin. In conjunction with this project, he would encourage consideration of ways to make this area walkable and safe. Although their school is across the street, the children in the neighborhood cannot safely cross SR161 to reach the school. Perhaps a pedestrian bridge or tunnel could alleviate the walkability issue in the neighborhood.

Public Comment:
[received via livestream]

Andrea Milner, 323 Clover Lane, Dublin stated that she would strongly discourage moving forward with this plan as proposed based upon the following: (1) An increased degree of overcrowding and congestion to the neighborhood and surrounding areas. This will only exacerbate the existing quagmire that is rush hour traffic on Bridge Street. Perhaps consider adding a traffic signal. (2) Adding more vehicular traffic on Monterey Drive decreases the safe space for children to play. (3) Overcrowding of the local schools. (4) The proposed structure will ill match the Dublin aesthetics. (5) In the age of remote work, why would this proposal include mixed-use office space? There currently are office spaces in the City that are far under-utilized and by the conclusion of this project, that utilization rate would further decline.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission appreciates the public's interest and response in the proceedings. He is empathetic because he lives in Historic Dublin and walks these streets, as well. The Commission is constrained in its authority with respect to the use of this parcel. It is limited to the Code. The proposed project is a good start. The public comments tonight represent the residents in this neighborhood. However, the front of this site lies along a state route – SR161. If there were not a residential community behind this site, the discussion would be very different. We would be talking about what should be built along a state route with a high volume of traffic. Within this small area, there is a state route, a residential community, a gas station and a municipal cemetery. The needs and desires seem to be mutually exclusive. He commends the applicant for making an effort to accommodate them. He likes the mixed-use. He is in favor of greater walkability and having attractions in Dublin. There are other examples of areas that have been developed close to schools. Jones Middle School in Upper Arlington is located at the end of the Mallway, where there are restaurants and retail with office above. It is a very commercial area. In Grandview Heights, across from the elementary school, there is a strip center with restaurants and a bar. While he would not like to see that type of zoning here, he does believe the uses can co-exist. He believes the proposed use is appropriate, and the Code prescribes it. He is supportive of working with the applicant and residents to achieve the best outcome.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the residents' comments. They live there and are probably better experts than Commission members as to what should or should not be there. He believes the site will be developed, but what is proposed lacks creativity. There are two rows of townhouses

and two large surface parking lots, and a small strip as an extension for the cemetery. This area deserves something much more creative and attractive. It sits along SR161 and is very visible to people entering Dublin. This area is a distance away from Bridge Park, and he would like to see something less dense and really beautiful and creative. The site backs up to residential neighborhoods and is in the center of Dublin in a very visible, well-used neighborhood. The development should be attractive, something of which the residents can be proud. He would recommend the density be lowered and the townhomes be arranged in a more attractive manner. The traffic issue described by the residents is quite accurate; adding more traffic here should be avoided.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the proposed project is a nice start for a challenging site. He is sympathetic with the residents. We need to start to consider how to make our community more walkable, rather than using traffic mitigation. The traffic should be eliminated by creating a true, walkable community, creating places to walk to, such as a school. Creating more safety down SR161 would make it more walkable and discourage vehicles driving there. Adding traffic circles and traffic signals does not reduce traffic. There need to be fewer cars and more things to walk to in the area. He is not in favor of making Monterey Drive a cul de sac, as it would be diverting traffic somewhere else and creating the same issue. He agrees that the proposed townhomes need to be much more creative. There is too much proposed paving. Children will be cutting through the site to reach the nearby park, and that amount of paving and vehicles would create risk for the pedestrians. Confusion remains about the land trade. Does it account for the required greenspace for the project? The intent is that the greenspace for a development be usable greenspace. The park is already very crowded, so this project could alleviate the need by providing true usable greenspace.

