



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 20, 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, Ms. Kennedy, Ms. Fox, Mr. Supelak, Mr. Fishman, Mr. Wilson and Ms. Call

Staff members present: Mr. Papsidero, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hoppel, Ms. Goss, Ms. Gilger, Ms. Ray, Mr. Hammersmith, and Mr. Stanford

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Fox seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

(Motion passed 7-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the April 11 and May 2, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

(Motion passed 7-0)

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 the administrative cases must be sworn in.

TABLED CASE

1. Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche Signs, 6325 Perimeter Loop Road, 19-030AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a proposal for signs for the Porsche showroom as part of the existing Midwestern Auto Group campus, a 30-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District. Staff has received a request from the applicant this evening to table this case.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Call seconded to table the case.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

(Motion passed 7-0)

CASES

2. Dublin Rehabilitation Hospital, PID: 273-012662, 19-028INF, Informal Review

Ms. Newell stated that this application is a request for an informal review and feedback on a proposal for the construction of an approximately 48,000-square-foot rehabilitation hospital serving 40 inpatient beds. The 5.76-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Northeast Quad, Subarea 5B.

Case Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an informal review and feedback on a proposal for the construction of an approximately 48,000-square-foot post-acute care rehabilitation hospital. An informal review allows an applicant to seek feedback on a proposal prior to filing a development application. Discussion points are non-binding.

Site

The site is approximately 5.8 acres and zoned Planned Unit Development District N.E. Quad Subarea 5B. It is located on the east side of Emerald Parkway, 550 feet west of the intersection with Sawmill Road and immediately north of the existing Kroger. [Photos of site shown.]

Proposed Site Plan

The main entrance is oriented south toward Summer Drive facing the Kroger Marketplace. The rehabilitation amenities space is centrally located between two, 20-patient room wings that extend north toward Emerald Parkway. The lawn to the west of the building is to be used as open space or greenspace, but could accommodate a future expansion, if warranted. Any expansion would be limited in size due to density requirements set forth in the development text and would require an Amended Final Development Plan, if the applicant should desire such a course of action. Proposed parking, which is primarily situated north and south of the building, totals 103 spaces. The development text for the site refers to the Dublin parking code, which would require 175 parking spaces based on the number of patient rooms and employees on the largest shift. The applicant has indicated that 85 parking spaces would be adequate for their needs. Two access points along the internal drive provide ingress and egress, while a driveway aisle provides access around the building and to the parking.

Development Text

The development text requires the building materials be earth tone in color and primarily brick, stone, and EIFS. The proposed materials are not exact but closely resemble and complement those used in Subarea 5A (Kroger Marketplace). The main entrance, located along Summer Drive, consists of a contemporary, two-story glass enclosed lobby and a stone accent wing wall that extends south toward Summer Drive. An earth tone aluminum composite vehicular canopy extends over the pickup/drop off area. The maximum height of the building is approximately 31 feet. The north elevation, the rear of the building, consists of three window walls, one on each of the two patient wings and one on the interior amenity area. The primary façade is finished in an Amaretto brick. The east and west elevations continue the use of a cast stone header and coping that extends over the windows throughout the building. The main entrance and lobby is a prominent feature on the west elevation facing Emerald Parkway. The east elevation contains the refuse area. A colonial white screen wall is proposed to screen utilities on the roof and would be visible on all facades.

Staff recommends the following three discussion questions:

1) Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed site layout?

The proposed building does not take advantage of the investments made to Emerald Parkway and rather is oriented toward Summer Drive. The proposal allows room for future expansion, which results in an underutilized area adjacent to Emerald Parkway. Based on the density limitations, the future expansion may be reduced in size or will require a rezoning to permit additional density. The applicant has worked with Staff to consolidate parking. Staff continues to have concerns about the configuration of the centrally located curb cut that aligns with the private drive off Sawmill Road.

2) Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed architecture and building materials?

The development texts requires that complementary materials to those already existing in the Northeast Quad be applied to future development. The applicant is proposing primary materials including brick and stone, which will closely resemble those used in Subarea 5A to the south. Staff continues to have concerns about the length of the elevations with little to no architectural relief, particularly the east and west elevations.

3) Does the Commission support a deviation from the parking requirement in the Zoning Code?

The development text refers to the Parking and Loading requirements outlined in the Zoning Code. The proposed development requires 175 parking spaces, per Code. The applicant submitted a memo explaining that 85 parking spaces are adequate for their parking needs. The plan provides 103 parking spaces located on the site.

4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy inquired about the layout and orientation of the building. The information provided indicates that 103 parking spaces will be provided versus the 175 required by Code, while the applicant also has indicated that 85 spaces are adequate. Is backup information available on the 85 parking space adequacy?

Mr. Ridge responded that the applicant provided a memo explaining their parking needs. He defers the questions regarding the layout and the parking spaces to the applicant.

Ms. Call inquired the last time the parking section of the Code was amended, understanding that Code is not established based on single applications, but for all uses.

Ms. Rauch responded the regulations in the Zoning Code were adopted many years ago. However, this application is based on the development text standard for this particular section of the Northeast Quad.

Ms. Call indicated that the information reflects what would have been in 2014, which is not that long ago.

Mr. Fishman stated he has never been to a hospital that had more parking than needed. He is concerned about deviating from the number of spaces required by Code. What will be in that area instead -- green space or the building footprint? If it is greenspace, parking could be added, should the need arise. However, he does not see any extra greenspace.

Ms. Rauch responded that the applicant is showing only the proposed 103 parking spaces on their site plan. The remainder of the area would continue to be greenspace, unless at some point they needed to add an addition to the facility, which would require more parking.

Mr. Fishman responded that there would not be sufficient land for that to occur.

Ms. Call inquired if the proposed plan meets or exceeds open space requirements.

Mr. Ridge responded that as proposed, the plan meets open space requirement.

Ms. Call confirmed that if the additional area is left as open space, thereby retaining the ability to build an addition and meet the Code requirement of 175 spaces, and the application still meets the open space requirements with the additional parking spaces added, that would be acceptable.

Applicant Presentation

Jack Reynolds, Smith and Hale, 37 W. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, attorney for the applicant, indicated that also present this evening are Jeffrey Jones and Brian Wentworth, America Development and Investments, LTD, Chester Crouch, Nobis Rehabilitation Partners, and David Collins, architect. They have been working with staff for some time on the location of the building, and they are prepared to share the rationale for its location. This is a rehabilitation hospital, not an acute care hospital. An overview of the hospital's operation will clarify the reason a deviation in parking spaces has been requested. They have built a number of these facilities and have good knowledge of the anticipated use and demands on this property. They do not want to provide less greenspace in favor of unneeded impermeable surface. They have tried to achieve a balance between the two; however, the 103 parking spaces is still greater than the anticipated need. With the proposed layout, there will be greenspace where additional parking can be added, if needed. A final development plan would be required to do so.

Chester Crouch, Nobis Rehabilitation Partners, Lucas, Texas, 75002, stated that the Dublin facility will be the 14th rehabilitation hospital he has been involved with constructing, with partners such as America Development and Investments, and he has operated more than 20 such hospitals. The parking study is based upon facility experience. This is an inpatient rehabilitation hospital

only; no outpatient services -- diagnostic or therapy, are provided. It is a physical, not chemical or psychiatric rehabilitation hospital. Over 90% of their admissions are referred from local, acute care hospitals to their facility for care. Patients receive intensive, rehabilitative care, approximately three hours of physical, occupational, or speech therapy a day. There is a drop-off area for patient unloading, and most patients leave with a family member. If there is ever a need for additional parking with this 40-bed hospital, there is ample space to the west where it could be added. Safety of patients and visitors is a concern, and orientation towards the rest of the shopping center was considered appropriate. The most significant side of their building faces Emerald Parkway. There is a two-story entrance level, with a distinctive stone element; a detention pond is located on that side. This was a challenging site, but they are very satisfied with the site orientation achieved.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the majority of patients would be coming in through a third party, such as an ambulatory service, and not via their personal vehicle.

