



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 17, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. PUD, Perimeter Center, Subarea C – Schoedinger Funeral Home** PID: 273-010149
18-019INF Informal Review (Discussion only)
- 2. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights** PID: 273-008811
18-021BPR Informal Review (Discussion only)
- 3. BSD-SRN – Fado Irish Pub** 6652 Riverside Drive
18-026WR Waiver Review (Approved 5 – 0)
- 4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan** Administrative Request
17-093ADM Introduction (Discussion only)
- 5. PUD, Autumn Rose Woods** 7540 & 7660 Hyland Croy Road
18-023Z-PDP-FDP Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)
Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)
- 6. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign** 6659 Coffman Road
18-024ARB-AFDP Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 0 – 1)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Jane Fox, Council Representative; Bob Miller, Warren Fishman, and William Wilson. Kristina Kennedy and Steve Stidhem were absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Phillip Hartmann, Lori Burchett, Devayani Puranik, Tammy Noble, Rachel Ray, Nichole Martin, Cathy DeRosa and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from April 5, 2018. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)



The Chair explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said there were two cases this evening on the Consent Agenda – Autumn Rose Woods (fence) and Coffman Homestead (sign). She determined the consent cases were to be heard first and the rest of the cases would be heard in the order they were published.

**1. PUD, Perimeter Center, Subarea C – Schoedinger Funeral Home PID: 273-010149
18-019INF Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a single story, 12,000-square-foot funeral home and associated site improvements for a site zoned Planned Commerce District, Perimeter Center, Subarea C. She said the site is north of Perimeter Drive, approximately 800 feet west of the intersection with Wall Street. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback on a proposed future development application.

Nichole Martin said Informal Reviews are not a codified process in the Zoning Code but an option for applicants to receive early feedback/suggestions on a development proposal from the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). She explained this evening is intended to be a discussion only so no votes are taken.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the currently undeveloped 2.9-acre site. She presented photographs of an existing tree stand that is centrally located on the northern half of this site. She noted the site to the east is also undeveloped but the site to the west is currently developed with an office building.

Ms. Martin presented a proposed site plan that included a 12,000-square-foot structure with 94 parking spaces located in the rear, meeting the parking requirement for a personal service use. She noted the applicant is also proposing a stormwater basin in front of the building on the south side and a three to four-foot landscape mound that is required by the Development Text. She indicated staff questions whether or not the visual amenity of a pond along Perimeter Drive is better served without the mound.

Ms. Martin said the applicant has also provided conceptual architecture for the funeral home, which is modern in nature with some classic, craftsman elements, including masonry pillars. She presented the south elevation that will face Perimeter Drive and the main access to the building provided from the rear (north side). She presented the other proposed elevations.

Ms. Martin noted the discussion topics for the Commission's consideration are as follows:

1. Is this proposal compatible with existing development located along Perimeter Drive?
2. Is Personal Service as a use appropriate within Perimeter Center?
3. Is the alternate landscape design responsive to the site design?
4. Other considerations by the Commission.

Bob Miller asked what Staff's opinion is of the shared access encouraged versus direct access. Ms. Martin answered the City encourages it; the site does not have an access point along Perimeter Drive and the City is required to provide access. She reported the City Engineer requested the applicant to investigate shared access. She said the preferred access from a City's standpoint is with the existing developed property to the west; however, potentially sharing access with a future development to the east is more amenable after the applicant had conversations with the property owner on the west. Mr. Miller clarified it is acceptable to the applicant to share access. Ms. Martin said the applicant can speak to that. Ms. Husak

restated, the City has to provide access to all parcels so Staff may encourage shared access but the City cannot force it.

The Chair invited the applicant to approach the Commission.

Aaron Underhill, attorney with Underhill and Hodge at 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, said he is representing Schoedinger Funeral Services this evening. He pointed out there is no funeral home in Dublin and when the need arises to provide services, the residents of Dublin have to travel to Marysville, Plain City, or Worthington, amongst many other facilities in Central Ohio but they are not convenient. He reported Schoedinger's has been investigating for some time where they might want to add a facility in Dublin. He said they had to consider access, the feel of the area, a setting to create a certain atmosphere for families and friends who are coming to visit a loved one and this site fits the bill for that. He said most new funeral service facilities are located in areas that have other institutional and/or office type uses as funeral homes do not typically fit next to residential. He said this site provides access to major roads and freeways, it is near the Children's Hospital site (another institutional use), and will blend in well with the area. For a funeral home, he said traffic is not continuous and often comes at off-peak times, after work hours, and on weekends. Therefore, he concluded, traffic will not impact the area negatively. He said the building and setting is meant to comfort those who are grieving but it is not a crematory or a place that will conduct embalming services; it would be a place to celebrate the lives of those who have passed.

Mr. Underhill said the applicant does not object to contacting the neighboring property owner again, regarding access and see if there is an ability to get an easement.

Mr. Underhill requested that the Commission consider this as a Conditional Use with the understanding that a very detailed plan will be provided when it comes forward. He said it is very important for the applicant to understand that tonight for a number of reasons. He invited others on his team to speak to the operational side of this proposal and for the architect to speak briefly about the architecture.

Mark Ford, Ford Associated Architects, 1500 W. First Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said when he was approached about this project, the applicant understood his history in Central Ohio that involved complicated projects. He reported they worked with a firm out of Texas that Schoedinger has a relationship with, who specializes in funeral home design and planning. He said a very contemporary building using traditional building materials that are very prevalent in the community are proposed. He said not only does this represent an evolution of funeral home design but also a public meeting space with the large expanses of glass, an open terrace on the south face of the building with views of the pond, which provides a family-friendly and guest-friendly facility; and the architecture represents that openness.

In siting the building, Mr. Ford explained, they planned all the traffic and parking on the north face of the building and the porte cochere/drop-off area away from the street. He said with all the activity away from the pond, a nice quiet meeting space is offered. He noted the mound on the site plan, which staff had already called out. He reported that after driving around this site, he noticed the new day spa just to the northeast of this site, also has a very nice pond up along the public right-of-way, and there is no mounding there. To be consistent with that site, he said the applicant would support the request to not have a mound so they can take full advantage of the visual quality. He said they have really pondered the roof pitch and design as it is a flat roof system so mechanicals would be placed on the ground and pointed out the mechanical screening areas. He said this is not the final design and they are still considering other sloped roof configurations to control water runoff but believes a modified design would still be in keeping with what the applicant is illustrating this evening.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

William Wilson asked if brick veneer is proposed or the four-inch solid brick and requested more information about all of the materials. Mr. Ford reviewed the proposed materials. Mr. Wilson questioned the metal roof that pitches to the middle of the building. He said he was concerned about drainage. Mr. Ford said Randy Schoedinger has concerns about long term maintenance on a flat roof. He said Schoedingers' have never used a flat roof for any of their other facilities so there are a lot of conversations to bring him to a certain comfort level. He restated they may consider a different roof configuration. He said they would still have the porte cochere on the back and a covered canopy out to the front but whether the center section gets a low pitched roof, etc., that has not yet been determined but the concept would stay the same in terms of the building orientation.

