



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 1, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche & Ferrari 6325 Perimeter Loop Road**
17-121INF Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 2. BSD HTN – The Avenue – Outdoor Speakers 94 North High Street**
17-106CU Conditional Use (Approved 6 – 0)
- 3. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone – The Grand Salon 6645 Village Parkway**
17-119MPR/WR Minor Project Review/Waiver Review (Approved 6 – 0)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Steve Stidhem, Jane Fox, Bob Miller, Warren Fishman, and Deborah Mitchell. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Phil Hartmann, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, Nichole Martin, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the December 7, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Mitchell, and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. The following cases were eligible for the Consent Agenda: Case 2 - The Avenue; and Case 3 - Charles Penzone – The Grand Salon. She determined both cases could be reviewed per consent and the cases would be heard in the following order: 2, 3, and 1.



**1. PUD, Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche & Ferrari
17-121INF**

**6325 Perimeter Loop Road
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a request for an Informal review of two new car dealership buildings approximately 23,000 square feet and associated site improvements. She said the 15.53-acre parcel is in Subarea A of the Midwestern Auto Group PUD. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District and is south of Perimeter Drive, approximately 250 feet southwest of the intersection with Venture Drive. She said this is a request for non-binding informal review and feedback on a future formal application. She indicated that typically, the Commission limits informal review applications to 30 minutes of time.

Logan Stang said this is an Informal Review for the Midwestern Auto Group - Porsche and Ferrari showrooms. He presented an aerial view of the site and noted these showrooms are on the western edge of the MAG campus. The applicant is seeking feedback on a future Amended Final Development Plan, he said, which includes the demolition and reconfiguration of the area highlighted where the existing Land Rover building is located. He said the existing display "fingers", service drive, and portions of the parking lot to the south will not be modified with this proposal. He noted proposed modifications include the demolition of the former Land Rover building to allow for the construction of two showrooms for Porsche and Ferrari.

Mr. Stang stated the Porsche showroom is approximately 15,000 square feet and orients the front façade towards the display area and intersection of Perimeter Drive and Perimeter Loop Road. He added a service area is proposed in the southeast portion of the building with service doors facing Venture Drive, similar to other buildings approved throughout the MAG campus. He said the Ferrari showroom is approximately 7,500 square feet in size and will face the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive. There is no service area included with this building, he noted, and a single-drive lane is proposed on the eastern edge for customer drop-off and pick-up.

Mr. Stang pointed out the existing parking lot to the south would be reconfigured to provide circulation around the buildings in addition to any relocated parking spaces. He added a shared display area is proposed between the buildings along the northern service drive. The proposed modifications were overlaid on an existing site plan to demonstrate the changes to the site.

The proposed elevations of the Ferrari showroom were presented and Mr. Stang described the Ferrari showroom as a modern design containing a large glass projection along the front façade with red accents around the main entrance and recesses on the side elevations. He stated the materials include glass, metal panels, and concrete panels complementing other buildings on the campus. A glass overhead door is recessed into the south elevation for the customer drop-off and pick-up, he said, with a similar feature located on the front façade.

Mr. Stang described the Porsche showroom as a similarly modern building with a curved front façade addressing the adjacent rights-of-way. He presented the proposed elevations and noted the building has two overhangs on either side of the curved façade for use as a display area and for customer drop-off and pick-up. He added the main entrance is recessed in the center and attached to a window well that splits the massing of the structure. He said the service area faces the interior of the site with an overhead door on the south elevation. He concluded the materials proposed include glass, various metal panels in a variety of finishes, and concrete masonry units.

A proposed sign package was presented and Mr. Stang explained all the sign details have not been provided for review; however, the preliminary review indicates that a number of the signs shown do not meet the Development Text such as Signs A, B, and H, identified in the submittal. He said these signs would be reviewed and approved with a future application to ensure compliance with the Development Text and consistency throughout the entire MAG campus.

Based on the application, Mr. Stang said staff has identified questions to guide this evening's discussion:

- 1) Are the proposed buildings appropriate in terms of architectural mass, form, and design given the surrounding context?
- 2) Is the overall site design appropriate for safe and efficient circulation?
- 3) Is the proposed sign package consistent with the context of the entire campus?
- 4) Are there other considerations by the Commission?