Mr. Crouch responded affirmatively. There is a drop-off area for patient unloading, and most patients leave with a family member.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would be more comfortable with a deviation in the parking spaces provided if there was more greenspace than required, so that if a need arose later for the additional parking, the additional greenspace could be converted to parking. If the space is covered with building, that cannot happen. The greenspace will gone, and the character of the building will change.

David Collins, principal with Perkins & Will Architects, 2218 Bryan St #200, Dallas, TX 75201, stated that they are a nationally renowned healthcare architecture firm. He is the designer on this project. This hospital is designed with two patient wings where the nursing units are located. The expansion goes to the left of the building, where there is room for one more leg. This site has been master planned for an additional 20 beds and 40-50 additional parking spaces.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the site would still meet the open space code.

Mr. Collins responded that he does not believe it would, but they would be required to bring a potential application for expansion back to the Commission for consideration.

Ms. Call stated that with the additional beds, there would be additional parking requirements. If the parking for the 40 beds does not meet Code now, they will not meet it with an expansion. The open space would be consumed with parking.

Mr. Collins stated that they are asking for the amount of parking that represents what is needed for this specific facility.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a different zoning requirement between a rehabilitation hospital and a standard hospital. Is the Code consistent for both?

Mr. Ridge responded that is correct.

Ms. Newell requested the applicant to respond to the orientation of the building on the site in response to Ms. Kennedy's previous question.

Mr. Reynolds responded that a memo of explanation was provided to staff.

Jeffrey Jones, America Development and Investments, LTD, 9 Brittonwoods Way, Dallas, Texas, 75220, stated that this site is part of a Kroger shopping center. He is unsure if the 175 parking spaces relate to a retail operation or the hospital, but this is very different from an acute care hospital, from which all of their patients come to them. There is adequate parking for a 40-bed hospital for all of the staff at peak, plus all of the visitors. Their application is for a 40-bed hospital. They have no idea if they will ever expand this facility by another 20 beds. If so, it could be 10-20 years from now and only if the community were to have a demand for it. They would have to return and justify to that Planning Commission that they have sufficient open space and parking to handle an expansion. For the foreseeable future, it will be a 40-bed hospital. Originally, their plan provided more parking spaces, but staff directed them to provide more greenspace and remove some of the parking spaces they had on the north side. If there ever is a need for additional parking with this 40-bed hospital, there is ample space to the west where it could be added. Safety of patients and visitors is a concern, and orientation towards the rest of the shopping center was determined to be appropriate. In their early meetings, staff did not want the building entrance to face Emerald Parkway on the north. They did want the refuse and service area to face east. However, they believe the most significant side of the building faces Emerald Parkway because that is the most prominent street. Therefore, a two-story entrance level, with a distinctive stone element, and a detention pond is located on that side. This was a challenging site, but they are very satisfied with the site orientation achieved.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the entrance on Summer Drive was the primary patient and visitor entrance.

Mr. Jones responded that a porte cochere over the entrances was required. He believes the front of the building faces Emerald Parkway. Although the porte cochere faces Kroger, the front entrance will face the open lawn area along Emerald Parkway. They believe that will be considered the front of the building.

Ms. Fox stated that she has the following questions about the architecture of the building:

1. Has this design been used with their previous hospitals?

Mr. Crouch stated that this design recently was used in Norwood, Ohio, a very successful hospital. One-story buildings are the most appropriate model for rehabilitation hospitals, as patients do not need to deal with elevators.

2. How is the outdoor space between the two wings used for therapy?

Mr. Crouch stated that the two-story center section is a rehab gym. Glass windows face the courtyard, where there are different surfaces that facilitate a patient's return to normal mobility. There are concrete steps, gravel and a grassy area.

Ms. Fox stated that her background is in healthcare. Today, useable outdoor areas for rehabilitation purposes are considered essential to progress to moving home. This outdoor area is only about 51 feet wide, and in shadow much of the time. There is some justification to orienting the facility more internally and toward something the patient and/or family members could walk to. She understands the reason for locating the front toward Emerald Parkway. The traditional, two patient wing building is the old model with very little use of open windows. It permits only a narrow, 50-foot wide area for therapy. On the western Emerald Parkway elevation, there is greenspace, a pond, and the opportunity for a larger patio, stairs and different surfaces. Those

elements in a wider area would enhance the rehabilitation efforts. The narrow, shadowed area seems more depressive.

Brian Wentworth, America Development and Investments, LTD, 2911 Turtle Creek Blvd., Suite 1100, Dallas, TX 75219 stated that it is unfortunate that they do not have the interior perspectives for the building. This is a one-of-a-kind rehabilitation hospital. In each of the wings, there are 22-foot wide corridors that act as a day room. Patients leave their rooms and interact with their physical therapists and family in that open area. They are not the typical, eight-foot corridors of hospitals. At the end of these 22-foot wide corridors, there is nothing but glass. Light floods into the space where most of the patient's interaction occurs. The patients will be outside some, but this natural light, interior space is where most of their activities will occur.

Ms. Fox stated that architecturally there could be a much better use of lights flowing into the room. This is a north exposure, so there will not be much daylight achieved in there. Although we do not have the interior perspectives, on the exterior, there is a lack of architectural interest and use of daylight, which is necessary in a rehabilitation hospital. That is her initial impression.

Mr. Wentworth responded that the windows in the patients' rooms are very large. Ivy is positioned between every third window to use nature to articulate the façade. Evergreens, shrubbery and ornamental trees are used in the area, as well. There is no greater need to break up the façade, as it is merely ten patient rooms that open into the larger, family day room area.

Ms. Fox responded that she believes orienting the therapy areas toward the west could be a better use of the space.

Mr. Wentworth stated that he has been designing hospitals for nearly 40 years. Wayfinding is the most important factor for families and visitors. If they had flipped the hospital, orienting it toward Summer Drive, the wayfinding element would be confusing. With this orientation of the building, wayfinding is not an issue.

Ms. Call requested clarification of staff's concerns about the orientation of the private drive ingress and egress.

Mr. Ridge responded that staff's main concern was with the refuse area – the ingress/egress immediately west of Chase Bank and the private driveway leading off Sawmill Road.

In response to Ms. Call's inquiry, Mr. Ridge confirmed the access was right in/right out only.

Ms. Fox stated that not only would it be possible to take better advantage of the views on the west side, it is important to consider sidewalk connectivity. It is desirable to add pedestrian connectivity between parcels. It would be an advantage for a recovering patient to be able to walk with a family member to Starbucks or another retail site. This needs to be a transitional hospital.