Mr. Wilson asked about the access to the property as that main road gets busy. He said he understands the funeral home will be open after hours. He said he likes to see entry points align with other entry points across a street. He encouraged the applicant to talk to the neighbors on each side.

Jane Fox inquired about the south elevation where there is a terrace and asked if there will be a canopy or awning there. Mr. Ford referred to the side elevation and noted the canopy element that will provide a nice cover from the weather.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak in regards to this case. [Hearing none.] She opened the discussion up to the Commissioners and asked them to respond to the talking points provided by staff.

Ms. Fox said she believes this is a good, compatible use for the area. She understands that the City needs the service and it is in a location that would be convenient for most people and easily accessible. She stated she was impressed with the architectural design and that natural materials are proposed. She said she particularly likes that the structure is distinctive and the architecture is unusual while also providing a welcoming feeling from the street. She said she would support the elimination of the mounding as required; it would be nice to be able to look across the pond from Perimeter Drive. Instead of mounding, she suggested utilizing trees in groupings, seasonal color, and then to see the south elevation would be very attractive and inviting. She indicated most people would not imagine this structure is a funeral home.

Mr. Miller agreed to the compatibility of the use and to the elimination of the mound. He said if the shared access could come to life it would help a lot. He asked if there is a way to soften the south and north elevations. He said the building behind this property has a similar type roof at the entry. He stated he likes the conceptual design and thought that landscaping may provide the softening. He expressed the view across the pond is going to be spectacular and the parking behind is very appropriate.

Warren Fishman encouraged the applicant to work for a joint entrance. He asked how many parking spaces are typical of a funeral home.

Randy Schoedinger, Schoedinger Funeral Service, 229 E. State Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, said their largest funeral home has about 140 parking spaces and the average would be around 80 spaces.

Mr. Fishman said he has been to a Schoedinger Funeral Home where he could not find a parking spot. He said a lot of visiting hours are 5 pm to 8 pm, etc. so people are going right after work and concluded the service would be during a busy time for Perimeter Drive. Not only is a shared access encouraged, he asked, if there would be any overflow parking available. He emphasized he is apprehensive about the 98 parking spaces proposed and emphasized the need for overflow parking.

Mr. Schoedinger said he can talk to adjacent businesses and ask for areas to be used for overflow parking; there are a number of neighbors they do that with in other locations.

Mr. Wilson emphasized the need for overflow parking as well as pedestrian access. He said it would be nice to provide seating for the pedestrians as they come in, especially when it gets busy, because this is a large property and a large number of people arriving will be elderly. He said he does not see the need for required mounding but it is nice to see some movement of the earth so maybe there is undulation in the landscape here and there.

Ms. Newell said she believes this proposal is compatible with existing development. She said she has no objection to the funeral home being here. She said generally a mound is used in landscaping when there is something to hide or not to be visible directly. She confirmed this is a retention pond of which she would be supportive of with good landscaping and a mound is not necessary. She said Mr. Ford said “flat roof” but maybe “low slope” is more what the architect meant like a quarter-inch per foot. She suggested the side elevations could use more attention and to soften the structure. She recommended overflow drainage with the scuppers that are on the outside of the building so this could be unsightly unless they are architecturally well planned into the building. She said the overhead door would have to be screened so she is anticipating additional landscaping on the site.

The Chair asked the applicant if he received enough feedback from the Commission to which he answered affirmatively.

**2. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a four-story and 132-unit residential facility with associated site improvements for a 2.48-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback on a Basic Plan Review application, prior to formal review by City Council.

Claudia Husak said she was filling in for the case manager, Joanne Shelly who is traveling.

Ms. Husak said since new Commission members have come onboard, staff is reviewing the process and she explained the process contained in the Bridge Street Code. Ultimately, she said, City Council will receive a formal recommendation from the ART and then Council is the reviewing and approval body for this application and would select a reviewing body for any future applications.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and explained it is not a parcel but it is portions of land leftover from the old Buyer’s site as well as land that Casto currently owns and it is just east of Tuller Flats and west of the AMC Theatre in Dublin Village Center. Therefore, she said, this would be situated on a very prominent corner of the two rights-of-way. She added that the City has the John Shields Parkway Greenway planned. She mentioned that the Greystone Mews residential development is to the south and the City has reached out to those residents and there have been no requests for a meeting or any kind of negative feedback or concerns expressed.

Ms. Husak presented photographs of the existing conditions and noted the vacant lot and the sidewalk that is within John Shields Parkway – the brick pavers are what is being used throughout the district.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan with the schematic footprint on the aerial view. She said this is a proposal for a Senior Living Apartment complex, which is permitted in the district as a multi-family

use. With this proposal, she explained, there will be a street connection from John Shields Parkway going north toward Tuller Road; an east/west street connection would connect Village Parkway through to Tuller Flats; and the intention is to straighten out the existing curve to a 90-degree intersection at Village Parkway and Tuller Road. She indicated this proposal could be a catalyst to get the street changes started.

Ms. Husak restated this is a facility intended for seniors to live independently within fully functional apartment units with additional services being provided on the first floor at street level and highly visible facing the public street that include: outdoor patio seating for the café and bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower; a pub-style recreation area, planting area, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center all at the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said these are amenities these residents can take part but are not required. She pointed out the residential units are on the opposite corner, which is John Shields Parkway and a future street.

Ms. Husak pointed out the drop off area and internal parking that is proposed for the north side of the site, off the (future) public street. She said the need for parking spaces is fairly low so the applicant is likely to request a Waiver for parking. She said the number of spaces required for a multi-family building is not appropriate in this instance. She pointed out the open spaces around the building on all sides that include foundation plantings, streetscape created, formal open spaces on the north ends of the wings. She added there is a rooftop terrace proposed.

Ms. Husak presented renderings of the proposed conceptual elevations that include a lot of brick and a variation in windows – some a storefront and some on the tower element. She reported the ART had suggested that perhaps the tower element could be enhanced to give more presence on this prominent corner. She noted there are balconies, windows, and many projections within the building.

