



## MEETING MINUTES

### Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 7, 2019

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Newell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Newell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Ms. Newell, Mr. Stidhem, Mr. Fishman, Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Wilson.

Ms. Fox was absent.

Staff members present: Mr. Papsidero, yes; Ms. Husak, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Stang, Mr. Rayburn, Mr. Hoppel, Mr. Ridge

#### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Stidhem moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.  
Motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Newell stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. For those cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. For other cases, the Commission has the decision-making responsibility, and anyone who wishes to address the Commission on any of those cases must be sworn in.

#### AGENDA ORDER

1. **ID-2, Noah's Event Venue, Site Plan Review**
2. **BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1, Development Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**
3. **PUD, Muirfield Tournament Headquarters, Amended Final Development Plan**
4. **Presentation – Dublin Sustainability Framework**

Ms. Newell stated that there are no changes to the agenda order.

#### 1. **ID-2, Noah's Event Venue, 17-108SPR, Site Plan Review**

Ms. Newell stated this application is a proposal for the construction of a ±8,000-square-foot conference and event center and associated site improvements on a ±4-acre parcel, zoned ID-2, Research Flex District. The site is on the northeast corner of the intersection of Shier-Rings Road

and Eiterman Road. This is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042(E)(7)."

### Background

Mr. Stang stated this is an application for Noah's Event Venue, which is located in the West Innovation District. This is the first West Innovation District application to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). The Commission is familiar with the PUD and Bridge Street District review processes, which involve a two-step process for reviewing development applications. The first is usually a higher-level look at the development with general locations and design intent outlined. The second step is to refine those details to verify Code requirements and ensure that the intent matches what was reviewed and approved with the first step. The West Innovation District review process is different. There is no formal first step of providing a preliminary review of the development. Applicants are able to file a development plan showing the refined details up front for review by the ART. That body then has the option to approve the development plan, ensuring the proposal meets all of the Zoning Code requirements, or forward the entire application to PZC for site review, as has been the application before PZC at this time. ART's recommendation for the Commission was based on three findings:

- First is the proximity of this site to the Ballantrae Subdivision;
- Second is the first development along the Shier Rings Road corridor and will begin to establish a development character, and
- Third are the improvements to Eiterman Road based on the proposal.

### Site Details

- The site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Shier Rings Road and Eiterman Road. The church directly east of this property is not within the City of Dublin but falls within Washington Township's jurisdiction. The property is predominantly vacant, with a stream and vegetation running along the northern property line.
- The proposed site plan includes a two-story, 7,500-square-foot conference/event center, a 98-space parking lot with a single access point from Eiterman Road, and a stormwater retention pond along the northern edge. The parking lot contains two landscape peninsulas, a drop-off area, and dumpster enclosure in the northeast corner. The applicant is proposing a series of sidewalks for pedestrian circulation through the site with connections to the existing pedestrian network.
- The northern edge of the property falls within a Stream Corridor Protection Zone that preserves all existing natural features. As part of this development proposal, the applicant will be required to dedicate right-of-way to meet the requirements of the Thoroughfare Plan. The applicant has also provided a traffic access study which identified a need for improvements to Eiterman Road including the widening for a designated southbound left turn lane and northbound right turn lane for traffic mitigation. To help guide discussion this evening, this application is treated similarly to a Final Development Plan review in a Planned District, meaning that all portions of the proposal are part of the review such as architecture, landscaping, signs, parking, and other items.

### Landscaping

- The proposed landscape plan includes appropriate plant materials that meet the requirements and intent of the district. Additional buffering is provided from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way to create a natural appearance.

- Foundation plantings are proposed around the building, and a plaza area is proposed in front of the building with seating areas and connections to the pedestrian network.
- The front elevation which will face the intersection of Shier Rings Road and Eiterman Road.

#### Architecture

- The proposed building contains a mix of materials including pre-cast concrete panels, in two finishes, corrugated metal panels, glass, and aluminum siding in a wood finish. Innovation Districts require that facades contain at least 80% primary materials which include stone, metal panels, EIFS, glass, and pre-cast concrete. All the proposed materials are permitted primary materials thus meeting the requirement. The applicant is also proposing black metal canopies with a metal mesh inlay on all four facades, including a wrap-around feature to accent the main entrance.
- The interior of the building contains a two-story main hall space occupying half of the building with the remainder containing a lobby area on the first floor and conference space on the second floor. The lobby area is accessible from both the front and rear elevations. The conference space on the second floor contains a series of operable glass doors on the exterior. A black railing is proposed in front of the door that lies flush with the exterior façade.
- Additional renderings have been provided showing the building from certain locations. The corners of the building contain the aggregate concrete panels while the remaining portions are comprised of the smooth finish. Wood finish aluminum siding is used as accent, and corrugated metal panels are used to screen rooftop mechanicals.
- The facade facing Shier-Rings Road has a canopy accent around the main entrance and operable doors with the railings on the second story.

#### Signage

- A single projecting sign is proposed on the front elevation. The proposed sign is 24 square feet in size, installed at 20 feet measured from grade, and will project three feet from the building. The sign consists of a black steel frame with metal mesh inlay and stainless steel lettering consisting of "Noah's Event Venue". The sign will be externally illuminated by a horizontal light fixture.
- Projecting signs in the Innovation Districts are limited to a maximum size of 6 square feet and maximum height of 6 feet. These requirements are the smallest size permitted by Code with the Historic District permitting an eight-square-foot projecting sign.
- The proposal will require approval of two administrative departures to the height and size. Planning is supportive of the proposal, as the design incorporates elements of the building architecture, is appropriately sized and integrated into the building, and shows a level of creativity not typical for these sign types.

#### ART Recommendations

Two motions are recommended.

- Administrative Departures

- 153.040 – Interior Landscape Requirements (B)(5)**

- All landscape islands must include a minimum width of ten feet from back to back of curb.