Mr. Crouch stated that from a clinical perspective, the proximity of the outdoor rehab space is critical, because it abuts the inpatient gym, enabling the patient to move outdoors in a safe, outdoor setting. It is important to be able to have the appropriate number of staff members with the patient. Providing rehabilitation a distance from the building is not suitable. As soon as the patient can ambulate 300 feet with assistance, they are going home. This is not a highly mobile

population. Therefore, this is a small, very specialized facility. Having a better outdoor space is an architectural determination; it is not a clinical determination, which drives the current layout. Even if they had a separate, outdoors rehabilitative space, they would keep the current design because it is a clinical requirement. From an interior space perspective, a normal patient corridor is eight feet. The inpatient corridor in this hospital is 22 feet. They are required to have an activities area. In a rehabilitation hospital, because that area is typically separate from where people are, the space is not used. They decided to change the corridor space to make it wider and functional from a care-giving standpoint. The much wider space is full of natural light. In the daytime, it is a clinical area; in the evening, it is a social area. He understands the desire to get patients outside, but in their setting, most of them physically are unable to do so.

Ms. Call summarized her feedback on the plan:

1. Currently, this plan meets only 60% of the parking requirement. She encourages the applicant to work with staff on the possibility of a different zoning requirement for this model. Perhaps there is an opportunity for a shared parking agreement. There is no guarantee that this same business will be in that building in five years; the Commission approves buildings that can be there for much more than five years.
2. There is a need for architectural relief on the sides of the buildings.

Ms. Newell inquired what the typical parking counts for nursing homes are.

Mr. Papsidero responded that per Code requirements, a nursing home must have one (1) parking space per six (6) beds plus one parking space for each employee on the largest shift. A hospital, which this falls under, must have 2.5 parking spaces per one (1) bed and one space for each employee on the largest shift -- a difference of 2.5:1 versus 1:6.

Ms. Newell stated that using the parking count for a nursing home is probably more appropriate, given the type of facility this is.

Mr. Fishman stated that he could not support this facility if it cannot meet the Code required parking spaces without eliminating greenspace. If the facility's needs change, for example, a heliport is needed – adding that could eliminate the greenspace. Over the years, greenspace often has been eliminated to meet a hardship. Therefore, if fewer parking spaces are provided initially, it must be remain possible to add the spaces later while also keeping sufficient greenspace.

Mr. Ridge stated that there is not a greenspace requirement in the development text for this subarea. There is a density requirement.

Mr. Fishman responded that would be greenspace not filled with density. With the Kroger store and the outparcel retail, this is already a very dense area. This project must have adequate greenspace for the future to have his support.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that the applicant provide a site plan for the next submittal that demonstrates that additional parking spaces could be added to the site without exceeding the required density calculation.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is important to retain the visibility of the greenspace, as a balance to the building.

Mr. Wilson inquired how many employees are anticipated for this 40-bed facility. Mr. Crouch responded that there would be a total of 120 employees within a 24-hour period. The maximum number per shift would be approximately 50 employees.

Mr. Wilson inquired when their first facility was built.

Mr. Crouch responded that it was built in 2008. The first facility was not the current model; it was a 60-bed facility. They have done a market study for this facility, which will be a 40-bed facility.

Mr. Wilson indicated that he was interested in determining a trend for expansion.

Mr. Crouch responded that he would speculate that for every 10 hospitals, there would be a need to expand two or three. Therefore, he would estimate a 20% chance for expansion.

Mr. Wilson stated that this area is experiencing a lot of growth. This facility may be the only one in the area providing this type of service and be very successful. He assumes if there is a need to expand the facility, it would not go up but expand horizontally.

Mr. Crouch confirmed that it would be a single-story expansion. The maximum bed expansion would be to 60 beds. The facility would not accommodate a greater number. Traditionally, parking counts are driven by emergency room and outpatient services. This facility has neither and that program will not change.

Mr. Wilson commended them on the large spaces in the facility, which will enhance the impression of not being a hospital for the patients. What is the average stay for a patient?

Mr. Jones stated that the average stay is 13 days. The patients have private rooms.

Mr. Wilson inquired if patients spend approximately 60% of their time in their rooms.

Mr. Jones responded that would be a good estimate, as these patients spend most of their time inside. Having a 22-foot living room provides a better experience for the patient and their family. Their rehabilitation facility is unique.

Mr. Wilson stated having large windows in the patient rooms is important because of the amount of time the patients spend there. The windows face east and west, capturing the sunrise and sunset. It is important to determine the most important rooms in which to provide the most sunlight. Achieving a balance between the rooms and common spaces is important. Having the patient rooms on the perimeter and that sunlight is beneficial. He concurs with the previous comment on a need for connectivity. He would encourage that there be a perimeter sidewalk around the entire property.

Mr. Jones responded that they have worked with staff on the need for sidewalks. There would be a need to add a sidewalk that would lead to the small, retail center. They will attempt to make this site very walkable.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the pond would always have water.

Mr. Jones confirmed that the pond would permanently hold water. It is not a detention basin but a retention basin.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no issues with the site layout or the parking perspective. There are sufficient parking spaces to accommodate their peak staff, as well as more than one spot per bed, which assumes all patients will have guests at the same time. She is an engineer not an architect, but the architecture does appear flat and institutional to her. She is satisfied with this proposal.

Ms. Fox summarized her comments:

1. Agrees that it is important to have sunlight on the east and west rooms. She would prefer to see more openness in the middle space.
2. Would prefer to see a patio on the western side to enrich the area between the pond and the hospital and give a better view from the corner and Summer Drive.
3. The driveway around the property would be a good space for families and patients to take a walk. Perhaps adding a shared use path to the drive would be good.
4. Wonders if it would be possible to stub off and reduce the curbcut on the back street.
5. Building materials. Would like to see more architectural interest, particularly on the wings. From Emerald Parkway, that will have a long, boring look. The use of some outdoor space might create a more complex, complementary and inviting look.
6. Supportive of more parking spaces. Dublin has a population of more than 50% seniors. This will be one of the few facilities that offers this level of nursing care and intensive therapy. She anticipates they will be very successful and a high need for parking.

Ms. Call summarized her final comments on the discussion questions:

1. **Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed site layout?**
She is supportive.
2. **Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed architecture and building materials?**
The articulation is a concern; it looks a little sterile. Dublin has high architectural standards.
3. **Does the Commission support a deviation from the parking requirement in the Zoning Code?**
She appreciates the applicant's willingness to come back with drawings that would demonstrate how the space would look if additional parking spaces were added. In reference to Ms. Newell's earlier comment, she also would like to see what it would look like with a 30 parking space reduction. This would be using 2.5 parking spaces per bed versus 1.0 parking spaces per bed for a total of 40 beds. She would recommend that the applicant and staff determine if a nursing home zoning definition would be a better fit for the rehabilitation hospital than the traditional hospital zoning. If there were many deviations, it would make sense to place it in the one that is more fitting for that use.

Ms. Supelak stated that Dublin appreciates good architecture, and this is a great building. However, the architectural relief on the patient wings is long and repetitive. Adding some interest there would be well received. This building will have great grounds surrounding it, which will be visible to the community and potentially used by the community. A patio near the front would be

compelling. Some discussions need to occur with staff regarding the parking. He is comfortable with fewer parking spaces, but is concerned that a change not be too significant; an intermediate position would be better. If this building use were to change to either business or office, however, he assumes a new review would be required.

Ms. Newell stated that she is very happy to see this potential project here in Dublin. In response to the discussion questions:

1. Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed site layout?

She is generally supportive, but has a couple minor comments. As an architect, she can identify the entrance to the building when it is facing Emerald Parkway, so she has no issue with the orientation of the building on the site. She has some concern about the separation between the service drive and the delivery entrance drive. The island that separates the two does not appear more than three feet wide. It will not be possible to appropriately maintain the landscaping in that area. The island's width should permit it to be a landscaped buffer/barrier.