Ms. Husak suggested discussion topics:

- Walkability
- Architectural style
- Open spaces
- Other considerations

Ms. Husak said there is a lot of open space required within the Zoning Code for this type of development. She said the applicant is proposing hardscapes and soft space, and getting close to meeting the open space requirement. She said the four-acre park at Tuller Flats that the City owns and will program, is less than a half mile away.

The Chair asked if there were questions for staff.

Bob Miller said if this project were to go forward, would it go 'hand and glove' with the street realignment to which Ms. Husak answered affirmatively.

William Wilson said he assumes that when people come to the area there will be pedestrian activity and Ms. Husak answered yes. He asked then if walkability will be ensured. Ms. Husak said, ultimately, John Shields Parkway is intended to go to the east, north of the movie theatre. She indicated the City is waiting for the owner of that shopping center to be ready to do that and she agreed there needs to be pedestrian accommodations to get to that area because there are attractions that these residents would use.

Warren Fishman said he was concerned about the street realignments happening in conjunction with this project as well. He asked how many units would be independent to which Ms. Husak explained that all of the units are for independent living. She noted that early in the discussions, the applicant had considered

assisted living units. She emphasized that in the Code, assisted living would not be permitted in this facility.

Mr. Fishman asked about parking. Ms. Husak answered there are on-street spaces as well as 39 interior spaces.

The Chair asked if there were any more questions for staff. [Hearing none.] She invited the applicant to speak.

Denise Pampena, Graziano Construction, 654 Alpha Drive, Pittsburgh, PA, 15238, said she is the president of the company. She said they have been working with Ms. Husak and the City for over two and a half years to get to this point. She said they believe this will be a great project for the retirees and the seniors in the City of Dublin. She stated that Graziano Construction Development Company, based in Pittsburgh, has been in operations for over 66 years. She said they started out as a general contracting firm and in the early 80s, phased into development of senior housing, skilled nursing facilities, assisted living, and independent living. She said not only did they construct these for themselves but also for national operators as well as institutional clients.

Ms. Pampena mentioned that in 2001, they had been 100% woman-owned and are nationally certified as a woman-business enterprise and also certified by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Their focus is independent living, which is mostly 55 and older but they have expertise in all senior communities.

Ms. Pampena said their communities are all rental, there are no buy-in fees, and they are month-to-month so the seniors are not forced to sign a long-term lease. She said their focus is on lifestyle and their typical seniors would be a widower or any elderly person living on their own that needs the socialization, the nutrition, and the support services and amenities. She emphasized they are not a healthcare community like assisted living would be or a skilled nursing facility; they are offering strictly independent living units. She said they offer 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and studio apartments that are full service units including kitchens with granite countertops, bathrooms with pull-cords for safety but they offer three meals a day, large dining room, café and bistro, pub, billiard rooms, lounges, a creative arts studio, fitness center and wellness studio, and movie theater. She said in this environment she found the seniors thrive because of the support services and activities that keep them vibrant.

Ms. Pampena said they like this area for the walkability and the opportunity for the residents of Dublin as they retire to be in an area with entertainment, shopping, and dining for when they want to be outside the community. She said community transportation will also be offered for excursions or doctor appointments as a lot of residents would no longer drive.

Mr. Wilson asked if the services would just be for the residents and not open to the public. Ms. Pampena answered they are private and they are focusing their amenities and services on the first floor; typically in their communities, they are peppered throughout the building. She said the result will be the visibility and interaction with John Shields and Village Parkways.

Mr. Fishman asked about private versus public areas. Ms. Pampena said they are private for safety reasons. Because they are now locating all the amenities on the first floor, there may be a way to engage the outside community into some of those amenities because they have a beauty parlor and a barber shop. She said they could also potentially have the outside community use the outdoor café and bistro or perhaps the fitness center.

Mr. Fishman asked how many employees will be at this facility. Ms. Pampena said there are shift employees and they also have live-in managers. Mr. Fishman asked how many employees total could be

on the property at one time. Her answer was about 12 employees. She said they also have overnight staff but they are not nurses that live there. She said they have housekeeping, dietary support, the chef, servers, and the activity director but some of the servers and those in housekeeping can serve other functions. She emphasized the impact on traffic and parking is very low. Ms. Pampena answered typically, when they have conducted parking demand studies, they have about 56 spaces. She said in some communities, they have been able to obtain a Variance or a Waiver for that because most of their residents do not drive and there has never been an issue.

Mr. Fishman said he owns a property across from an assisted living facility and the biggest problem they have is parking. Ms. Pampena pointed out that assisted living is a different concept than independent living. He clarified the facility he is referring to is mostly independent and some assisted living.

Ms. Pampena said 55 and older are permitted in their community but their average age of residents are in their 70s.

Ms. Husak noted that in the district there are on-street parking spaces within all of the streets they are allowed to count. She said at this time, there are 23 on-street spaces that can be dedicated to this facility.

Julie Polletta, Radelet McCarthy Polletta, Architecture and Interior Design; 100 First Avenue, Suite 300, Pittsburgh, PA, 15222 said conceptual, preliminary renderings have been presented. She said the building is ±400 feet long – they broke it down into human scale volumes and also controlled the perception of a four-story mass by using different colors of brick different planes on that façade. Unfortunately, she said, the projections and recessions are not showing up clearly. She clarified, part of this structure is four stories and part of it is three stories. She said they are introducing a metal panel on the fourth floors. She said there is a lot more design detail to work out between now and the next time it is presented. She pointed out that the red metal roofs are over porches.

Ms. Polletta explained there is a five-foot grade from one end to the other and the three-story area is the lower area, and those porches are lined along there. She said even though the porches would be above grade level, people can see the residents and the residents can see what is happening on the street and that is part of the residential experience. She referred to the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway where all the amenities are, which are still serving the residents but residents have the opportunity to sit on a sidewalk café patio and there would be canopies covering these areas.

Ms. Polletta referred back to the tower they were articulating earlier in the conversation. She said there is an opportunity to create a public space on that corner because they would be coming right up to sidewalk and they have a placeholder in there for a piece of public art.

Ms. Polletta said they need to mitigate the grade difference in two places as far as exiting the building and getting down to grade. She described the footprint as a horseshoe and the grade difference is at the top of each horseshoe. She said she is going to work with a landscape architect to develop these two-tiered plazas where one would exit from the building at a higher level and go to the street level – a combination of an accessible route and stairs and that would be right on the sidewalk level, which makes it an outdoor plaza available to anyone in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wilson said he sees this as a lot of strong pieces together and more of a monumental residential building. He suggested if the applicant went more towards the inspiration pictures included in their packets, they would get a better result because now, it appears as an office building in some sections. He encouraged the applicant to frame windows and consider separating the buildings and making it more of a residential scale. He said he anticipates parking to really be an issue, especially when visitors come like for Mother's Day or Father's Day; he could not count on the on-street parking. He said maybe putting parking

underground could be a solution but parking really needs to be addressed. He said he visits his elderly family members in facilities such as this and there is never enough parking and he gets frustrated because he has to park several blocks away.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak on this application. [There were none.] She opened the meeting up for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Fishman agreed with what the other members said about the architecture. He asked if real brick was going to be used. Ms. Polletta answered affirmatively. She said they are considering load-bearing masonry as a structure. Mr. Fishman emphasized it is going to be an important corner so we want it to look rich and stunning.