**Request:** 5 feet, 6 inches for the landscape island adjacent to the dumpster enclosure.  
*Criteria Met*

**153.040 – Table of Height, Area & Setbacks (L)(1) – Projecting Sign Area**

Maximum area of six (6) square feet.

**Request:** 24 square feet. *Criteria Met*

**153.040 – Table of Height, Area & Setbacks (L)(1) – Projecting Sign Height**

Maximum height of six (6) feet.

**Request:** 20 feet *Criteria Met*

- Site Plan approval with seven conditions

- 1) That the Eiterman Road widening improvements be constructed concurrently with the site and building improvements and be completed and conditionally accepted by the City prior to occupancy of the building;
- 2) That the required right-of-way be dedicated prior to occupancy of the building;
- 3) That the applicant updates the traffic study or provides a memo indicating whether or not the proposed site mitigations would be sufficient if the roadway network changes on Shier Rings Road;
- 4) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering on the appropriate Eiterman Road turn lane configuration and roadway improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 5) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 6) That the applicant ensures the Fire Department Connection (FDC) maintains three feet of clear space, per the Ohio Fire Code, to be verified with the building permit review; and,
- 7) That the applicant updates the landscape plan to ensure the Fire Department Connection (FDC) is not obstructed by any proposed plantings, to be verified with the building permit review.

Ms. Newell swore in those individuals wishing to provide testimony on the case.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Stidhem inquired about plans for the intersection and whether it will be signalized or be a roundabout. Mr. Stang responded that the tentative plan is for a roundabout, but it would be outside the existing five-year CIP. At this time, there would be no modifications to the intersection.

Mr. Stidhem stated that directional signs at the intersection would seem appropriate for the Eiterman Road ingress/egress, but he did not see that reflected in the plans. Mr. Stang responded the applicant is not proposing any directional signs. Code allows for private on-site directional signs, which they could pursue for their patrons approaching the exit.

Mr. Fishman stated the proposed sign does not meet Code. Typically, a variance is based upon a hardship; however, a sign would be very visible here. Because this is the first building in this District, he would prefer not to set a precedent.

Mr. Stang responded that this is not a variance, but is comparable to a waiver in the Bridge Street District for a deviation from the Code. It is essentially a technicality. The applicant is proposing a projecting sign, which in the West Innovation District, is regulated more heavily than in other

areas of the City. That poses an issue for the development character that will occur here. This area is not meant to be walkable, as are the Bridge Street District and the Historic District. Larger research and development and light manufacturing business will be located here. Because the sign has been designed to integrate with the building and complement the architecture, staff believed it was appropriate for this site. The request is for one sign. The applicant could have chosen to do something more simple in form or a ground sign near the entrance. They decided to incorporate the sign into the actual building itself. Staff was supportive of this effort, not to set a precedent but to provide a good example of how that could be done.

Mr. Fishman stated that at the ART meeting, there was significant discussion regarding the parking lot location. He asked whether those details been resolved satisfactorily.

Mr. Stang responded affirmatively. The initial iterations to the Site Plan provided for the building to be located at the rear and the parking at the front. The applicant has addressed ART's comments satisfactorily.

Mr. Fishman stated this site is on the corner of Eiterman Road and asked why two entrances/exits are not provided.

Mr. Stang stated the desire is not to have multiple entrances due to the fact that this property is located on the corner. From a traffic standpoint, the intent is to provide as much distance as possible between entrances/exits. The applicant provided a traffic access study to show that condition and reduce it. The first iteration did have two access points, but staff requested that it be reduced to one main entrance.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there would be a left-hand turn onto Shier Rings Road.

Mr. Stang responded that there would be two designated lanes, both left and right, on Eiterman Road to enter this site.

Mr. Fishman inquired if all the materials meet the Code.

Mr. Stang responded affirmatively. They are all permitted primary materials.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the building and signs were discussed with a Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang responded affirmatively. It is consistent with the language of the Innovation District Code. A Site Plan Review is treated similarly to a Final Development Plan in a Planned District, and any of the items in the plan are open to discussion at this review.

Mr. Wilson asked about the plan for signs in area. He asked whether we would see more signs coming up in this area as monument signs or something different.

Mr. Stang responded there is no Master Sign Plan for the entire District. Code allows for any property to have one of a number of types of signs – wall, ground or projecting sign. He said what has been most seen are either a wall or ground sign. There will be an update to the Innovation District Zoning Code to align with the West Innovation District update that was approved in 2018. Sign standards to complement the uses and desired development character in the District will be discussed.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the status of the proposed development west on Shier Rings Road.

Mr. Stang inquired if he is referring to the residential development at Cosgray Road.

Mr. Stidhem responded affirmatively.



Mr. Stang responded that the proposed development has not advanced.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to comment.

Chris Winkle, Noah's Event Venue, 47 Greenfield Drive, Milford Center, Ohio stated that this is a corporate meeting and events venue during the week and a wedding venue on weekends. Their closest facility is in New Albany on SR62. The facilities operate approximately 70-75 hours per week; approximately 50 of those hours are for corporate events. This facility will be two stories. The first story is comprised of a main hall and has a capacity of 250 people. The building reflects a new concept for them. It reflects the intent of the Innovation District for a modern style building. Their New Albany site has a traditional style building. Brides within the Columbus area will be able to choose their preferred concept. Within the building on the first floor is a main lobby, café' area and catering room, and on the second floor is a large conference or ceremony room and two small meeting rooms.

He responded to two Commissioners' questions. He said they have ensured their development poses no limitations to future intersection decisions, and that per staff's direction one of the previously proposed driveways removed. He stated directional signage will be helpful their patrons.

Mr. Winkle noted the patio concept that exists at their New Albany facility is not part of this design. Instead, the upstairs windows have been converted into open doors to add an outdoor feel. The top floor is also open to the hall below. In addition, there are moveable walls, which offer the ability to block off noise or add more privacy.

#### Commission discussion continued

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the size of the parking lot is adequate.