2. Is the Commission generally supportive of the proposed architecture and building materials?

The building materials do match the brick color in the surrounding development text. However, there is no deviation in the façade of the patient wings. Architectural interest is needed.

3. Does the Commission support a deviation from the parking requirement in the Zoning Code?

She supports a reduction in parking spaces. She has designed a number of nursing homes and assisted living facilities in her career. Typically, they have a lower occupancy and need for parking spaces. It is appropriate to review the City's regulations for a nursing home. She does not want to require more parking spaces on a site than are needed. Because this facility is called a "hospital," staff's interpretation is consistent with the City's Zoning Code requirements for a hospital. However, she believes this project warrants a deviation. In general, Commissioners are supportive of having interconnected walking paths throughout Dublin; it has always been a priority of this community.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is supportive of this project. He concurs that as long as the additional parking spaces are not needed, they should not be included. This is an aging community, however, and he anticipates this facility will be successful very quickly and need the additional 20 beds and parking spaces. He does not want to sacrifice the look of greenspace and open area. The use of increased landscaping would emphasize a "green" look.

Mr. Wentworth stated that the function of the building does not need to change the articulation of the patient wing facades. He inquired if the use of ivy would be acceptable to the Commission. Ms. Newell responded that she is typically not supportive of the use of landscaping materials to articulate the façade of a building. They become seasonal, and putting ivy on a building is not necessarily good for the façade materials. There are other ways to achieve articulation. Even minor relief in the length of a façade can make a difference.

Mr. Wilson concurred. Emphasizing the windows could achieve minor relief.

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

There was no public comment.

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

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

Case Presentation

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

Site

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

Dublin Corporate Area Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commission Questions

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

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

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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

Public Comment

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

Ms. Kennedy inquired why he preferred Concept B.

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

Ms. Kennedy inquired if Mr. Christianson preferred a particular shape for the top park -- long versus centrally located.

Mr. Christianson stated that he likes the elongated park; it is a scenic area.

Commission Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Case Presentation

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

Site

This site includes a portion of what was once the 167-acre Riviera Golf Course. The proposed site was originally intended to be donated to the Dublin City School District as a potential site for relocation and construction of Deer Run Elementary School. However, the applicant removed this site from the overall Riviera Development Plan decreasing the size of the redevelopment from approximately 167 acres to 152 acres. The site remained zoned R-Rural District, whereas the other 152 acres were rezoned to a PUD. This site is that remnant piece. Cacchio Lane, which was stubbed at the west edge of Riviera, was recently extended to Hyland-Croy Road, providing access to this site. The site is located on the south side of Cacchio Lane, approximately 1,400 feet east of Hyland-Croy Road. Riviera is directly to the east and Dublin Jerome High School is directly to the southwest. The Code requires R-zoned properties to have a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet, a minimum lot width at the building line of 150 feet, a minimum public right-of-way frontage of 60 feet, an 8-foot minimum side yard setback with a minimum sum of 25 feet, and a rear yard of 20% or more of the lot depth with no more than 50 feet required.

Proposal

The proposal includes the subdivision of an approximately 13.5-acre site into a new public street, named Bova Court; 11 R-zoned, single-family lots that all meet the development standards; and two reserves with an open space total of approximately 1.3 acres, although only 0.876-acre is required by Code. Also proposed on the west edge of the site is a 30-foot wide landscape buffer for Lots 1 – 6 from the directly adjacent Dublin Jerome High School athletic facilities. Per the plat, this area shall be maintained by the individual homeowners of those lots. The proposed gross density on this site is approximately 0.8 dwelling units (du) per acre, whereas the surrounding densities range from 1.22 du/acre in Riviera to 3.28 du/acre just north of the site. The architecture of the future lots is not reviewed with this application; however, the residential appearance section of the Zoning Code is applicable to any future development and will guide the architectural details of new homes on the lots.

Recommendation

Approval of the following Subdivision Regulation Variances:

The proposal calls for five deviations from the Subdivision Regulations, including:

1. To permit a right-of-way width of 50 feet for the cul-de-sac street where the requirement is 60 feet.
2. To permit a right-of-way diameter of 102 feet for the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is 130 feet.
3. To permit a cul-de-sac street pavement width of 28 feet where the requirement is 32 feet.
4. To permit a pavement diameter of 80 feet for the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is 91 feet; and
5. To permit the exclusion of a landscaped center island within the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is for this island to be installed.

Approval of Preliminary Plat with the following conditions:

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

- 2) That the plat be revised to indicate that Reserve "B" be combined with the existing adjacent reserve and that Reserve "A" be owned and maintained by the City for consistency throughout the Riviera development; and,
- 3) That the plat be revised to eliminate reference to the tree replacement fee.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox inquired about staff's assessment of the need for tree preservation. There are a couple of large trees on the site.

Mr. Ridge responded that a tree survey was provided. Because of the size of the lots, a large number of the trees can be preserved. There is a tree row on the west edge, which will be maintained, and approximately 50% of the trees will be preserved.

Ms. Fox inquired if there was discussion about the need for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity from the school, which is located on one side of the proposed development, to the bikeway and path in the adjacent development on the other side of this site.

Mr. Ridge responded that was discussed. The applicant does not want to provide a bikepath connection through Lots 8 and 9, as there was concern about the neighborhood becoming a cut through. However, sidewalks are proposed along Bova Court, which will connect to the shared use path along Cacchio Lane.

Ms. Fox inquired what was the reason that Reserve A was placed in the proposed location. Reserve B is an existing pond.

Mr. Ridge responded that there is a significant grade change from the north side of this site to the south, which dictated its location.

Ms. Fox stated that the topography of the site is slightly rolling, not unlike the adjacent subdivision. Would it be flattened out or otherwise impacted by the proposed development?

Mr. Stanford stated that although the site has a good amount of acreage, four sides are bordered by the existing topography of other developments. That limits the ability to alter the grades for the new development. As the road flows to the south, it will follow the existing grade, which drops from the north to the south. In general, the existing topography of this site will remain.

Ms. Call inquired if, with the reduction in the diameter of the cul de sac, there was any concern about the turnaround needs for fire and emergency vehicles on the site.

Mr. Ridge stated that Engineering and Washington Township Fire were supportive of the reduction in diameter. They expressed no concerns. What is proposed is consistent with many of the recent developments in the City.

Ms. Call requested clarification concerning the 30-foot area on the backside of Lots 1 through 6. Would all fixed structures and foundation be prohibited, or would that also be non-fixed swimming pools and trampolines? If so, how is enforcement handled?

Mr. Ridge responded that none of those items are permitted.

Mr. Boggs stated that in no build zones, even temporary structures such as swing sets and movable playhouses are prohibited. That will be further defined in the final plat.

Ms. Newell stated that the no build areas are permitted to exist in a naturalized condition, unmowed.

Mr. Fishman stated that in the established neighborhoods around the City, however, homeowners have extended their use into the no build zones. Their lawns become slightly larger and swing sets are placed there, so there is a need for enforcement to be addressed by the plat.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the two reserves are floodplains. Will there be retention or detention basins?

Mr. Ridge responded that they would be retention basins.

Mr. Fishman that, although there will be water, they will not be lakes.

Mr. Ridge confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Fishman stated that in this part of the development, there is no useable greenspace other than on the individual lots for the homeowners.

Mr. Ridge confirmed that this is correct. The ponds are for stormwater management only.

Mr. Fishman stated that retention ponds become unsightly without water. They are mushy, weedy sites.

Ms. Newell clarified the terms: Detention ponds will go dry; retention ponds will always hold water.