Mr. Miller applauded the proposed metal panels for an alternative material. He said he was concerned that there is too much building on too little of a space. He said parking is an issue and more parking will need to be added to the site itself. He said he also considers this corner a gateway entry into Bridge Park and encouraged the applicant to do a lot with the tower itself or with a different design aspect that would need to pop. He said he liked the engaging porches. He said the public space will be behind the building so it is not going to add to the character of the building as there will be another building behind it. Ms. Polletta said her understanding is that those lots would become residential. Ms. Husak said a multitude of uses are permitted within the residential district.

Ms. Fox explained the intent in the Code is to create a sense of place and to engage pedestrians. She encouraged the applicant to give serious consideration about the intent of this space and structure the building to engage the pedestrian walking down the street. She agreed this is 400 feet of a huge mass. She repeated this corner is one of the main gateways and the tower is lacking interest. She said having to walk around a very large building to get to parking goes against walkable urbanism. She said in terms of the architectural style, there needs to be a lot more interest at the street level. However, she really liked the porch idea and thought that was wonderful. She said when she looked at the inspirational pictures in the back of the packet, she did not see any of that in the proposed renderings. She said she is over 55 and she would love to live in a building similar to this but does not want the building labeled '55 and over'. She encouraged the applicant to not design this like a '55 and over community' but just as an apartment building. She suggested opening up the pub and dining area to the street so the residents do not feel as they have left anything. She said she sees very little articulation to the stories and would also like to see the structure broken in half. She encouraged the applicant to have their green space on site because the residents may not want to walk to another space. She added the open spaces need to be interactive with the sidewalk. In conclusion, she said, the rooftop is wonderful but it needs a lot of shaded areas or it would not get used.

Victoria Newell said in terms of walkability and the open spaces, the Commission has been consistent with all of their applicants. She said all the pocket parks and plazas should be public spaces as that is the intent. She said she has designed and worked on assisted living facilities and nursing homes and the applicant gave the definition of an assisted living facility but would leave that up to staff's interpretation. She said she does not have an objection to this being in the district but that is something to be worked out with staff how they define this. She said the massing can be improved, finishes can be developed, greater attention should be paid to the corner, and she completely agrees with staff on the tower feature and with her fellow Commissioners about the lack of parking. She concluded by saying she liked the placeholder for the public art.

Ms. Polletta said she appreciated all the comments.

**3. BSD-SRN – Fado Irish Pub
18-026WR**

**6652 Riverside Drive
Waiver Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal to reduce transparency on the east and south elevations for a restaurant located in Building C1, Block C, zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Lori Burchett said the Planning and Zoning Commission had reviewed the proposal at the previous meeting on May 3, 2018, and expressed some concerns about the lack of creativity with the proposed window film and suggested that the applicant look for art work or alternative that would provide more vibrancy in the district. She indicated the applicant had suggested some photographs of Dublin, Ireland, or something to that effect and the Commission was generally supportive of this proposal. She said the applicant explored other options and they are requesting a review of some photographic images.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of Building C1 in the Bridge Park Development. She presented photographs of the existing conditions on the east elevation and she had highlighted the locations of where the requested window film would be placed. She presented a side-by-side image showing the original proposal and the new proposal with the image of Dublin, Ireland on the windows and the image of the Fado graphic to be placed on the door and these are both on the east elevation. She said the transparency is consistent with what has been approved for the Master Sign Plan, which included a reduction in permitted transparency (Street Façade) from 70% to 50%.

Ms. Burchett presented photographs of the existing conditions on the south elevation, which faces the open space, therefore there are two pictures because these windows are not side by side; one image shows the conditions left of the plaza and the other shows the right. She again had highlighted the locations of where the requested window film would be placed. She presented a side-by-side image of the south elevation showing the original proposal and the new proposal with the two images added. She presented another image of a street view in Dublin, Ireland for both windows on the south elevation. She said the transparency is consistent with what has been approved for the Master Sign Plan, which included a reduction in permitted transparency (Street Façade) from 15% to 13%.

For better viewing, Ms. Burchett presented up close views of the window and door graphics for the east elevation and then better views of the window graphics for the south elevation. She presented additional existing conditions for the south elevation and plaza with surrounding context and the location of the window graphics highlighted.

Ms. Burchett reported staff has reviewed this application against the Waiver Review Criteria and finds it is consistent; therefore, approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant amends the approved Bridge Park Master Sign Plan to address the size of window graphics when used for screening of interior spaces, prior to sign permitting, subject to approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The Chair invited questions for staff.

Jane Fox asked why the applicant is asking to amend the Master Sign Plan to allow for this kind of graphic in this location instead of a Waiver. Ms. Burchett answered the Waiver is specific to the reduction

in transparency and because the MSP has been approved to limit the size of a window graphic and that is the issue. She said typically, window graphics are only permitted to cover 30% of the window.

Claudia Husak added that window and door graphics are considered signs so they are not eligible for Waivers. Ms. Fox asked if the Commission amends the MSP and someone just wants to throw up graphics on a window for whatever reason would they be permitted to do so. Ms. Husak explained the discussion has been that in terms of this MSP coming forward and being amended that this gives us another opportunity to take a look at what kind of situations we are encountering that deal with transparency and window graphics. Currently, she said, the City has a very finite window graphic regulation for the BSD. She said in this instance, the graphics can be approved just for this tenant space, but also a BSD-wide regulation could be altered but staff and the applicant are not there yet. Ms. Fox said for this instance, this proposal is the best solution for this tenant but she questions whether these images should be considered signs.

Victoria Newell said there is some text that allows infinite color and digital images. Ms. Husak repeated these graphics in the BSD are considered signs. Warren Fishman said, if an applicant is permitted to change it, they could add text on it. Ms. Husak explained that is why the MSP is being amended and the Commission is also approving transparency and the applicant is requesting graphics associated with that. She indicated that when the MSP is amended, it will include more rules and regulations. Mr. Fishman said he was confused about the definition of graphic. He asked if the image presented could also say Joe's Diner on it, for example. Ms. Husak pointed out that regulating content of signs is illegal. Mr. Fishman said that is what concerns him if they make the change; the next applicant could ask for a graphic that states what they specialize in. He said he remembers vividly when the Commission allowed sandwich board signs and now they are all over the place and everyone has them. He said businesses are advertising oil changes and so on. He emphasized this could be dangerous.