Mr. Stang concluded his presentation and offered to answer any questions. He noted the applicant was present as well.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance, 49 East Third Avenue, Columbus, OH 43201, said he has returned for the next phase of development for MAG. He said they have broken ground for the Jaguar/Land Rover facility on the east side of the property. He noted the Porsche facility has been shown along the way over the years. He said the biggest thing about this site is to organize the east side of the site with the display fingers that are there. He referred to the site plan where the Porsche facility lies with the middle display finger and hopefully makes that side of the site more activated. He said the interior display area between the two facilities also will allow display on both sides of that curved drive. He said the Ferrari facility is a unique showroom with two showroom facades - one directing towards the display area on the interior and the other towards the public way.

Warren Fishman asked how much denser the site will become. He said it is very difficult to load and unload cars, which is usually done on the street, which then causes a safety hazard. He asked if any allowances have been made for pulling trucks onto the site to load/unload.

Mr. Parish indicated the back area behind the facility has always been considered the main loading area. He said when they move into the Jaguar/Land Rover facility, there is more room. He said the intent was always to have the road that parallels Venture Drive to be the drop-off point for all the cars. He indicated the loading/unloading on Perimeter Loop are for the Crown site. Mr. Parish said, to his knowledge, all of MAG's loading/unloading happens off of Venture Drive.

Mr. Fishman emphasized that Venture Drive is also a public road.

Mr. Parish pointed out the area that all trailers are to use to come on site; there can be up to three carriers at one time. He said they adjusted the curb cut to ensure that the trailers would not bottom out when entering or exiting.

Mr. Fishman clarified that with the improvements, cars will no longer have to load/unload on Venture or Perimeter drives.

Mr. Parish stated it was designed so that would not happen but whether it does or not, he is not sure. He pointed out a loading dock on the side of the BMW facility and on the Jaguar/Land Rover facility allows full-size semi-trucks to come on site.

Jane Fox asked about circulation throughout the site. She said, if the driveway that runs along Venture Drive is where the trailers are located, she noticed it comes to a terminus at the corner of Venture and Perimeter Drives. She said it appears there is sufficient circulation coming from the east until one approaches the curb cut on the west side of the site.

Mr. Parish explained the campus was designed to have two zones on site, the customer experience, which is along the outer drive and the other area for service, inventory overflow, and employee parking. He said that is what the applicant has tried to retain the whole time.

Ms. Fox said she appreciated that these areas had been separated.

Mr. Fishman noted, as the buildings continue to expand, there is a loss of green space. He asked about when this was originally zoned, if there was a requirement for green space and if the applicant is still meeting that requirement.

Mr. Parish answered it is 30% and they will demonstrate it on the next submission.

Bob Miller asked if this proposal will officially max out the site. Mr. Parish answered it is getting very close. From the last traffic study standpoint, they left enough allowance in there when they did the Jaguar/Land Rover facility to expand this side of the site. He said now that they have shuffled the big building and all the brands within that so there is actually vacancy in there.

Mr. Fishman said he visited the site and he would like to see a condition added that there is no loading/unloading on Venture Drive or Perimeter Drive.

Mr. Parish indicated there might be something already included but it is a matter of if it is enforced.

Mr. Papsidero said staff could research the initial approvals but this situation would need to be enforced by the Dublin Police, it would not be Code Enforcement's responsibility.

Ms. Fox said she noticed on the south elevation the organic design and complimented the architect. She said she likes the way it addresses the road. She said on the east elevation it appears there is a very long solid black wall. She asked how that wall is viewed from the road.

Mr. Parish said the Ferrari building will actually block that wall and the intent is to landscape the area heavily. He said the black box in the back is needed for Porsche.

Ms. Fox said the applicant has not yet submitted a landscape plan but because there is very little real green space, that pond can be such a nice transition piece between the next building to the south and tie the entire curb together in a very beautiful way. Ms. Fox inquired about materials.