Mr. Fishman clarified that he would prefer to see retention ponds here, which will always hold water and will be usable spaces. On another point, it would be unacceptable not to have a bikepath crossing through the site to the school. That would be inconsistent with Dublin's longstanding position. It will be necessary to provide a connection here.

Applicant Comments

Charlie Ruma, president, Davidson Phillips, 3675 Paragon Drive, Columbus, Ohio, stated that a major problem with the Belvedere community is the morning traffic backup in the subdivision due to parents delivering their children to the path that extends to the other side of the baseball field. He is trying to avoid having this cul de sac become a drop-off place for a path connection to the school. That would not be good for these 11 one-acre, high-value lots. There are no other such lots available in Dublin. He is trying to protect that quality and not disappoint the buyers by having a stream of school traffic in their neighborhood every morning during the school year. That is the situation in the Belvedere community.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would be possible to run the bikepath around the perimeter of the community.

Mr. Ruma responded that there is a bikepath to Cacchio Lane on the north side of the property, and there are sidewalks along every lot that can take people to that bikepath. However, he wants to avoid drawing traffic into this site with a bikepath.

Ms. Fox stated that there is a bikepath that borders the east side of the parcel, which winds its way east toward other bikepaths. The school property is to the south, and if the bikepath were to connect on the south side of the property, children who want to walk or bike to school would be able to take the bikepath. There is no vehicular access to that path.

Mr. Ruma responded that they can do that now with the bikepath in Riviera.

Ms. Fox inquired if that would be a path to the school.

Mr. Ruma responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox stated that the question is how accessible that path would be from this section of the development.

Mr. Ruma stated that the homeowners on Lot 5 or 6 would have to ride their bike on the street or the sidewalk to Cacchio Lane to connect to the bikepath; it is not that far. It is preferable to having cars enter this neighborhood to drop off their children at a bikepath. That would make this neighborhood the closest place for them to get to the school. It will be a significant problem.

Ms. Fox stated that she understands the need not to encourage vehicular traffic into the cul-de-sac. Her suggestion related to connecting the existing bikepath along the lower perimeter of the property to the school. There would be no vehicular access to it.

Mr. Ruma responded that a bikepath east of this site is already in place.

Ms. Fox noted that it does not go west, which is her point.

Mr. Ruma concurred; it does not go west. To achieve that, it would go directly into his site and cause the problem he is attempting to avoid.

Ms. Call clarified the two positions:

A bikepath exists in Riviera, and the expected transportation would be across the northern side of the proposed site, along the sidewalk, into the property. Mr. Ruma wants to avoid the issue that would be created if a bikepath were to be added between Lots 4 and 5 or 5 and 6 on the western side, wherein parents living in a distant section of Riviera would drive their child into this cul-de-sac and drop them off at that path to walk the one-lot distance to the school. Ms. Fox, on the other hand, is suggesting the addition of a bikepath along the southern perimeter of the site.

Mr. Ruma stated that to the south is a fence and a tree row, which it is important not to violate, nor would the school appreciate a break being made in their fence. There is a path that drops down and around and connects to the field on the other side. He noted that making a connection to the football field would create a problem on Friday nights.

Mr. Fishman stated that if a bikepath to the school is not provided, the kids will walk through these lots, creating muddy paths through the yards. He believes that a way needs to be provided to get kids from the opposite side of the site to the school. It has been Dublin's practice to, where possible, provide paths for students to bike to school. He also believes the ponds must be retention ponds and continuously hold water.

Mr. Ruma responded that the ponds would hold water. Currently, Cacchio Lane dumps water into Reserve B. A pipe will be constructed south to Reserve A, because that is the closest point to the large pond in Riviera. This will connect all of the stormwater in one place. Dublin Engineering offered this logical solution.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the ponds in Reserve A and B would always hold water.

Mr. Ruma responded affirmatively, though he will not promise that during a drought.

Mr. Fishman reiterated that it is important to have ponds that will always have water.

Mr. Stanford stated that both of the ponds will be retention basins that will have a permanent pool.

Mr. Fishman reiterated a need for a connection from the existing bikepath to the school.

Ms. Call suggested that a connection be provided directly from the existing path to the Board of Education property. A connecting path could be wrapped around the existing baseball diamond to the school property. If she lived in this community, she would not want Friday night football stadium population walking through the cul-de-sac to reach Riviera.

Mr. Ruma cautioned that if an easy connection to the school is provided here, that is what will happen. He reiterated that the most appropriate connection would be taking the sidewalk to Cacchio Lane and connecting there to the bikepath.

Ms. Newell stated that it is important to remember that this Commission does not know if Dublin Schools wants the path to the school. Typically, schools do not want every possible connection into their property. This would need to be a joint decision with the Schools. However, it is good for the residents of any neighborhood to have a connection to the bikepath. She would be more concerned that none of residents on this street can get to the bikepath, which is so close. They could access it through the reserve, if there was a small pathway through the reserve area. She is less concerned about connecting to the school site, as that would have to be a joint decision.

Mr. Supelak stated that he understands Mr. Ruma's desire to curtail traffic through this site to the school. The School would probably have an issue with it, as well, especially if it would provide access to the backside of the stadium. Disregarding any connection to the west or the south to the School, he believes it would be a miss not to provide the residents of the proposed community a connection to the existing bikepath.

Ms. Newell concurred. The City has made ongoing efforts to provide bikepath connectivity to all neighborhoods. She would prefer not to miss the opportunity with this parcel to continue that connectivity.

Ms. Fox stated that Reserve B is beautiful, but there is no accessibility to it. It would serve as an amenity to Lots 9 and 10 only. Typically, when a developer offers open space, the intent is that the open space will be an amenity for the entire subdivision. It would be desirable to have a path to Reserve B provided for all the residents.

Mr. Ruma responded that there are many other beautiful areas in Riviera to which the residents have access. This one, which is only 0.3-acre, will be inconsequential to most of the residents.

Ms. Call stated that the required open space is 0.87-acre, which is more than met by Reserve A. Reserve B is not necessary to meet that requirement. Because the applicant has already exceeded the open space requirement with Reserve A, compensating those residents who are getting the awkwardly shaped lots by allowing them to have this feature in their backyard gives her no concern.

Mr. Ruma stated that this is a simple subdivision that is already zoned. He needs only to have a plat approved. They have complied with all Engineering requirements in terms of the streets, variances and stormwater management. The stormwater water from Cacchio Lane should not be running onto this site, but since it does, they have used common sense to solve the problem.

Mr. Fishman responded that he appreciates that Mr. Ruma has complied with all requirements. The only remaining issue is the traditional position of Dublin to provide a bicycle path connection for all neighborhoods. This plan does not do that.

Mr. Ruma responded that with the miles of bikepaths within Riviera, not all of the lots in the community have a direct connection to a bikepath. For those lots, it is necessary to take the street or sidewalk to a bikepath. He is suggesting the same for these 11 lots.

Mr. Wilson clarified that bikepath connections to the schools do exist. Nor will this neighborhood be isolated; the residents will have access via their sidewalks to the various existing bike trails. It is the prerogative of the developer to keep his neighborhood as private as he believes the residents will need, but still provide the connectivity. There may be some effort involved for the kids to use the existing paths to the school, but the connectivity is there.

Mr. Ruma noted that only four lots -- Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, would need to travel a little distance to the bikepath. The lots on the other side can connect from their backyards. These are all beautiful, one-acre lots, and it is not worth destroying their quality to improve the trail accessibility for those four lots.