Ms. Burchett said the MSP that was approved, specifically prohibits logos as part of the graphic image but to Mr. Fishman's point, this is something staff should consider. Vince Papsidero said the MSP excludes text as part of the graphic. He said the goal is that these would be treated as graphic images and would never have commercial speech or that would appear more as a true sign; we are splitting hairs here.

Ms. Newell said we like this image because it is enhancing the architecture of the building. She asked if that language could be added because she thinks it takes care of when graphics can be used in terms of truthfully marketing a product. She suggested that stipulating that graphics can be used to enhance the architecture of the building is a clear distinction. Ms. Husak added that was the intent of the amendment for the MSP to address and make it clear. Ms. Newell said she is suggesting that verbiage be added that specifically limits the intention of the graphic for enhancing the architecture and that might help all of us if a different presentation comes before us in the future. Ms. Burchett emphasized it does not alleviate them from transparency requirements, regardless of having a window graphic.

Ms. Fox asked if this turned out to be an opaque picture or if it is see-through, and what type of material is being used. Ms. Burchett said the material is the same in that shadows would not be visible behind it and the applicant is also building a wall behind it. Mr. Fishman confirmed this graphic is on the window and not the wall to which Ms. Burchett answered affirmatively. She added the applicant is building the wall so there is room between the two and no damage can be done to the image; it would be preserved. Mr. Fishman asked why it is not in color but instead in black and white.

Don Brogan, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, said he is here representing Fados. He said from their perspective, the black and white graphics were old images of Dublin, Ireland, and it spoke better to the content than color would have and they thought it would look better from a design standpoint on the facade. He said Crawford Hoying will work with staff on amending the MSP to

ensure the correct verbiage was included from staff's perspective. Ms. Burchett said the Commission is considering the Waiver request this evening for transparency while utilizing this image. She said the amendment to the MSP would be completed at a later date.

Mr. Miller questioned what happens if the graphic deteriorates.

Mr. Wilson said as the BSD develops with bars and restaurants, he anticipates this will come up again so he asked if there could be a standard, which can always be used and it can differ though throughout the development. He indicated graphics could become a piece of art for a specific restaurant and suggested that could be explored with the developer.

The Chair invited anyone from the public to speak on this case. [There were none.] She opened the meeting up to the Commissioners for any further discussion. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Newell said she thought these proposed graphics were a great solution and she liked the black and white images because they were a better enhancement to the architecture. She concluded she really appreciated that the applicant was willing to work with staff to find the right solution and bring back something better than what was originally proposed. She called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Miller moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve the requested Waiver to reduce transparency on the east and south elevations with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant amends the approved Bridge Park Master Sign Plan to address the size of window graphics when used for screening of interior spaces, prior to sign permitting; subject to approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan 17-093ADM

Administrative Request Introduction

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for an amendment to the Community Plan to create a new Special Area Plan for Dublin's legacy office areas including Metro, Blazer, and Emerald Districts. She said the site is approximately 987 acres bordered by West Bridge Street to the north, Emerald Parkway to the west, Frantz Road to the east, and Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the south. She said this is a request for an introduction of a future Administrative Request for proposed amendments to the Community Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.232.

Devayani Puranik introduced fellow presenters, Jason Sudy, Side Street Planning.

Ms. Puranik said The Community Plan was last updated in 2013. She explained this is the vision plan, a policy document which guides development in the future and helps guide development decisions. She said Special Area Plans look at specific geography within the City. She explained zoning is a legal tool to guide the development, which will be reviewed at a later date. She said The Community Plan is on the City's website and it contains many elements but one of the most essential components of the plan is the Future Land Use Map. Another important element, she said, is the Thoroughfare Plan and it shows connectivity within the City, some of which is existing and some has been planned for the future. She stated that there are nine Special Area Plans and the Dublin Corporate Area Plan would be part of this list

when it gets adopted. She presented the Zoning Map and said, most of the time, zoning aligns with the Future Land Use Map but sometimes there are conflicts so as development occurs, staff has to negotiate and work on those recommendations as well as existing zoning processes. She presented the study area that contains multiple classifications and districts within the study area. She said it is challenging for more consistent compatible development within the district and that is one of the issues to look at as part of this planning process.

Ms. Puranik explained that the Special Area Plans also align with seven Business Districts that have been established by our Economic Development team. Going from east to west, she pointed out the Bridge Street District (BSD) and the West Innovation District (WID), which is the most recent Special Area Plan that is now adopted. She pointed out the study area for the Dublin Corporate Area Plan; it includes three different business districts including Dublin's older office complex – Legacy Office complex. She presented graphics that showed the office development from the 1970s to 2010. After 2010, she noted there were very few office developments because the suburb and office market is now shifting to more walkable areas and mixed-use, amenity-driven requirements. She said most of Dublin's offices are between 17 and 45 years old, therefore, some of that is ready for redevelopment.

Ms. Puranik said the project goals to begin this plan focused on the following:

- Repositioning the Legacy Office sites for success;
- Creating walkable, mixed-use environments to serve the workforce as well as neighboring residents;
- Identifying under-served markets and look for opportunities to introduce those markets;
- Establishing a strategy to "refresh" the Frantz Road streetscape;
- Recommending mechanisms to ensure additional development along Frantz Road does not adversely impact neighborhoods to the east;
- Recommending zoning tools to ensure successful implementation of the vision and plan recommendations, while providing new zoning protections for adjacent neighborhoods; and
- Introducing consistent and compatible architectural and site design guidelines for the entire area plan.

Ms. Puranik said existing land uses, zoning, natural resources, and connectivity were examined to see what is happening today. She reported stakeholders were engaged, which included residents, businesses, property owners, tenants, and real estate brokers. She said staff made conceptual recommendations and presented it to the stakeholders and continued to work with the stakeholders to come to final recommendations for the plan.

Ms. Puranik reported this process began in 2015 and Phase 1: Legacy Office Competitiveness Study culminated in a workshop focused on property owners, brokers, and company representatives within the study area. Key feedback included:

- The need for more amenities for office workers;
- Updates to the appearance of the sites and adjacent roadway corridors;
- More efficient parking and parking ratios; and
- Strategies for more aggressive redevelopment of the area.