Mr. Winkle stated that it will take three years for this to become a mature building. They have conducted traffic studies and learned that, nationwide, they are experiencing approximately 2.6 people per car. With an event of 250 people, that is 75 cars. Their parking plan provides for 100 vehicles.

Mr. Stidhem stated that if needed, the adjacent church site has a parking lot, perhaps accommodations could be arranged with them for overflow parking.

Mr. Winkle stated that if a situation should arise in the future, they are confident they will be able to reach an agreement with the church.

Mr. Stidhem ask how loading and unloading is handled for the catering service.

Mr. Winkle stated there is a drop-off area, and most of the vendors use nothing larger than a custom van. Tables and chairs are provided by the facility.

Mr. Stidhem ask whether the open doors are on the southeast façade.

Mr. Winkle responded the open doors face Shier Rings Road.

Mr. Fishman inquired about the thickness of the wood-finished siding and if it was backed.

Mr. Winkle responded it is a commercial grade. It is not backed, but will be against a concrete wall.

Mr. Fishman stated that if it is not backed, there will be a space between it and the wall.  
Mr. Winkle confirmed that is correct. However, it is not a residential material, but a heavy-duty commercial product.

Mr. Wilson asked if the window frames are aluminum.  
Mr. Winkle responded that they are black aluminum.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the size/capacity of the trash container is adequate for perhaps three events.

Mr. Winkle responded affirmatively. The venues at their facility are high-end, and typically use plates and silverware, not paper and plastic table service.

Mr. Wilson observed the vendors would be bringing/removing the table service.  
Mr. Winkle noted that the only items their facility provides is the table and chairs and the linens.

Mr. Wilson asked about the hours of operation throughout the week.  
Mr. Winkle responded that blocks of time are rented from 7:00 am to 9 p.m. weekdays. On weekends, events can run until midnight. Staff has regular hours, but during events, some staff remains onsite.

Mr. Wilson inquired if there would be music.  
Mr. Winkle responded that there would be, but it would be confined within the building at all times, typically within the reception area.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if their plan contains any sustainability efforts.  
Mr. Winkle responded that their sites have sustained well over a period of years. Although the company CEO initiated this concept in 2008 during the economic downturn, it has succeeded and multiplied. This facility will be their 45 – 50<sup>th</sup> location in the nation. Should anything happen to the business in the future, the buildings are easily convertible to office space.

Mr. Stidhem clarified that he was interested in the environmentally sustainability perspective, such as rainwater collection and solar and wind energy capture.  
Mr. Winkle responded this site meets the City's stringent drainage requirements for this area, and the site releases little runoff.

Mr. Stidhem stated that one of his recommendations would be exploration of the potential to have the building wired to support solar panels on the roof, in recognition of that future trend. While the 2014 studies indicated that solar panels are not a cost-effective solution in Ohio at this time, those studies are four years old. Cyclical efforts such as rainwater collection would be more environmentally friendly. Although this site is not located within a well-developed area today, that will not be true ten years from now. He would encourage the West Innovation District to look innovatively at long-term environmental sustainability efforts.

Mr. Wilson stated that the building has been reviewed by the ART, but in the future, he would encourage the architectural design be pushed with future applications. He sees this building as a cube structure with little personality. He would encourage exploration of more movement within the building architecture. This design appears to be designed by an engineer with a focus on

being functional. Bringing a design team into this process could improve the architecture and enrich the community.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no concerns with the plan. Although the sign may not meet Code, the design is well integrated with the building. She is an engineer and likes the building. She finds the exterior of the building appealing and simple. She is also happy to see this business locate in the community.

Mr. Stidhem stated he likes the building and the sign. It is a good fit with the building. He appreciates the ability to convert this building to another purpose in the future. There is a demand for a venue for corporate and wedding events in this community. This is a great location for this service.

Mr. Newell concurred with Mr. Wilson's comments regarding the articulation of the façade. She would be more concerned if it was a much larger building. Overall, she likes the design of the building. She finds the sign very artistic and well blended into the building. Her only concern is with one building material. The text refers to it as aluminum siding, but aluminum siding is not a permissible material in the West Innovation District. Metal panel siding is permissible. This material is half-way between. It is installed in the same manner as a metal panel screen system would be installed. Therefore, she believes it is more of a metal panel siding. For the record, she wants to clearly state that the Commission was interpreting this material as metal panels, not aluminum siding. This is a very nice project.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the three (3) Administrative Departures. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.  
Motion passed: 5-0.

Ms. Stidhem inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the seven conditions.  
Mr. Winkle responded that he is in agreement.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with seven (7) conditions. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.  
Motion passed: 5-0.

## **2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1, 18-080DPR-SPR, Development and Site Plan Reviews with Parking Plan**

Ms. Newell stated this request is a proposal for review and approval of a Development Plan, Waivers and a Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, for a proposed six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel and commercial building and associated site improvements, southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive.

Ms. Newell swore in those individuals who wished to present public testimony on this case.



### Background

Ms. Husak stated that this is a development plan and site plan with a parking plan for Building F1 in Bridge Park. On January 17, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) recommended approval of the plat that includes the lot for F1 as well as the private drive. On October 22, 2018, City Council approved the Basic Plan Reviews for Block F and Block G, and appointed PZC as the required reviewing body for all future applications. Tonight's review will be the final step in the development review for Block F. There will be several other buildings, but PZC is reviewing only F1 at this time. When this plan is approved, the applicant will be able to apply for building permits.

### Site

This site within Block F is located on Bridge Park Avenue and is bordered by Mooney Street on the west and Dale Drive on the east. Blocks A through C are completed and Blocks D and H are being completed. Building F1 is an 86,000-square-foot hotel with approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space. The building has six stories and 145 rooms. The south façade is adjacent to the reserve that was platted and the private drive of Winder Way, and contains a canopy-covered patron drop-off area. On the north façade along Bridge Park Avenue is the primary entrance/exit for pedestrian traffic. Dale Drive on the east side, which is anticipated to be a street similar to Bridge Street, will have some interim conditions. It also has topography changes, which were partially addressed with waivers in the Basic Plan, as there were some areas where the front property line coverage could not be met due to the layout of the existing roadway. On the west side is existing Mooney Street. Directly across from the F1 building on Mooney Street are buildings in B Block and the B Block garage.