Mr. Parish answered there is a metal panel that has a profile to it whether it is corrugated or a more chamfered edge to it. He said corrugated metal exists on the main facility currently and the Jaguar/Land Rover facility, the service area will have the corrugated metal panel as well. He said the metal material proposed for both of these facilities are very similar to everything else that is currently out there.

Mr. Miller said he agreed with Mr. Fishman that there is a sense the campus is going to be very crowded. He encouraged the applicant that when they bring forward the formal application, that they bring as much documentation around the materials as possible and provide views for the Commission. He also requested visuals showing intended landscaping as you move through the site. He said the whole campus is gorgeous and the more the applicant can provide at the next review the more helpful their review would be for those Commissioners that are not architects.

Mr. Fishman said he agreed with Ms. Fox. He said he is really anxious to see the landscaping around the buildings.

Mr. Parish said the evergreens have really matured since 1997 so part of this is revitalizing the entire campus. He said some of the evergreens are dying because they are overgrown.

Mr. Miller asked if there was previously a discussion regarding the pond.

Mr. Parish said there was a conversation about the other pond with Jaguar/Land Rover. He said this pond is fed through a well that is underground and it will be used for irrigation on site. He added there are coy fish in it and it serves as a focal point for this end of the campus.

Mr. Fishman indicated he is eager to see the landscaping around the pond as well.

Mr. Miller noted, when he visited the site, there was a light pole that is leaning significantly to one side. He pointed out it is right behind where the Porsche building is going to go, in that parking lot, close to the pond and he wanted to make sure that was addressed.

Ms. Newell said she likes the curved front on the Porsche building. She stated the materials proposed are in keeping with everything else on the site. She said the applicant has done a great job at breaking up long walls of facades but she is not seeing that on these two facilities. She encouraged the applicant to continue the curve on the Ferrari building as well. She stated the applicant has always done very nice presentations. She noted this is the third time the Commission has seen this side of the site. She recalled at one time the arc was followed all the way down, which looked lovely and would be nice to reinforce that arc with Ferrari.

Ms. Newell addressed the signs. She said for all of the buildings that have been brought before this Commission, they have made concessions and given variances for the height of the signs. She explained part of that was the applicant was keeping it in a neutral color palette. She recalled they asked the same thing for the Land Rover facility and they were willing to eliminate the green. She indicated she has the exact same comment in regards to the Ferrari red just because they have kept a neutral palette across the entire campus. She said the Commission made concessions in regards to the height of signs and locations because it was such a cohesive unit and introducing a new color element is something she would discourage.

The Chair asked if the questions had been answered by the Commission or if there is other input the applicant was looking for from the Commission. Mr. Parish answered no; there was nothing else.

Mr. Parish indicated the applicant is going to occupy Land Rover in September so then it will be one building right after another. He said he plans to return fairly quickly to get this application processed. He said if they can put a shovel in the ground in September/October that is what they will do.

Mr. Parish thanked the Commission and the Chair thanked the applicant and said she was looking forward to him coming back.

**2. BSD HTN – The Avenue – Outdoor Speakers
17-106CU**

**94 North High Street
Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the use of outdoor speakers in an existing patio space and an exterior entrance for a 6,000-square-foot restaurant in Historic Dublin, on the east side of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. She added the Commission has final authority on this Conditional Use application and witnesses will need to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone that intended to address the Commission in regards to this case. She asked if there was anyone present from the public that wished to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] There were

no questions or concerns so she called for a vote of approval. She asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions to which Ms. Martin answered they were.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with three conditions:

- 1) That the use of the outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant’s hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing;
- 2) That the speakers only be permitted for the patio, and therefore be removed at the entry on North High Street; and
- 3) That the use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City-sanctioned special events or programming in Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

**3. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone – The Grand Salon 6645 Village Parkway
17-119MPR/WR Minor Project Review/Waiver Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for modifications to the previously approved, new Charles Penzone Grand Salon on a 1.8-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is west of Village Parkway, northwest of the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing Boulevard. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review and a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She stated the Commission has final authority on this application, which will require two separate motions and votes and witnesses will need to be sworn in.