Ms. Fox stated that there is a connection on Reserve A from the cul-de-sac. The reserve is not fenced, so access in and out to other areas is possible. What landscaping or amenities will be provided around the pond?

Mr. Ruma stated that there are some nice trees there, and most of the trees on the site are evergreen. Per the City's policy, any tree replacements must be deciduous; so many deciduous trees will be added in this area. There are some nice trees on Lots 9, 10 and 3, which will be retained.

Ms. Fox stated that typically, the City recommends that benches be added around retention ponds for seating. If the landscaping is designed to provide alternative places to sit, that is sufficient. Mr. Ruma responded that they would do their best to make the reserve and pond attractive. He has done this successfully before, the most notable of which might be the Wedgewood Reserve area. It is very beautiful. His goal is to sell these lots, which will be expensive, notwithstanding the somewhat negative presence of a school football field.

Mr. Ruma noted that this site was initially saved because they thought that perhaps the School Board would want it for an elementary school. Conversations have occurred over the past years, but the School Board has decided to go elsewhere.

Public Comment

Dr. Todd Hoadley, superintendent, Dublin City Schools, 5204 Forest Run Drive, thanked the Commission for permitting him to share his thoughts on the proposed project tonight. He likes the fact that there would be only 11 homes. As is typical for Dublin, the Commission has been thorough in its review. As Mr. Ruma mentioned, this development would be right up against the sports field. On this field, there will be football, lacrosse, soccer and band practice. Between 150-200 nights per year, those stadium lights will be on and noise will be generated. With the other two high schools, concerns about the lights and noise are frequently expressed by the residents. He lives in the Woods of Indian Run, and his neighbors share their concerns about the Coffman High School stadium, which is a much greater distance away than 30 feet. It is important that he share his concerns about the 30-foot setback that would exist here. The new homes on the north end of the Dublin Scioto football field have already generated a significant level of resident concerns regarding the noise and the lights. On a normal school night and during the summer

months, that stadium will be in use. They put turf down because the fields are used for school activities and are rented out. This is a high use stadium. Placing high-end homes up against a sports facility that will be used 150 nights per year concerns him. He had not thought of the connectivity of a bikepath, and he would encourage the Commission to think very clearly about that. Kids will be kids and the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Students will cross through these yards. In the Woods of Indian Run, there is a nice, lighted path connecting to Coffman High School stadium. It serves not only the Woods of Indian Run but also Coventry Woods. The residents use the path to reach the stadium for many events. The stadium will generate a high level of noise and bright lights. Five years down the road, people will forget that the stadium existed before the neighborhood. He would caution that there is a need for serious thought about how closely homes are placed against outdoor stadiums.

Ms. Kennedy inquired what the School's response is to these complaints.

Dr. Hoadley responded that they usually point out that the school was there first. It does not settle the issue, but it does lend perspective. The most recent issue is with some of the residents next to Dublin Scioto High School. Dublin Schools worked with the developer to encourage buffers of landscaping. Unfortunately, that did not happen, and the lights from the stadium shine directly into those homes. Therefore, they have to point out that the school was there first, and the residents knew that they were buying homes immediately next to a sports stadium. The typical response is that they did not understand how often the stadium would be used. That is the reason he wants to emphasize the point that the school stadiums are not used only for five Friday night home football games during the school year. They are often in use, and that is what is desired.

Ms. Newell inquired if the Schools would be agreeable to and encourage having a bikepath that enters the school property.

Dr. Hoadley responded that they would always engage in any conversation about connectivity, particularly any opportunity to be forward thinking. The entire stadium empties out to the south, and people who live in Riviera will be looking for any opportunity for a left-hand turn. There is no path along the north end of the School property, where the practice soccer fields are located. Farther south, there is a connection next to the baseball fields. If the connectivity issue is not well thought out, people will be cutting across the yards, and not just on Friday nights. In summary, they would be open to any conversation that advances the settling of issues before they occur.

Ms. Newell stated that she lives in Indian Run Meadows, but a good distance away from Coffman High School. Nevertheless, she can hear the noise and see the lights. It is unfortunate that people buy homes next to the schools and do not understand the school activities that occur. In that instance, it is a case of "buyer beware." She is not opposed to this development or its minimal setback for that reason. The buyer has to acknowledge that situation when they purchase the property.

Mr. Fishman inquired if Dr. Hoadley is open to a connection being made from Riviera to the school property, which would be the shortest distance.

Dr. Hoadley responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if he would be willing to work with the developer on that connectivity.

Dr. Hoadley indicated he was willing.

Mr. Fishman inquired if his greatest concern is the 30-foot buffer.

Dr. Hoadley stated that his comments have focused on the proximity of those homes to a very active sports stadium and the issues that would occur. The Commission's discussion about the bikepath makes sense, and they would like to be part of that conversation.

Commission Comments

Ms. Call thanked Mr. Ruma for bringing something to Dublin that has been lacking – one acre, residential lots. Dublin is approaching build out, so there will not be many more opportunities for this. She appreciates that the school was there first. It would be more difficult if the development was present first, and the stadium was proposed later. She has no issue with the reduction in the width of the turnaround in the cul-de-sac, if Fire and Emergency have approved it. She appreciates that the developer has provided more open space than required. She understands that the school and stadium were there first, but Mr. Ruma owns the property and has the right to develop it. It is the Commission's job to achieve a balance, therefore she wonders if the City has the ability to stamp a plat with a notice about adjacent uses, i.e. the school. In the past, she was involved with a City that provided a note on the plat regarding an adjacent school use.

Mr. Boggs responded that he is not sure if Dublin has done this in the past, but he would look into that possibility of adding a note to the final plat.

Mr. Fishman stated that a plat notation might not be needed in this case, because the school and stadium are already there and a potential buyer would be aware of the fact. He does agree that a plat notation would be needed if the school and stadium were not yet constructed. He is very happy that Mr. Ruma and Dr. Hoadley will be working on the school access issue.

Mr. Ruma clarified that he did not state that access would be provided. He indicated only that he would work with Dr. Hoadley on trying to find a way to address the need. He has been developing residential sites for a long time, and has built many subdivisions in Dublin and Powell. It is important to do what is best for the people who will be living in those homes. While it is not preferable to put homes next to a football field, it is there, so they have to work around it. The builders will have to pay particular attention to the windows that are placed in the homes and the siting of the homes to best deflect the noise and light. In addition, they will be adding a buffer with many trees on the west side. This is the best use possible of that site.

Mr. Fishman agreed. He is supportive of the project. His only concern was the access to the school, which he is confident will be addressed.

Ms. Fox shared final comments:

1. There will be some issues for the residents on the west side of this development. There is only a 30-foot buffer, so it will be important for the Commission to pay particular attention to the landscape plan, ensuring that it will be effective in alleviating some of the problems that will occur.
2. It is also important to add bicycle connectivity along the south side.
3. It will be important for Reserve A to be designed in a way that will encourage people to stop and enjoy that space.

Ms. Call inquired if the Commission would see a landscape plan on the individual properties in a subdivision.

Mr. Ridge responded that there would be none for the individual properties.

Ms. Fox inquired whether the Commission would see any landscape plan.

Ms. Newell responded that the landscaping is the responsibility of the individual homeowners.

Mr. Fishman stated that the homeowners association would be able to address that issue.

Mr. Papsidero stated that this is strictly a plat, not a PUD with a development plan, so the Commission will not see a landscape plan.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to avoid angst between these future homeowners and Dublin Schools. She would encourage Mr. Ruma to do whatever it takes to make sure that buffer is deeply landscaped.