### Landscape Plan

The landscape plan for this site includes open space primarily in the area south of the hotel and west of the canopy area. Patrons of the hotel can exit and enjoy the outdoors in a comfortable setting. It is publicly accessible and the applicant is counting that as their open space. This site is slightly short of open space dedication. Overall, the Block will make up all the open-space requirement; however, for this particular site, there is a condition that the open space dedication will be deferred to the development to the south to make up the needed portion. Retaining walls and chairs and lounges are proposed to make a comfortable space. There are also areas for seating to the north along Bridge Park Avenue.

### Elevation

On the northeast east side along Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, a large amount of glass and brick are incorporated into the facades. The signs depicted in the rendering are not part of tonight's application. They will be addressed in a future amendment to the Master Sign Plan, which currently encompasses Blocks A, B, C and D. On the northwest elevation along Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street are located commercial spaces with patios and a more active streetscape, along with higher windows and views into the restaurants. On the southeast elevation is Dale Drive and Winder Drive -- a proposed private street through the block, which has the canopied drop-off area. The applicant is present and can explain the changes that were made to address the direction shared at the previous Council and PZC meetings. The plan has been revised to increase the width of Winder Drive and the inclusion of passenger drop-off spaces and delivery areas. Winder Drive has also been revised to be one-way only.

### ART Recommendations

Three motions are recommended.

- Development Plan with no conditions.
- Waiver Review – Approval of Waivers to permit the following deviations from Code:
  1. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.**  
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.  
**Request:** To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
  2. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.**  
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.  
**Request:** Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
  3. **§153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.**  
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.  
**Request:** To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
  4. **§153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements**  
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.  
**Request.** Permission for PTAC and VTAC unit grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.
  5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**  
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.  
**Request.** Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback  $\pm 3.33$  feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
  6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**  
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.  
**Request.** Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
  7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**  
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.  
**Request:** To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
  8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**

No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.

**Request:** To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.

9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**

Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.

**Request:** To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.

10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane**

Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.

**Request:** To permit roof planes of  $\pm 111$  feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.

11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**

80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.

**Request:** To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.

12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**

One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.

**Request:** To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.

13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**

A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

**Request:** 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

**Request:** Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

**Request:** Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

- Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan with eight conditions

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

#### Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage of the pocket parks was reduced or were they only reoriented.

Ms. Husak responded that the square footage was not reduced, but it is not on a principal frontage street. It is the street orientation that does not meet the Code.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the square footage remains the same as originally intended.

Ms. Husak responded the pocket park size requirement is met. However, the Code has several different open space types, and the space in this plan qualifies as a pocket plaza.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification. Although F1 does not meet the open space requirements, she asked whether the other buildings in F Block would provide the additional space that was required.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Overall, the applicant intends for F Block to meet the open space requirements. If the anticipated office space should be unable to provide the additional square footage needed, it will be dealt with that application review.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City does not want payment in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that with the Basic Plan, the applicant showed where the open space would be provided throughout the block, which met the requirement.

Mr. Wilson stated that it is important that these open spaces are designed to be usable spaces. In the areas that are already designed, the spaces are wider and can be used as gathering spaces. He said what is occurring between Building F2 and Building F4 are hallways or corridors that permit pedestrian traffic instead of being gathering spaces. As the design continues for Building F2 and F4, that should be considered. The spaces should be made into something that the public will remain in for a time and enjoy, not just aisles to move people.

Mr. Wilson asked about construction sequence. He stated he assumes the hotel application is currently being reviewed will be built before the parking lot that will be across the private street.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. The only application currently online is the hotel.

Mr. Wilson stated that he assumes the parking for the hotel would initially be provided by the existing parking structures, but he asked if that will be enough space and sufficiently close for the hotel guests. He inquired whether there is an expectation that F2 garage will be built within a few months.

Ms. Husak stated the applicant would address the timing/phases of this project; however, in terms of the availability of spaces, staff is comfortable with the research and resulting numbers for this parking plan. Code does not require a certain linear distance.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the ownership of the pocket park is changing.

Ms. Husak responded that because the open space parking plaza is located on the hotel property, it is owned by that property owner – either Crawford Hoying or Springhill Suites, not by the City. However, the public will use the open space. Code requires the open space to be owned by the City. A waiver will be needed to permit it to be owned by the hotel.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would remain open space in perpetuity, and the hotel not be permitted to identify it for hotel use.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if that understanding would be clearly reflected in a deed or elsewhere.

Ms. Husak stated that the record will reflect the Commission's approval that the space fulfills the City's open space requirement. If the nature of that open space were to change, it would no longer be consistent with the Commission's approval.

Mr. Boggs stated the Condition suggests that with the Waiver, the property owner would provide a public access easement, which would provide public access in perpetuity.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is concerned the hotel might put a kiosk there.

Mr. Boggs responded that would be in violation of the Commission's approval and the City's rights under the easement that would be granted as a Condition of the Commission's approval.

Mr. Fishman stated it is important to ensure projects are providing the required open space and not receive waivers of that requirement or be permitted to pay a fee in lieu.

Ms. Husak stated that only 700 square feet is being waived.

Mr. Fishman stated he is concerned the future project is expected to supply that additional amount but will object that it is not their responsibility.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification of the bicycle rack requirement for a certain number of spaces.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a Code requirement.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if one of the waivers or conditions was related to that.

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. Code requires the provision of bicycle parking spaces. The Condition language is not specific in terms of where these bicycle spaces must be located, so they could be located in the garage or on the site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that because there is no garage in proximity, the bicycle parking spaces will be on the sidewalks.