The Chair swore in anyone that intended to address the Commission in regards to this case. She asked if there was anyone present from the public, other than the applicant that wished to speak on this case. [Hearing none.]

Lori Burchett restated there are two motions to be made this evening, one for the Minor Project Review and one for the Waiver Review.

The Chair said she would accept a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Miller moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with no conditions to allow for a change in materials at the north entrance elevation. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Miller moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve a Waiver to allow for a distance of greater than 75 feet between entrances on the west elevation of an approved structure. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Communications

Vince Papsidero said that, at the next meeting, the Commission will start with a joint workshop with the ARB to discuss, in a very draft form, the first set of amendments to the BSD Code Process. He explained this builds on the joint Council and Commission work session in April 2017. He noted there will be a case presented at 7:30 pm after that work session that runs from 6:30 - 7:30 pm.

Mr. Papsidero reported that Motel 6 has filed an Appeal in The Environmental Court. He stated any material that is relevant must be placed in the Drop Box folder by February 27, 2018. He asked if the Commission had any emails between themselves, those should also be included.

Mr. Papsidero said the APA - National Planning Conference is being held in New Orleans, Louisiana and the early-bird registration is February 22. He said this year they are trying something different. They have a peer review process where their programs for review session proposals and he volunteered to be one of those peer reviewers and was asked to Chair one of the major tracks. He said there will be almost 50 Planners reviewing almost 200 proposals. He said if anyone on the Commission is interested in attending, he hopes they find a conference of value.

Mr. Papsidero mention that the MORPC 2050 Academy will have their large regional initiative open to Commissioners and elected officials; the deadline to apply is March 2, 2018. He noted it is a four-week commitment on Friday mornings for these educational sessions. In the past, he noted, Bridge Street was one of their educational sessions - Bridge Park specifically. If anyone is interested, he said, the City will cover the costs. He said the Academy has been a value and MORPC is hoping to grow it.

Mr. Papsidero recalled very important questions raised at the last PZC meeting that were relevant to the case. He encouraged the Commissions that whenever there is a question pertinent to a case, to please let Planning know in advance and they will do whatever research is necessary to help inform that conversation.

Claudia Husak said we are expecting a new Commissioner to be appointed at the next Council meeting on February 12. She said she was approached by Mr. Fishman about training opportunities and she had said Planning was waiting for a full Commission to start training. She asked the Commission what sort of topics they would like a refresher on or new subjects to discuss. She said part of the discussion with Mr. Fishman was his approach to reviewing materials that Planning provides. She indicated she would like the entire Commission to discuss how each member approaches their reviews. She said what works for one may not work for another.

Mr. Miller asked to make a comment on what happened at the last meeting. He said he was incredibly proud of the professionalism of this Commission and of staff in a very tense, frustrating, environment that obviously has very high stakes and everyone across the board did an incredible job during that session.

Jane Fox asked if it was possible to get the joint workshop information sent to them as early as possible so they have a chance to review it. She said it can be so complex and it is very difficult at a work session to read through that and check out the nuances.

Mr. Papsidero said the packet is typically delivered on the Friday of the week prior and usually on that Friday, staff is still working through it. He said this can come back before the Commission as many times as they need to see it so they are comfortable before voting, as well as the ARB. He anticipates the material will be before the Commission for two to three meetings to reach that comfort level as there is a lot of detail.

Ms. Husak added there have been discussions internally to possibly consider if it easier for the Commission/ARB to have an extra meeting each month to focus on that subject or if it is easier to have more cases on the agenda for one meeting a month and then use the next meeting just to focus on the Code. She explained it is hard for Planning to predict how many cases they will have ready in a month but that may be something to also discuss at that meeting.

Ms. Fox said it is really important that the Commissioners spend enough time to really consider these Code changes because they are initiated and because there has been controversy. She said the Commissioners need time to study, review, and understand the materials so they can make the very best suggestions and not waste anyone's time. She said she understands how hard it can be for Planning to get all the materials out given the amount of work they have but it is helpful to even see drafts.

Mr. Papsidero confirmed the materials will be in draft form.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] She adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission approved April 5, 2018.