Ms. Harter stated that it is good that the applicants are meeting with the residents. She believes this site should achieve a flow with the neighborhood and the park. There is an existing traffic issue in the area that is already a challenge for the residents, and addressing that concern will be important. She noted that there are apartments adjacent to the Dublin Scioto High School and providing mounds and landscaping between the two have been helpful. The walkability in this area is important to consider, as the pedestrians include many young students. She would suggest adding creative entrances, perhaps including artwork and a dog park.

Mr. Way thanked the residents for participating. It is equally important for the Commission and developer to hear the comments and for them to be on the record. This project seems to fit well with the Bridge Street District Code, so it is difficult for the Commission to offer comments on anything inconsistent with that Code. In terms of the uses along Bridge Street, additional parking would not be good; therefore, he would be supportive of residential rather than office uses. He believes the proposed site layout works well. He is supportive of transitional land uses, so the idea of transitioning from single-family detached to single-family attached on a busy corridor is a perfect transition. It is difficult to do layouts on tight sites, and the applicant has managed to get it all on the site in a manner that works well. Townhouses with garages at the rear are a direction the City has been encouraging. The project meets the permitted height, but the community is asking that the height not be higher than 2.0 or 2.5 story. He would recommend the applicant show some options, and let the Commission consider the look/feel of the height and massing. He is supportive of the proposed plan and looks forward to seeing the evolution of it.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission and the developers profit from hearing the residents comments. He is supportive of the proposed use and project. Adding the commercial along the thoroughfare creates a buffer, which then steps down to the single-family townhouses, which then steps down to the single-family home community. That is a nice transition on the site. He applauds the collaborative thinking behind the contemplated land trade. It creates a nice quid pro quo opportunity, although the specifics have yet to be determined. He is supportive of meetings continuing between the applicant and the community. The traffic issue is a concern at all points. The property owner has the right to develop the property according to the current Code, so the hope is that we leverage that collectively to improve the situation. Adding a traffic signal at Monterey Drive and Bridge Street would alleviate the traffic access issue and provide a crosswalk across Bridge Street to the school site. He agrees that the walkability of SR161 is a safety issue, and efforts should be made to alleviate that.

Ms. Call stated that it is not the Commission's purview to discuss land swaps, acquisitions and the associated legal implications. As an administrative body, the Commission's job is to make sure applications meet the Code and that includes the required open space. One of the public comments referred to obstacles in the public walkways along SR161. She would ask Ms. Rauch to speak to Code Enforcement about that issue and ensure public walkways are not being obstructed. In regard to the suggestion for a pedestrian tunnel or bridge over SR161, that would be a very large project and involve many stakeholders. It would be outside the purview of this applicant, but it is an intriguing idea. There was also a comment about the future use of the school site; however, that would be a joint school-City decision. None of those discussions are within the Commission's purview, at least not at the current time. She is generally supportive of the proposed site layout. She does believe the architecture and character images are lacking. She has viewed previous Crawford Hoying applications that were much more conducive to what the City is looking for in those areas. The proposed architectural feel of the next case would be nice to see in a future application of Crawford Hoying. The cemetery expansion is outside the purview of the Commission, but it would be nice if that cemetery could better accommodate the needs of the City. She believes the residential and office use components could provide a positive activation of the area. She inquired if the applicant needed additional input.

Mr. Hunter responded that they did not require anything additional at this time. He noted that with their 520 rental units at Bridge Park, there are 14 school-age children. The density there is 32 dwelling units (du) per acre; with this site, it is 11 du/acre. The images shared in the application were intended to represent scale and massing more than design, which will be further developed as the plan evolves. They prefer multifamily for the upper floors, as it would have a better parking solution. They appreciate the Commission's feedback.

- ~~**Case #23-107CP Penzone Live/Work**~~

~~Review of a Concept Plan (CP) for the Construction of a Proposed Live/Work Building on the Existing Penzone Campus. The 2.54-Acre Site is Zoned BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is Located Southwest of the Intersection of Village Parkway and Cooperstone Drive.~~

~~**Applicant Presentation**~~