Ms. Husak responded that there are bicycle parking spaces on Bridge Park Avenue that are in the City right-of-way. There are also spaces in the Block B garage.

Ms. Newell invited the applicant to speak.

James Peltier, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus stated that he would like to address the open space requirement. He pointed out a hatched area on the rendering that indicates that space. Previously, the plan proposed a pool in that area that would be associated with the building. The pool was removed and a wall was pulled back approximately 20 feet to provide more open space here. The F1 Building is required to provide 1800 square feet of open space. The plan provides 1200 square feet, making it 600 square feet short of the requirement. They will be building and providing additional open space across the street; which will be well in excess of the open space requirements.

Mr. Fishman stated that these spaces are not public gathering spots. He asked if the one particular space was for the restaurant.

Ms. Husak responded that it is not for the restaurant, but it likely would be a patio space.

Mr. Peltier clarified the patio space is not for the restaurant. It is intended to be an open space similar to other public open spaces within the area, such as the public space between Buildings C1 and C2, where Cap City Diner is located.

Mr. Peltier summarized the results of the parking analysis, which was included in the Commission packets. The existing B Block garage across Mooney Street has 142 spaces in excess of the City Code requirements. Code requires 187 spaces for the hotel and restaurant. There are 107 spaces in the garage dedicated for B Block office use. On weekends, those spaces are not being utilized. Therefore, during the peak hours for the restaurant and hotel, those unused spaces dedicated for office would be available for hotel and restaurant use.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if there would be signs that identifies those spaces as reserved for office use Monday – Friday during specified hours.

Mr. Peltier responded that no specific spaces are reserved for office.

Mr. Fishman inquired if an additional garage is anticipated.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively. It would be south of the F1 Building.

Mr. Fishman inquired the anticipated timeframe for the additional garage.

Don Brogan, Crawford Hoying Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated the additional garage is expected to be included with the next office building project. However, the hotel will have sufficient parking with what is available at this time. When the next office building is constructed, the garage will be built, as well.

Mr. Fishman stated the parking garage across the street is a free, self-park structure, and asked if it will remain as such when the hotel is completed.

Mr. Brogan responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if valet parking of hotel vehicles would not be required.

Mr. Brogan responded that there would be no need for valet parking. The garage is directly across the street.



### Commission Discussion

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the bike rack design and location.

Mr. Peltier referred to images provided in the Landscape Plans. There are existing bike racks on Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue, which are included in the required bicycle parking count. Additional bike racks will be included on this site, as well.

Mr. Stidhem encouraged using interesting bike racks. Throughout the plan, he would like to see interesting features to draw people in along Winder Drive. For the last three years, the Commission has been discussing the use of artistic features that will draw people to this space. In Hilton Head, for example, the bike racks reflect a "fish" architectural feature. He said there are many interesting features in Bridge Park already, but he asked what, if anything, is planned here. Ms. Husak responded that the City bike racks utilize the same, circular design. Staff has discussed the need to expand that palette. They can work with the applicant to do so here, and staff can focus on expanding the effort Citywide.

Mr. Peltier stated the bike racks in Bridge Park already show a variety in design. As he understands the conversation, in addition to the bike racks, the Commission is encouraging incorporation of more interesting features within this open space.

Chris Meyers, Meyers & Associates Architects, 232 North Third Street, Columbus, stated the intent is to create charisma throughout the Bridge Park venues through the use of fixed objects and materials. In addition, they have attempted to seek areas in which to add a charisma of activity, such as outdoor musicians. The goal is to create spaces that encourage people to gather and sit. The landscape element next to the hotel is intended to energize the appearance of the front entrance.

Ms. Kennedy stated that, as a resident, she cannot envision wanting to sit down outside a hotel. It does not seem to be a space that will be utilized by the general public. Adding the vibrancy does bring the back side of the building to life.

Mr. Meyers stated it is challenging because it is difficult to differentiate which is the front and which is the back. With all the activity that is planned around this site and what is currently in place, a hotel visitor may exit to the north or the south and interact with the entire development. An additional benefit to Bridge Park will be the new park to the west, which will provide a large outdoor gathering space and amenity for the City. These smaller pocket spaces add to the identity of a particular building. This small space may be utilized more by hotel guests, but it is not exclusive to their use.

Mr. Fishman encouraged the incorporation of artwork, such as sculptures, in the area.

Mr. Meyers stated that the discovery of interactive sculptures adds an unexpected element of surprise. Throughout Bridge Park, there is an effort to look for opportunities to add interactive elements. Likewise, their intent is not to extend buildings to the street, but allow a transitional space between the public right-of-way and the façade for such opportunities.

Mr. Fishman noted that there has been previous discussion about the intent to add sculptures and elements to attract people. He asked if it their intent to do so.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively.

Mr. Wilson inquired about the reason the internal road on the site must be private. He asked if the hotel is permitted to block that road and prevent through traffic.

Mr. Peltier responded that it would be treated like a public road, and built to the same standards. There are private roads on Block A, as well, such as Longshore Loop. The intent would not be to block them off or make them inaccessible to the public.

Mr. Boggs stated that at the previous PZC meeting discussion regarding the plat, it was clarified that this area is set forth in the plat as a Reserve for purposes of providing public access into the site.

Ms. Husak responded that it would not be a neighborhood street, which would provide connectivity through the blocks; its primary purpose is to provide access to the hotel and the garage. It is not a through street like the north/south streets.

Mr. Peltier stated the street will meet fire and emergency access requirements.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if the developer would be responsible for the maintenance.

Mr. Peltier responded affirmatively.

Ms. Newell inquired if the cement board siding is prefinished.

Mr. Meyers responded affirmatively. It has a factory prime and one coat finish. In the event that any marks occur to the finish during shipping, a final finish application would be added. There are other examples of this commercial grade product within Bridge Park.