Ms. Puranik said based on the first workshop, they began Phase II: Dublin Corporate Area Plan. She reported staff has held several public workshops and meetings and the most recent was with neighborhood meeting with Llewelyn Farms, Waterford Village, and Mid-Century Modern neighborhoods. She said staff received good feedback from the residents and they are supportive of the plan. She said

meetings have also been held with representatives from the large companies within this area. They, too, have been supportive of the plan and feel it is addressing the needs of their employees.

Jason Sudy, Side Street Planning, said the project began as an analysis of the parking ratios within the boundaries of the study. He stated that some tenants that were concerned about moving into different areas because of the potential inability to accommodate the parking ratios that they identify as suitable parking for their businesses. He said some of these buildings used to be multi-tenant buildings and have now become individual tenant buildings; in some cases, the amount of square-foot per employee dropped significantly and that creates tight parking. A full traffic study was not conducted, he said, but parking was observed at different times of the week and day and found in almost all cases, there was no situation where the parking was completely full. However, he said there was a lot of cases where parking was not very well aligned or convenient for the use and in some cases, it was because it was located on a side of a building that did not have a door so employee had to walk all around the building to enter.

Mr. Sudy said they concluded they needed to reposition some of these areas to function for yet another generation. He said there were a number of issues and parking is only one of those issues. He said the larger issue was it was predominantly all highway oriented legacy office. He said there is a lot of vacancy in these buildings. He said they have learned that the decision to move into a space is not just based on the space itself but also what amenities are around the office. He said there are not many amenities in this area, the area has limited roadway connectivity, and it does not have much quality public open space.

Mr. Sudy said there are changes in mobility and the market is shifting for overall office development in suburban locations. He said they are not contemplating the end game for what all of these areas are likely to become. He said they are proposing to position this area so that it survives and thrives for another generation.

Mr. Sudy said the area is large so it is impractical for the entire redevelopment. Through market analysis, it was determined that there is great spending potential that is closely associated to planning area. Specifically, he noted, there are several hotels and when someone determines where to stay, they look at what is easy to access for dining and recreational needs. He noted the Metro Center area has several hotels but not options for dining that is easy to walk to so that is one way to capture some of that spending potential. He said the feedback was received for the need for food options including restaurants and grocery stores. The consultants determined a reasonable amount of new development could begin in each of these areas in the short-term.

Mr. Sudy said with new development, there has to be compatible zoning and that will require a separate zoning process. He said they conducted a preliminary cursory analysis of the zones and a separate consultant will be updating the Zoning Code to provide zoning standards that meet the objectives of the plan. He said a set of mixed-use, regional districts were analyzed that accommodate these employment facilities but also allow other uses to be there. He said mixing other supporting uses will allow for control of the scale and the type of development they are considering.

Mr. Sudy said they also looked at undeveloped sites to get a sense of how they could fit into these mixed-use areas and presented a map that represented proposed land uses for different districts. He said they took into account preserving the natural features, scale of the buildings, and buffering and setbacks standards and that was a large part of the most recent discussions with the neighbors. He provided some of the key points in conjunction with the neighboring area:

- Limited building height of only one or two stories along Frantz Road and stepping up the heights so sites closer to the highway would allow for much taller buildings. This would allow a more dense development of potential employment, should someone choose to locate in that area.
- He presented a graphic to show what might be implemented in the plan. In the Frantz/Metro area, lower two-story, mixed-use buildings on Frantz Road were shown as well as a destination restaurant with a cool, modern design (or a historic classic design) but it would be something that would be fairly large scale that would be able to accommodate a lot of business users at lunch and people from the business campus and neighbors to go there afterward.
- An opportunity to reposition the way open space works so that it can be an amenity that really functions as more of a park for the area including neighborhood residents (existing and potential new residents).
- As demographics shift in the region, an opportunity to provide more small-scale, individual-unit housing to ease the ability of some of these employers to attract the types of employees that they are looking for in close proximity
- Along Rings and Frantz Roads there is an opportunity to do a small, two-story format grocery

Mr. Sudy said these recommendations can be implemented in short term.

Mr. Sudy recommended long-term solutions. He said the City's early requirements for landscaping and parking are now outdated in the suburban office context and do not respond to environmental and sustainability efforts that have been revolutionized over the past decade. He said they are recommending a different approach to the way parking lots are laid out and the way they are landscaped. He stated edge screening is still important but other issues are important to address. He said Dublin's internal landscaping requirements create small landscape islands that do not promote sustainability. He said an example would be long linear landscape areas, in parking lots, that help with storm water management.

Mr. Sudy looked preliminarily at Frantz Road and said it is a great area for cohesive requirements that create a gateway to the area. He said examples include enhancing landscaping, using accent paving, and having more cohesive signage. He presented renderings which showed existing conditions that could be beautified. Most importantly, he recommended creating a more systematic approach. He pointed out a graphic that depicted outdoor dining that is closer to the street. He said the current design of the most of the sites within DCAP have buildings with large setbacks. He said they are contemplating, finding a way to move businesses closer to the street, while keeping a robust setback, a pedestrian path, great landscaping, as well as opening up those front patios for opportunities for more activity on the street. He said the crosswalks should also be enhanced on a consistent basis as well.

Mr. Sudy concluded that there should be zoning requirement and design guidelines that create the environment that the DCAP is proposing. He said this should include high quality building materials, landscaping, signs, and open space that interacts with the uses of the site.

Ms. Puranik said there were some key points she wanted to highlight regarding next steps:

- Frantz Road streetscape improvements
- Drafting new zoning districts and rezoning, which came out of discussions with neighboring residents that included buffering and how development will impact existing residential homes next to these parcels. She said therefore, buffering, setback standards, and building height standards would be examined.
- Economic Development is working toward having the Frantz and Rings Road development posted on the website, an initial step to looking at implementation.

In terms of next steps for this planning process, Ms. Puranik said tonight was the introduction and understands there was a lot of material presented. She indicated the next meeting is tentatively scheduled to incorporate a review and recommendation to City Council, June 7, 2018, and final review by City Council in August/September of this year.

Warren Fishman said since he was on the PZC in the 70s, 80s, and 90s, he recalled the slogan that “It’s Greener in Dublin” was emphasized and that is why Dublin is the way it is. He said they fought rigorously for those setbacks because the community supported large setbacks. He understands that the parking lots are awkward but he favored the open space. He said he can appreciate that some of this is outdated but many roads had setbacks of 100 to 200 feet as a requirement. He reiterated, the residents wanted a “green Dublin” so we need to be mindful of that.

Mr. Sudy said they heard from many developers that this is not the kind of development that attracts their desired workforce. He said young, energetic, bright people have the opportunity to work anywhere and they do not want to work in the middle of a sea of parking, if they have the option to work somewhere else.