Mr. Ruma stated that he requires plan approval and that includes approval of the landscaping. No buildings or play equipment will be permitted within that 30-foot buffer. It will be a buffer for landscaping only.

Ms. Fox inquired if he would require the homebuyer to put the trees there.

Mr. Ruma responded that he would be installing the trees.

Ms. Newell inquired if staff could add an additional condition re connectivity.

Mr. Ridge responded that the additional condition would read as follows:

"That the applicant work with staff and the Dublin City School District to address issues of connectivity with the school site to the west."

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant was in agreement with that condition.

Mr. Ruma responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval of the following five subdivision regulation variances to City Council:

- 1) A right-of-way width of 50 feet for the cul-de-sac street where the requirement is 60 feet.
- 2) A right-of-way diameter of 102 feet for the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is 130 feet.
- 3) A cul-de-sac street pavement width of 28 feet where the requirement is 32 feet.
- 4) A pavement diameter of 80 feet for the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is 91 feet; and
- 5) The exclusion of a landscaped center island within the cul-de-sac turnaround where the requirement is for the island to be installed.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval of the preliminary plat with four conditions to City Council:

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

- 2) That the plat be revised to indicate that Reserve "B" be combined with the existing adjacent reserve and that Reserve "A" be owned and maintained by the City for consistency throughout the Riviera development;
- 3) That the plat be revised to eliminate reference to the tree replacement fee; and
- 4) That the applicant work with staff and the Dublin City School District to address issues of connectivity with the school site to the west.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Boggs indicated that there was some miscommunication earlier regarding the applicant's desire to have the MAG application tabled. The applicant does wish that the case be removed from the table and considered tonight.

1. Midwestern Auto Group – Porsche Signs, 6325 Perimeter Loop Road, 19-030AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to un-table the case.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Ms. Newell stated that this is a proposal for signs for the Porsche showroom as part of the existing Midwestern Auto Group campus, a 30-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Case Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that the site, which is Subarea A of the MAG PUD, is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive.

The Commission approved the demolition of the former Land Rover building and construction of the Porsche showroom in February of this year. The applicant is seeking to get approval for the signs that were removed from the previous application.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a series of signs, including a directional sign, a brand sign and a wall sign. The directional and brand signs meet the development text requirements and are consistent with the other signs within the MAG development. The third sign, a wall sign on the front elevation, is comprised of the word "Porsche" in red channel lettering. The sign is proposed at a height of 14 feet, five inches and is 33 square feet in size. The proposed red color, while permitted, is inconsistent with wall signs throughout the campus. This proposal was reviewed and tabled by the Commission on May 2, 2019. That earlier discussion focused primarily on the red color. The applicant is proposing a perforated red vinyl lettering that would be unlit during the day, and would appear red. At night, when it is lit, it would appear white in color. The sign meets all applicable requirements of the development text for wall signs, except that wall signs are not permitted to be internally illuminated. This restriction was discovered earlier today in preparation for this meeting, and an additional condition has been added to the staff recommendation to reflect this.

As before, staff's recommendation is that the sign color not be red but a complementary color, which is consistent with the other brands, which in most instances is a more muted color. Staff recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the wall sign to replace the manufacturer color with a complementary color used throughout the campus, subject to staff approval with the filing of sign permits.
- 2) That the applicant revise the wall sign to be externally illuminated, rather than internally illuminated.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the Code states that the complementary color determination is at the discretion of staff.

Ms. Rauch responded that the colors are the discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Red is a permitted color, and the Commission could decide that color is acceptable. However, that would not be consistent with what has been required of the other dealerships' wall signs. The text prohibits the interior illumination.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that his understanding was that the applicant was not permitted to have three signs.

Ms. Rauch responded that their specific development text allows them to have significantly more signs due to the campus nature. They can have three signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that all but one of the other signs are chrome or silver, and he would prefer that this sign be consistent with the others.

Ms. Newell stated that when Mr. Parish presented this proposal previously, there were only four commission members present, so he requested that the case be tabled in order to be reviewed by the entire Commission.

Ms. Fox stated that when she visited the site, she observed Volkswagen and MAG signs. Are those part of the campus?

Ms. Rauch responded that they are.

Ms. Fox stated they were not included in the images shown, as were the others, and they do reflect the use of different colors.

Ms. Newell pointed out that they are also logos.

Applicant Presentation

Brad Parish, President, Archall, 49 E. Third Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, thanked the Commission for removing the case from the table and proceeding with the consideration tonight. At the previous meeting, the lettering and coloring were discussed. In regard to external illumination, the applicant would be satisfied with halo lighting, which is consistent with the Jaguar Land Rover and Audi lighting. Because they agree on the external lighting requirement, the only remaining issue is the color. The Porsche brand with the color red is consistent on all their showrooms. It is

an issue of brand identity for Porsche on the MAG campus, given the multiple brands present on that campus. The signs for the other dealerships were consistent with their brand standards, which are monolithic in color. Although this color would be different from those dealerships on the campus, there are some other signs with color, such as the Volvo. At the previous meeting, the Commission expressed a desire to see an example of the proposed sign. He has had the letter "P" portion of the brand fabricated to display the red lighting that is the point of discussion [displayed].

Commission Discussion

Ms. Newell stated that her position remains unchanged. She is in disagreement with Mr. Parish's proposal for the use of the color red. She summarized the history of the other signs on the MAG campus related to color, as well as the adjoining Crown dealership. She believes this sign should remain consistent with the existing neutral palette of the MAG dealership. The only use of color in signage on this site is with the logos. She noted that the MAG dealership is receiving substantially more site signage than other auto dealerships in the City of Dublin. She is in agreement with staff's recommendation and conditions.

Mr. Parish stated that regarding the comment about the amount of signage, all of the signs are in conformance with the development text written in 1997. They have abided by the rules established for this development and have not requested variances from it.

Ms. Newell agreed. The signage they have proposed has been in compliance with their zoning text.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has visited a Porsche dealership in another city that did not have a red sign.

Mr. Parish inquired if it was during the day or night.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes it was during the day.

Mr. Parish stated that what he has been told by Porsche North America is that every sign in America is red, although on occasion, they have made the concession that at night, the lighting changes to white lettering, similar to the sample he has with him tonight. However, that sign is internally illuminated.

Mr. Fishman responded that his position is the same as Ms. Newell's. The color standard for all the dealerships should be consistent.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with the need for consistency, however, she also thinks it is important to respect brand integrity. In one of the slides shown tonight of MAG signage, there was a red sign immediately behind a window; she does not see much difference. When the Code requirement is just that it be a complementary color, that makes it possible to make concessions. That was how the Code was written; it could have specified colors, but did not. While there is an opportunity here related to color, it is not necessary to take that opportunity. She has no issue with the proposal for a sign that is red during the day and white at night.

Mr. Fishman stated that what concerns him is that there are many car brands on that street. As soon as a red sign goes up for Porsche, the other dealerships will be applying for a change to their signs. If the Commission sets this precedent, the result will be a change in the entire look.

There is no hardship here. Their argument is for brand identity, but he can recognize the brand as soon as he reads the word, "Porsche." Ms. Newell worked with these dealerships in the early days, and the result is that this is one of nicest car campuses that can be found in Ohio. Consistency is very important. This Commission has turned down many other sign requests that were based upon brand identities.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the Commission ever turned down another car dealership on the basis of the color of their lettering. She understands the disapproval of a green tower that was part of an earlier proposal; it would not have coordinated with the rest of the building materials. She does not believe red lettering would not be complementary with the gray tones of the rest of the campus.