Mr. Stidhem stated that the building is attractive and will be a great addition to the District. He is hopeful that this site will encourage pedestrian traffic in the area. He asked if there is rooftop access for the hotel or restaurant.

Mr. Meyers responded that there is rooftop access only for the maintenance of the mechanical equipment. There will be no interactive public area.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if any environmental sustainability feature would be incorporated.

Mr. Meyers responded that a significant amount of environmental sustainability has been incorporated in the building, which is consistent with Crawford Hoying's standards and is also a requirement of the Marriott brand.

Ms. Newell inquired if any of the mechanical equipment on the roof would be screened, given that waivers are requested to permit parapet heights.

Mr. Meyers responded that all of the mechanicals are positioned out of the sight line and have screening. The conditions for the parapets are related to the form of the building, not to add any visibility. They have considered the potential views from the elevations of the adjacent buildings, and any need for screening has been addressed.

Ms. Newell stated that she appreciates that response, because, in with some of the other buildings in Bridge Park, assurances were made that the mechanical units would be screened. However, they are very visible in certain locations, particularly when there is a change in elevation.

Mr. Meyers noted that the specifications of each of the units was included in the materials.

Mr. Stidhem stated that, whenever possible, he would encourage rooftop access for play, not only for access to mechanical units. The AC Hotel provides evidence of the level of draw that is created. It may not be advisable for this location; however, due to its more limited view.

Mr. Meyers responded that it also is not consistent with the Marriott brand.

Mr. Wilson inquired if street lighting is being provided.

Mr. Peltier responded that a plan for street lighting was included in the materials. Three light poles are proposed along Winder Drive, which are consistent with other street light poles utilized in the District.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the awning for the main entrance would be an open, flat style that would not provide rain protection.

Mr. Meyers responded that the awning would be translucent but it is a solid acrylic panel.

Ms. Newell stated that a waiver has been requested regarding the primary materials on the building. She has a concern about the amount of cement board siding being used, in particular on the Dale Drive/Winder Drive corner. It creates an impression of a very large mass on that corner in comparison to the articulation that is expressed elsewhere on the building. She is uncomfortable with the size of that mass; however, she defers that issue to the Commission. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Development Plan Review without conditions. Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.  
Motion approved: 5-0.

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the 15 waivers:

1. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height.**  
Parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high.  
**Request:** To parapets of .5 feet and 7.5 feet in height.
2. **§153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(c) – Horizontal Expression Lines.**  
Expression lines are encouraged to distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building.  
**Request:** Expression lines distinguish the parapet from the upper stories of the building and define the top of the parapet.
3. **§153.062 – Building Types (H)(1)(g) – Windows, Projecting Sills Required.**  
Windows within siding clad walls shall have a projecting sill to serve as a base for either a minimum one-by-four trim or brick mould casing.  
**Request:** To permit windows to be recessed into the siding clad facades with no projecting sills.
4. **§153.062 – Building Types (N)(4)(a)(5) Vents, Air Conditioners, other Utility Elements.**  
Vents, air conditioners, and other utility elements are not permitted on street facing facades.  
**Request.** Permission for PTAC and VTAC unit grills/louvers on street facing facades and architectural louvers above restaurant storefront windows for future mechanical systems.

5. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Setbacks.**  
The minimum rear yard setback is 5 feet.  
**Request.** Allow for the closest corner of the building to Reserve "B" to be setback  $\pm 3.33$  feet from the shared property line with Lot 18.
6. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(2) Building Siting, Impervious Lot Coverage.**  
The maximum permitted impervious lot coverage is 80%.  
**Request.** Allow for the 96% impervious coverage for Lot 18.
7. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Street Façade Transparency.**  
The minimum ground story street facing transparency is 60%, and the minimum upper story street facing transparency is 30%.  
**Request:** To allow ground story transparency of 18% at the east elevation, 40% at the north elevation, and 46% at the west elevation. To allow upper story transparency of 26% at the east elevation.
8. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(1) Façade Requirements, Blank Wall Limitations.**  
No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless.  
**Request.** To allow for the southern portion of the west elevation and the east and west portions of the south elevation to have blank wall areas greater than 15 feet in horizontal distance.
9. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments.**  
Vertical increments are required no greater than 45 feet in width.  
**Request:** To allow vertical increments greater than 45 feet in width in the middle and the east end of the north elevation, at the east end of the south elevation, and at the south end of the west elevation.
10. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(4) – Change in Roof Plane.**  
Changes in the roof plane or type are required at least every 80 feet.  
**Request:** To permit roof planes of  $\pm 111$  feet in length without a change in the horizontal plane.
11. **§153.062 – Corridor Building Type (O)(5)(d)(5) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials.**  
80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.  
**Request:** To allow primary material percentages of 45% on the north elevation, 37.5% on the south elevation, 53% on the east elevation, and 38.5% on the west elevation.
12. **§153.064 – Open Space Types (C) Provision of Open Space.**  
One square foot of publicly accessible open space is required for every 50 square feet of commercial space proposed.  
**Request:** To permit 1,203 square feet of open space, where 1,910 square feet are required.
13. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(2)(a) Street Right-of-Way Frontage Required.**  
A minimum of 30% of the perimeter of the open space is required along a building and street.

**Request:** 0 feet of perimeter to be required along the street right-of-way.

14. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(3)(b) Frontage Orientation of Adjacent Buildings.**

The preferred orientation of open space is along the front or corner side property line.

**Request:** Permission to orient the Pocket Park toward the rear property line.

15. **§153.064 – Pocket Park General Requirement (G)(5) – Ownership.**

Open Spaces may be either publicly or privately owned. If privately owned, required open space must be publicly accessible along a street right-of-way.