Mr. Sudy said that the requirements for internal landscaping are not benefitting the sites as intended. He further stated that we could modify these requirements to create more sustainable practices. He said they are not proposing a change to the exterior screening around parking lots – that standard remains the same but keeping huge setbacks on Frantz Road is not beneficial for the long term success of this area. He said if the community does not want to do that, it is the City’s prerogative but he believes that would be a mistake. Mr. Fishman said times have changed in 40 years but he does not think we need high density buildings sitting right on the street to mimic any other city. Mr. Fishman said he does not support eliminating green space but perhaps reconfiguring it. Mr. Sudy said that is basically what the consultants and staff are proposing. Mr. Fishman disagreed that green spaces are not well used and cited the example of the annual car show and businesses that have picnic tables on their green space. He said once you lose a green space, it is gone forever. Mr. Sudy said there can be a difference of opinion on what is considered “well used green space”. He said large areas of continuous green space is being planned to be used as a park setting and additional development. He said they propose parking at the same ratios but more efficiently.

Bob Miller said he was impressed with the plan and highly commended Ms. Puranik for her efforts. He asked what a multi-modal hub meant. Mr. Sudy answered a multi-modal hub provides different types of transit/transportation options is various locations throughout a community. He said he noticed Dublin now has one of the different modes that is parked outside today and referred to LimeBikes. He indicated we are in a new world of mobility options that it is hard for us to define in the near future; however, Dublin is actively participating in a large regional-scale project that MORPC is undertaking and one of the corridors actually ends up pretty close to here. He said part of that is to determine what the future of transportation is for Columbus. He said we are considering possible locations of where mobility could provide better access to these different areas.

William Wilson remarked about existing buildings versus new buildings. He said for new buildings, particularly commercial, density is needed and people are not going to come to this area if they do not see the population. He asked if the existing buildings could be repurposed. He suggested restaurants can be added to first floors or maybe converting the buildings into residential. Mr. Sudy indicated there are some opportunities for some repurposing. He stated that placing new uses such as retail uses or restaurants away from Frantz Road or Emerald Parkway is probably not going to be very successful. He indicated they are confident in the near term that immediate development potential for those types of uses has to take place in areas that will service what is there but will also take advantage of the traffic counts along busy roadways. He stated that in the future, there may be additional opportunities as the

area densifies. He said if first floors were repurposed to retail uses or restaurants, they would have to be a really unique destination uses to attract people there. He said that approach of repurposing could work if it was part of a large scale approach and different ways to repurpose different elements of those buildings was considered.

Mr. Sudy said their plan is to interject brand new buildings with the existing buildings in Metro Center. He stated that there may be a time when it becomes economically feasible to redevelop that site but currently that is not what we are proposing.

The Chair opened the meeting up to the public.

Sven Christianson, 5765 Settlers Place, stated that Dublin is a unique and special place. He said he has heard that Dublin is difficult to build in but frankly it is the hard work of the Planning and Zoning Commission that makes this place special. He said he is here supporting the plan and the reason is the plan has all the right tools for a successful plan. He said Planning has educated the public along the process about how they provide the information to the Commission and the Commission ensures that it is implemented. He said he is very interested in how the public gets engaged when projects are presented to the Commission to ensure the details of the plan are implemented and all of the details are discussed. He said Planning has made a distinction with Site 11, and he is a resident representing Llewellyn Farms, and is primarily interested in buildings with significant height for that site and interested in uses on this site, in general. He said that he would like to ensure that the Commission consider all issues for this site not just buffering but lighting, sound, and uses. He indicated he is not sure if the Commission received the information from their meeting in April that listed the HOA's concerns. Ms. Puranik affirmed that information was received. The Chair confirmed the Commission has seen printed community correspondence.

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Place, said he echoes the comments shared by his next door neighbor, Mr. Christianson. He said the residents all see a need for this plan and the Planning staff has done a great job of recognizing many of the residents' concerns. He said the main concerns are building heights, setbacks, lighting, transparency of windows, hours of operation, parking lot lighting, and landscaping that includes buffering. He said the last concern is a huge piece when considering office buildings next to residential and usually those are complementary uses. He noted currently there are large scale trees for buffering but as they have matured, they are so tall that there is a 30-foot area where there is no buffering at all. He stated that if this vegetation is removed, there would be a wholly transparent view of whatever is in the lot next to the resident. He asked the staff to find creative ways to solve that problem. He said there are also environmental protections, materials and building design, and trash collection that the residents of Llewellyn Farms and Waterford Village are concerned with and staff had agreed those are items that need to be addressed in zoning. He stated they would like to be involved in this process because they are concerned they could be left behind if they do not. He said it is very clear, for the area east of Frantz Road that is the most concerning part of the plan as it stands today because there are residences nearby. He added that if a lot of multi-family development were to occur in this space, there would be an impact on the school system. He said they would like to see the population grow but want to know how the impact on the schools would be mitigated.

The Chair asked for anyone else from the public that wished to speak in regards to this case [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion. She thanked the residents that came in and encouraged them and others to stay engaged in the process.

Jane Fox thanked all the residents for coming and paying attention to this. She encouraged the residents to read the development text and design principles with this plan that are on the website and provide

feedback. She asked staff if this will become a Form-Based Code. She asked about the approval process for the new development that will occur in this area.

Vince Papsidero explained that the review process will be based upon the WID model. He said this would not be a Form-Based Code, it would be a much more like the traditional zoning structure that Dublin is accustomed to. He said to some degree, the ART would be involved and as we look at updating the WID, that could be a model use, which will also be dependent upon Council's thoughts. He said one of the goals is to create a system that is somewhat expeditious for investment to try to reposition some of this aging property. He indicated that this will all occur in a public process. He said staff will work with the public one-on-one and when this gets to the Commission, it will be a very transparent process. He said they still have to really engage the majority of the current commercial property owners and have reached out to just select representatives that are interested in working with us.

Ms. Fox noted the setbacks on Frantz Road would be reduced from a 50- to a 30-foot setback. She said the one thing she has noticed is there is a shared-use path and the proposal to add patio dining. She said if we are going to make this a very walkable, transit-oriented community, then we need to incorporate a bike lane that is separate from the roadway and a shared-use path. Ms. Newell stated that is an excellent suggestion.

Mr. Papsidero said the 30-foot setback is from the edge of the right-of-way so it should accommodate those amenities.

Mr. Fishman said he thought the setback was more like 100 feet. Mr. Papsidero said the setbacks vary substantially. He said the goal for new construction, there would be at least 30 feet of landscape for new construction plus heavy landscaping outside the right-of-way. He said this would be very attractive view shed opposed to 100 feet of turf.