Ms. Newell responded that past Commissions have required some color changes to brand logos, including KIA, Wendy's, and McDonald's. When a brand logo becomes part of the signage, then it is something the Commission has the ability to regulate under the Zoning Code. That is not asking them to re-brand themselves. This has been considered part of the overall campus aesthetic. This is a beautiful campus, which is to Mr. Parish's credit.

Ms. Call showed photos of the BMW logo with blue color, and next to it, the AUDI logo with red in the background. The color is not on their signs.

Ms. Newell responded that it is in the logo.

Ms. Call stated that the red on the AUDI logo is in their window; it is not part of their sign.

Ms. Newell responded that the City does not regulate that.

Mr. Supelak stated that aspect was pointed out at the last meeting. When the sign is inside, it is not under the purview of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Papsidero confirmed that is correct. The Sign Code does not regulate signs that are a certain distance behind the window. That is the reason the red logo is present there; likewise, the blue Volvo logo is behind a window, so is not subject to the Zoning Code.

Mr. Parish pointed out that there is also a blue ground sign and a green MAG sign.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is of the opposite persuasion. She is supportive of keeping the red color with Porsche. This reflects the discussion that occurred at the last meeting. When a color is part of the brand, that is part of the brand integrity. Porsche is a racing brand, and red is a racing color. It is more than a preferred color; it identifies specifically with the brand itself. Similarly, Audi is known by its three circles. She believes red is a coordinating color; it pops out visually, but it is not an offensive mismatch with the other color palettes on campus.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is also supportive of the red color. There is existing use of color on the site. The six photos shown are not the total occurrence of color, including blue, green and red edging. The argument is that red is not a complementary color on this site, but red is all over this site. As a steward of the City, he does not find the color disagreeable, so he is not inclined to suggest that it should not be red.

Ms. Call stated that it is important to look at the worst-case scenario. If this is permitted for one, it must be permitted for all, so would establishing this precedent be acceptable in similar scenarios?

Mr. Fishman clarified that his concern is not with the color red; it is with the precedent this would set. The next color may be green or yellow.

Ms. Newell stated that she has no objection to their ground signage. Her concern is with the overall campus aesthetic. It is part of the PUD text for the aesthetic of that campus. The signage on the building becomes an architectural element of the building, and the goal is to have a consistency in the buildings. She has no issue with the small logos that have been added with those signs, either.

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes it was established at the previous meeting that there was no PUD text that required the lettering had to be silver. We were inferring that standard because MAG has a few silver signs. It is not a written standard.

Ms. Newell stated that it was part of the discussion with all of these parcels.

Mr. Fishman stated that there are many components of our zoning that reflect tradition. Brand Road has a 100-foot setback, but it was never established in writing. It reflected tradition, and it makes Dublin beautiful. It is difficult to capture everything in writing. For instance, the Commission just asked Mr. Ruma to work with the School; we did not require him to run a path through his lot. He agrees with Ms. Newell. This color palette has been inferred in this manner since the campus started. He served on this Board when Ms. Newell represented the dealers, and her applicants were told the same. The result is a beautiful campus. Unfortunately, the same was not required for other auto campuses. He would encourage the Commission to consider the precedent and the value of consistency. The Commission will see similar cases come through that also are based significantly upon tradition.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important to look at this from the aspect of the predictability of our Code to an applicant. The Code permits them to have a color that is complementary. The Commission has asked for a neutral palette that is complementary on this site. The proposal that we have is a neutral palette that is complementary. It is subjective to say that red is not complementary, as it can be complementary. It is essential to offer some sense of predictability, so that applicants do not need to worry that the Commission will be too subjective in their decisions. She believes the Commission would be burdening the MAG dealership from not having the ability to use their logo color. If our Code permits a complementary color, and if that color is complementary to the rest, it is too subjective for her to argue that it is not complementary enough. We will never be able to give our applicants predictability or ease in participating in the City review process, if they have complied with our Code and yet are disapproved.

Mr. Fishman responded that in regard to predictability, the Commission is predictable. Even before the Porsche dealership was built, MAG was aware that red, blue and green signs were prohibited. It is the history of their campus. This is not a surprise to them. It has been the history of this particular campus and entirely predictable. The Commission has been fair and consistent, and that is what he encourages maintaining. The most dangerous aspect here is establishing a precedent that will not have a positive outcome for the City.

Ms. Fox stated that history does make a difference. She would like future applicants to be confident that if they comply with Code, and they listen to the Commission's suggestions, the result will be fair. It is important that the Commission not put undue subjective burdens on

applicants resulting in their wasting time, money and energy arguing their case before the Commission.

Mr. Parish stated that he was not present during the original MAG application. How was the internally illuminated green MAG sign on SR 161 approved? Was that considered a complementary color?

Mr. Fishman responded that sign was approved because they convinced four members of this Commission that they would not be able to get certain franchises unless that green sign was there.

Mr. Parish stated that it seems there was precedence that green was complementary, but not red.

Ms. Newell pointed out that was a ground sign. There are many colors in the ground signs, which are more discreet. The wall signage is more prominent.

Mr. Wilson inquired, if a precedent is set here, would everyone else who wants to change their sign need to come before PZC.

Ms. Newell stated that this case is a PUD. It is not a straight zoning. With a PUD, the Commission can discuss the architecture and the signage. Because it is a PUD, substantial concessions have been made for the auto dealerships on this site that they would not be entitled to have under a straight zoning. Those concessions were made because of the overall aesthetic quality of the site. Otherwise, they would have had to comply with the straight zoning code and they would not have the signage that they now have on the site.

Ms. Call stated that she understands that. However, we did document that the PUD code permits them three colors, not including their background color. How would any applicant be able to have three colors in addition to their background color and only be able to choose from black, white and gray?

Mr. Wilson inquired if the Commission approves the red color tonight, will the Commission be encouraging the other car dealerships to request sign changes. Will there be no way in which to control that?

Mr. Boggs stated that based upon the way this development text is written, the question is whether the color is complementary to the campus as a whole because it does not speak about a specific color palette. It refers only to creating a complementary campus feel. However, permitting the red color on this sign would not require the Commission to accept bright blue on a different sign. The Commission would engage in a similar discussion whether that color would be complementary to the campus as a whole.

Mr. Wilson inquired if such requests would need to come before the Commission.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively. It would require another Amended Final Development Plan.

Ms. Newell stated that it would require a conversation similar to that which has occurred tonight.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the wall sign to be externally illuminated, rather than internally illuminated.

Ms. Newell moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to amend the motion to include the condition recommended by staff:

- 2) That the applicant revise the wall sign to replace the manufacturer color with a complementary color used throughout the campus, subject to staff approval with the filing of sign permits.

Vote on the amendment to the motion:

Ms. Kennedy, no; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Wilson, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Ms. Call, no.

[Motion failed 3-4]

Ms. Call moved and Ms. Kennedy seconded the motion to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the wall sign to be externally illuminated, rather than internally illuminated.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0]

Communications

- Mr. Papsidero reported that Nicole Martin, Planner 1, has been promoted to the position previously held by Logan Stang, Planner 2. The vacated Planner 1 position has been posted.
- Mr. Papsidero reported that his retirement will be effective next Friday, June 28. He has enjoyed working with the Commission members the past four years. He invited members to his retirement party June 28, 4:00-6:00 p.m. at the Community Recreation Center.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Deputy Clerk of Council