**Request:** Permission for a privately owned open space to not require access along the street right-of-way.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem moved to approve the Site Plan Review with Parking Plan with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant evaluate opportunities for provision of required publicly accessible open space;
- 2) That the applicant provide a public access easement to and over the proposed Pocket Park;
- 3) That an on-street van accessible parking space be provided based on the provision of 3 new parking spaces;
- 4) That bicycle parking spaces be provided as required by Code;
- 5) That exterior lighting specifications for all proposed fixtures be submitted with building permits;
- 6) That exterior lighting be provided in the area of the Pocket Park to meet the minimum foot candle requirements of Code;
- 7) That details and specifications for the proposed vehicular canopy be submitted with building permits; and
- 8) That the applicant verify the proposed height of the retaining walls surrounding the open space along Winder Drive and request any necessary approvals should they exceed Code-permitted height.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant is in agreement with these conditions.

Mr. Meyers responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

Motion approved: 5-0

Mr. Stidhem thanked the applicant for their presentations.

### **3. PUD, Muirfield Tournament Headquarters, 5750 Memorial Drive, 19-003AFDP**

Ms. Newell stated this application is a proposal for modifications to a previously approved two-story, 15,000-square-foot office building for the Muirfield Golf Course. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Muirfield Village and is located north of Memorial Drive, approximately 450 feet northeast of the intersection with Kinross Court. This is a request for a review and disapproval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Newell swore in any individuals desiring to provide public testimony.

#### Background:

Mr. Rayburn stated that in November 2018, an application for an amended final development plan was reviewed by the Commission. The application for demolition of a one-story service cart storage building on the parcel and replacement with a new, two-story, 15,000-square-foot building for office, warehousing and recreational uses, and associated site improvements was approved. The building serves as the Muirfield Village Tournament headquarters.

#### Request:

The applicant is requesting modifications to the previously approved roof materials and the east elevation of the building. Previously approved for the east façade were windows and side lights at the first floor entrance, and a cedar shake material was approved for the roof. The applicant is proposing to replace the cedar shake material with a synthetic shake material and eliminate the windows and side lights on the east elevation. The east façade faces the golf course and the clubhouse, which is a prominent location.

Staff shared its concerns regarding the proposed modifications with the applicant. In response, the applicant submitted an alternative for the east façade, which includes a green wall treatment and a wall sign with a Muirfield Village Golf Club logo. The green wall is a vertical and horizontal planting incorporated into the façade using a mesh constructed from a wire rope system as the method of gross support. The applicant has chosen ideas for preferred plant species as an alternative to ivy. Also, provided was the image of a wall sign that is a logo of the Muirfield Village Golf Club; however, the sign dimensions were not included at the time of review. The sign will have to meet all applicable Zoning Code requirements. The review determined that the application was not consistent with the criteria and disapproval was recommended. Since the review, staff has been in communications with the applicant and has received additional information on their proposal for the green wall alternative. Additionally, the applicant has provided information for this meeting. However, because staff has not had sufficient time to review that information, it is left to the Chair's discretion whether to accept that information.

Ms. Newell stated that she believes there should have been the opportunity to review the new information with the meeting materials. The applicant has the opportunity to request that their application be tabled and resubmit their materials to staff and PZC to review preceding a meeting.

Mr. Stidhem inquired if staff had changed their recommendation after their initial review of the new information.



Mr. Rayburn responded that it did not change their recommendation. The elements previously approved were high quality and appropriate for the façade facing the golf course and Club House. The club house has a cedar shake roof, which is consistent with Muirfield Village requirements. Therefore, the new proposed roof material is a concern. The wall sign is a logo sign. The Code provides a 20% limitation on the area of the sign face that can be a logo, and the proposed sign exceeds that limit.

Mr. Fishman disclosed that he has had a brief conversation with Mr. LaRocca regarding shake roof materials and windows. He had mentioned that a fake window might be fine, but made no conclusions. He also spoke with the attorney, who indicated that it was satisfactory.

Mr. Wilson stated that some neighbors attended the previous PZC meeting review and they had indicated how visible this building was from their homes. He inquired whether the neighbors been notified of the proposed changes.

Mr. Rayburn responded that per City requirements, meeting notifications were sent. He received one phone call from a resident inquiring about the application details. He explained that the request was for approval of roof modifications and an alternative east façade. Although he encouraged them to attend this meeting to share any concerns, they are not present.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the expectation is that PZC make a decision tonight.

Ms. Newell responded that is the applicant's right to request the case be tabled or be permitted to proceed to a vote.

As Commission members had no further questions at this time, Ms. Newell inquired what was the applicant's direction.

Applicants present: Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan Architects, 300 Spruce Street, Columbus, and Nicholas LaRocca, General Manager/COO of the Muirfield Village Golf Club, 5750 Memorial Drive, Dublin

Ms. Umbarger requested that staff display the electronic images provided for this meeting.

Ms. Husak responded that because staff has not previously seen those materials, they have not been accepted into the meeting record.

Mr. LaRocca requested permission to provide explanation of the interior space behind the east wall, which is the reason for their request for elimination of the windows.

Ms. Umbarger inquired if she would be permitted to show a picture of the room's interior.

Ms. Husak responded that because these pictures would not typically be part of staff's review, staff has no objection to display of the photos. [staff displayed the electronic images]

Mr. LaRocca stated that in the image shown, the space serves as a golf teaching academy. It is critical that three of the room's walls be blank, in order that their teaching equipment operate appropriately. There are tracks with cameras along the left and right walls. [various views/perspectives of the room shown.] It is critical that the east façade be blank to enable use of the required training equipment.

Ms. Umbarger stated that the original intent was to display the equipment only on one wall, opposite the windows. There is now a need to have two instructors provide training at the same

time; hence, the reason training equipment must be provided on both sides. The other critical factor requiring this change is the level of light projected into that space. They have heard staff's concerns and have attempted to identify an appealing alternative to the windows.

Mr. Fishman that to break up the expanse of blank wall, one suggestion is to provide fake windows with shutters on the wall. It gives the wall dimension and achieves the appearance of windows. The interior would not be impacted at all.