Ms. Fox said in developing this plan, there are some character guidelines and some options for green spaces but she would wanted to avoid the common trend to create green spaces that are just simply long lawns that look like bocce ball courts. She would like really unique public realm spaces considered that draws the public in and creates a permanency, no matter what development goes on around them. She said it should include places that the residents will want to go. She indicated multi-family can be integrated because the whole purpose of this plan is to create environments that workers want to be in and they will enjoy going to.

Mr. Miller said that the planning process needed great amount of work over two to three years and he commended all of the staff. He said that introducing residential uses will result in success inside this whole area. He noted Site 4, Site 10, and Parcel 9 where he liked Option B because of the residential piece that will help bring vibrancy but Option C needs work. He said he liked the setbacks. He agrees with Cramer Creek Crossing residents and thought maybe there could be improvements with some of the visuals that were presented in the plan. He appreciated the recommendations for the solar and wind alternative energy. He liked the zoning proposals and is curious about the incentive programs that will help this be accomplished. He also said the local grocer is an awesome idea. Lastly, he said getting creativity is going to be a challenge because he does not know how you get people to invest in this area and be creative at the same time if it means additional expense. He said that is what the Commission is trying to do with the signs in Bridge Park but we are not being successful.

Mr. Fishman emphasized how thankful the Commission was for the resident involvement because nobody knows the area as well as the residents and he encouraged them to invite all of their neighbors to come for further discussions. He said it is the staff that helps move things along and make Dublin great. He

said he agrees about the aging landscape and that it can be addressed. He said staff is on the right track and this plan is pretty exciting.

Mr. Wilson told everyone they did a great job. He said that there needs to be connectivity in the plan and specifically referenced bike trails. He agreed some of the parks needed to be redesigned. He said exercise stations encourage people to get out and enjoy green space.

Ms. Newell asked staff if they see this plan as more straight zoning that will keep the Planning Commission engaged in this process and if so, how that would occur. Mr. Papsidero said it will be similar to Bridge Street with the exception that there will be more authority by the Commission opposed to the ART. He said there would be a Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan, and Final Development Plan all coming to the Commission. He said smaller projects may rest with the ART, if the Commission agrees.

Ms. Newell asked if there would be design guidelines and Mr. Papsidero answered affirmatively. She said she does not see how we would get the quality and creativity we want if we were to leave this as just straight zoning, especially in terms of landscaping. Mr. Papsidero indicated they would start with updated the Zoning Code but it may likely end up as a separate set of guidelines.

Ms. Newell said she is not entirely convinced about completely changing the setbacks on Frantz Road. She said she is thinking about all the other development that we are doing in the City of Dublin where we are allowing everything to come completely up to the street and we should consider how much land we are ultimately giving away. She restated a bike lane is needed, separated from traffic so she can see giving up some of that setback for that purpose because it would provide a better connection with walkability. She noted the multi-purpose path is not continuous now. She said a lot of people that work in these offices walk around this area and around the residential neighborhoods. She said she knows people will get out in the community and walk and understands there are not services in this immediate area but there is also not a connection to get all the way down the road. She remarked that as soon as the bike shares went in, she noticed them around town so that is another reason why she likes that connection. She said for the development of the green space, it really needs to be public and belong to the community of Dublin and not as an amenity for a specific area/office development. She asked if staff had considered the strip of land that is on east side of Frantz Road that is getting pulled into this area because it is open land to still be a PUD. Mr. Papsidero said currently that land is in the township so for it to develop, it would have to be annexed and could easily be treated as a PUD as part of that single-family development.

Ms. Puranik said staff will take back the comments, review the document, and then figure out the next steps.

Ms. Fox asked about the RFQ, how it was publicized, and who gets the chance to review. Rachel Ray, acting on behalf of Economic Development, said she is managing the RFQ process. She said that was released on May 7, 2018, and it was distributed to all of the developer contacts, the local American Planning Association, ULI Columbus so they could send out to their networks, it was shared via LinkedIn, the City's website, and all the typical channels. She said the intent is to keep the neighborhood involved as they go through the process, likely after they get responses, to measure how many responses were received, to record accurately to the neighborhood.

Ms. Husak asked Ms. Ray to state who was on the team to review the responses. She named Donna Goss, Vince Papsidero, Aaron Stanford, the Division of Engineering, Public Works, and Ray Harpham as review committee members.

Ms. Fox asked how many developers were on the list. Ms. Ray said ±150 contacts via email and then there is a lot of activity on LinkedIn. Ms. Fox asked once they are reviewed, what the process is. Ms. Ray said once the responses are received, (June 4 is the deadline), staff will have a two week internal turnaround filling a matrix of evaluation criteria and selecting the top three finalists to submit an actual proposed concept. She said that at the conclusion of the RFP process, (late summer) they anticipate hosting a public open house and the finalists would have an opportunity to present their concepts, engage with the neighbors, and get feedback. She said staff would review the proposals and prepare a recommendation for Council's ultimate consideration.

The Chair closed discussion.

**5. PUD, Autumn Rose Woods
18-023Z-PDP-FDP**

**7540 & 7660 Hyland-Croy Road
Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for changes to the previously approved development text and plans to permit the split-rail fence to remain along the perimeter of Reserve C, to be owned by the City of Dublin. She said the site is on the east side of Hyland-Croy Road approximately 1,200 feet south of the intersection with Tullymore Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council of a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case. She said a formal presentation was not needed. She called for the first of two motions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Claudia Husak noted the intent was to get this proposal to City Council for the meetings in June.

**6. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign
18-024ARB-AFDP**

**6659 Coffman Road
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the installation of a new sign for the existing Historic Coffman Homestead site west of Emerald Parkway, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection of Post Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case. She said a formal presentation was not needed. She called for the first of two motions.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve a Minor Text Modification to reflect a zero setback for the required sign rather than an eight-foot setback. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, abstain; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 4 – 0 - 1)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to approve the requested Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant include a landscape plan for the sign as part of sign permitting.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, abstain; Mr. Miller, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 4 – 0 - 1).

COMMUNICATIONS

Claudia Husak apologized for the issues with email. She said Flora Rogers has made contact with IT so this will be resolved.

Vince Papsidero said the Commissioners should have received an email from Dana McDaniel regarding a survey. He explained the City engaged a consultant to create a Facilities Master Plan and they have sent out a survey requesting feedback on meeting spaces and other City facilities. He said he would appreciate it if the Commission would provide their comments through the survey.

The Chair asked if there were any further items to discuss. [Hearing none] She adjourned the meeting at 9:47 pm.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission June 21, 2018.