Mr. LaRocca responded that there are no other shuttered windows on the property; however, ivy is present throughout the premises. The ivy creatively covers the blank wall and is sustainable. The club house also has a nice, mature growth of ivy. After five years, it now provides a very attractive appearance on the stone walls.

Ms. Umbarger stated this façade faces the club house; it does not face any of the neighboring properties. It is internal to the private property. This training center is for private use by the members, who access the area on the east side of the building by golf cart or foot. There is no public access.

Mr. Fishman stated that he took a lengthy tour of the site earlier today and talked to some of the workers. The building is much more dominant than he had realized during the Commission's earlier review and approval. The building can be seen from the street in front of the neighbors' homes. Construction has begun, and the steel now in place indicates the height of the walls upon which the roof will sit. With the pitch of the roof, it will be viewable in many directions. He sees no justification for lowering the standards and deviating from the originally approved roof material. The Muirfield Village Club has consistently maintained strict standards, and has required that homes backing the Club property utilize shake roof materials.

Mr. LaRocca responded that the house abutting this building, however, has an asphalt shake roof. Mr. Fishman responded that the homeowners experienced a hardship. Originally, the house had a tin roof. Due an ongoing leak issue, a variance was eventually granted permitting use of the alternative roof material. In fairness to the neighbors who were required to use shake roof material, he would prefer to retain the current standards. In essence, "what is good for the goose is good for the gander," so he believes that Muirfield Village should abide by those standards, as well.

Mr. Boggs provided a proceedings suggestion. The current status is that the applicant has submitted materials related to their proposal to eliminate the windows. Because the proposed materials were only recently submitted, and were not reviewed by staff and the Commission prior to the meeting, the Commission has determined that the materials would not be accepted for this meeting discussion. The next question to address is whether the applicant desires to have their application tabled or a decision made this evening. He does not believe the applicant has provided that answer.

Ms. Newell inquired what is the applicant's desire.  
Mr. LaRocca requested that the item be tabled.

Mr. Boggs clarified that tabling the application means that it will be reviewed on another date. The applicant will have the ability to consider staff's report and provide an update/response to any of the issues before their next appearance before the Commission.

Mr. Stidhem moved to table the application. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes.  
Motion approved: 5-0

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

### **Presentation - Dublin Sustainability Framework**

Mr. Rayburn stated that Nick Plouck, City Manager's Office, would participate in this report. He and Mr. Plouck have been working on a Sustainability Framework as well as other sustainability initiatives on behalf of the City. The impetus of this was MORPC's release of their 2017 Regional Sustainability Agenda. In addition, MORPC rolled out a program called Sustainable 2050, which provides the opportunity for cities to become certified under different measurements of sustainability as they relate to peer cities within the region. Last year, Dublin was certified as a "Platinum Community," the highest designation in that category. Part of their Sustainability Framework efforts focused on different ways in which to achieve sustainability as it relates to different work-driven groups of the City. The Framework suggested creation of a Sustainability Advisory Team. This would be an external advisory group consisting of different businesses, agencies and organizations within the City with a few regional partners to assist in developing the next iteration of this Framework, which will expire in 2020. They would identify various community goals. Staff has identified and confirmed participation of various City businesses and organizations. They also would like to invite a PZC member to represent the Commission on this new advisory team. It would be a two-year commitment, expiring the end of 2020 (a total of 8 meetings). There will be quarterly meetings with the first meeting occurring on February 26, 2019, 9:00-11:00 am at City Hall.

Mr. Stidhem indicated that although this is a topic of significant interest to him, because his term on the Planning and Zoning Commission will expire 3/31/19, he is unable to volunteer. He inquired about the absence of one of Dublin's largest employers, Cardinal Health, on the list that was shared in the meeting materials.

Mr. Plouck responded that they worked with the City's Economic Development Team in developing the list. The Economic Development Team indicated that the City is over-extending some of these larger businesses with other requests for representation at this time. They recommended taking advantage of the opportunity to include businesses that have not been over-extended. Other members can be added to the Team in the future, however; so the team representation may increase over the next two years.

Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Fishman volunteered to serve as joint representatives on the Dublin Sustainability Advisory Team.

### **Bridge Street District Code Changes**

Mr. Papsidero stated that on February 4, 2019, the Community Development Committee discussed Administrative Code Changes for the Bridge Street District. The Committee provided excellent feedback and direction to prepare legislation for a first reading at the March 18<sup>th</sup> City

Council meeting. If approved, it would be adopted at the April 8, 2019 meeting and become effective in 30 days.

### **Bridge Street District Code Update Stakeholders**

Mr. Papsidero stated that the kick-off meeting of this group occurred February 5. He expressed thanks to Ms. Newell and Mr. Wilson for participating on this team.

### **Central Ohio Planning and Zoning Workshop – May 17, 2019**

Ms. Husak requested that the Commissioners add a "Save the Date" to their calendars for May 17. The Central Ohio Planning Association is hosting the Annual Planning and Zoning Workshop. Planning staff members JM Rayburn and Nicki Martin are integral in organizing the conference. The City of Dublin is a sponsor this year, and will be hosting the all-day workshop at The Exchange. The conference would provide an excellent educational opportunity for Commission members. Mr. Papsidero noted that there will be some sessions for City Planning Commissioners.

### **State of the City – March 14, 2019.**

Ms. Husak stated that due to the State of the City on March 14, the ARB and BZA meetings, and Spring Break, PZC will meet only March 7.

### Commission Questions


Ms. Kennedy inquired if there would be a meeting notice and agenda for the February 27 Sustainability Advisory Team meeting.

Mr. Plouck responded that an agenda is being finalized and will be sent out to the list of participants. A current contact list will be included.

Mr. Rayburn noted that a copy of the Dublin Sustainability Framework was included in this meeting packet, which could be helpful to review before the meeting.

Mr. Stidhem noted that although he is unable to participate on this Team, he would encourage that, going forward, the City require the use of solar panels on new buildings.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council