



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 19, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Newell, Chair, 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: Victoria Newell, Jane Fox, Kristina Kennedy, Mark Supelak, William Wilson, Warren Fishman and Rebecca Call

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Claudia Husak, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge, Zachary Hounshell, Donna Goss, Paul Hammersmith, Barb Cox, Jeannie Willis, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Charles Stanford and Kenny Ganter.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

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

(Motion passed 7-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to approve the August 22, 2019 meeting minutes.

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

Ms. Newell stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Staff has requested that the cases be heard in the order in which they were published.

CASES

1. The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, 6600 Shier Rings Road, 19-055, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan of a ±34-acre site, from ID-1 to PUD to facilitate the future development of a medical office building and an ambulatory care center (Phase I) and a future hospital (Phase II). The site is on the north side of Shier Rings Road, east of Eiterman Road, west of Avery Road, and south of US 33.

Ms. Husak requested that Cases 1 and 2 be considered together.

2. University Boulevard Phase 2, 6600 Shier Rings Road, 19-080, Preliminary Plat

Ms. Newell stated that this is a request for a Preliminary Plat for the provision of right-of-way for University Boulevard to extend from Shier-Rings Road west to intersect with Eiterman Road and the creation of a ±34-acre parcel for future development of a medical center. The site is north of Shier Rings Road and west of the intersection with Avery Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that on August 22, 2019, the Commission reviewed and provided non-binding comments on a Concept Plan for this project. Tonight, the Commission is considering the Ohio State University (OSU) development as well as the creation of a new road, University Boulevard. At the Ohio University (OU) site on the south side Post Road, there is a piece of University Boulevard, to which this new section of the road eventually will connect and create a road network that has been planned for multiple years for the West Innovation District (WID). The Preliminary Plat for this project, which is Case 2, contains the detail on the creation of the parcel for Ohio State University, as well as the road. The approximately 34-acre site for the OSU Wexner Medical Center will be developed in two phases. The Preliminary Development Plan is similar to what the Commission reviewed in August. It includes a medical office building and ambulatory care facility. The future University Boulevard will be located on the south side of the site with a roundabout, which will provide site access. There also will be two minor access points on the east and west sides of the lot to provide access to the remaining parcels. In Phase 2, the hospital will be added on the east side of the medical facility, as well as additional parking and access that will allow additional uses. The applicant has included a significant amount of information in the proposed development text, including the permitted materials. Staff has encouraged that the structure be very similar to the existing West Innovation District (WID) zoning text. The rendering, the same as that shown with the Concept Plan review on August 22, depicts the creation of a walkable environment. Additional updated drawings show both respite and walking pathways through the parking lots. There are unique sign requirements for this use. After Dublin Methodist Hospital completed their facility and had data based upon user experience, they returned to the Commission to upgrade their sign rules. Making an effort to be at the forefront of that discussion, OSU has included sign requirements and diagrams in the development text. The rules and regulations in the development text will guide future signage. There are five hierarchy signs. A monument sign is proposed for the entry feature at the roundabout, well as vehicular signs that are taller than the Code permits but address the parking and navigation needs. Staff recommends approval with eight (8) conditions.

For Case 1, the OSU Wexner Medical Center rezoning and preliminary development plan, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the development text and the sign plan be updated to address the discrepancies prior to Council review, including the correct nomenclature and permitted sizes, permitted lighting and permitted number of secondary monument signs;
2. That the applicant update the development text to clarify that peninsulas may count in the interior landscape requirements;
3. That the smaller trees shown on the plans in the interior landscape areas be permitted in the development text;
4. That the development text be revised to include bio-retention measures, as appropriate, in the parking lot areas to aid in stormwater management and provide for irrigation of trees. This should include the elimination of the requirement of curbed islands;
5. That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
6. That the building elements and mechanical equipment areas be screened per Code in the text;
7. That the applicant work with staff to identify areas where new trees are appropriate to reduce the need for future removal during Phase 2 and update the text accordingly; and
8. That the applicant coordinate with ODOT for necessary approvals to remove any dead, invasive or hazardous vegetation along the frontage.

For Case 2, the preliminary plat for University Boulevard, approval is recommended for the following variance from the Subdivision Regulations:

- 1) To permit the creation of Lot 1 at 1.23-acre instead of meeting the Zoning Code required 3-acre minimum.

The application complies with all applicable review consideration and the intended development character of the area; therefore, approval of the plat is recommended with one condition:

- 1) The applicant ensure any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Ms. Husak noted that several discussions have occurred with the Ballantrae neighborhood residents regarding this project, some of whom are present tonight.

Board Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that traffic around US33 is a significant concern with the proposed project. He inquired about the timing of the two construction phases and the roadway.

Ms. Husak responded that City Council approved a development agreement with OSU earlier this year that provides for the alignment of OSU's and the City's construction activities for 2022.

Barb Cox, City Engineering Manager, asked if his inquiry concerned potential roadway work around the US33 interchanges with Avery-Muirfield or Post Road.

Mr. Fishman responded that was part of his question.

Ms. Cox responded that traffic studies indicate there is no need for roadway work at either of the interchanges for this project at this time. As more development occurs in the WID, it could become necessary. In anticipation of the construction of University Boulevard, permitting for the relocation of the creek is occurring, as well as the design of and right-of-way acquisition for the roadway. Construction of the roadway project is scheduled to begin in the spring of 2021 with completion anticipated in 2022.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the infrastructure construction would be completed before construction of the building.

Ms. Cox replied that construction of the building and roadway would occur simultaneously.

Mr. Supelak inquired what is the extent of the roadway construction.

Ms. Cox responded that the roadway project currently under design is for improvements to Shier Rings at Avery Road, widening of Shier Rings Road up to its curve north into this property, and connection of the new roadway to Eiterman Road. Future construction phases will extend the roadway from Eiterman Road to the Ohio University campus. That construction is not currently scheduled.

Mr. Supelak stated that in the meeting materials, drawings showed three potential roundabout locations. Which drawing is the most accurate?

Ms. Cox responded that the OSU team included a traffic engineer who conducted traffic studies pertaining to this development. The City also has engaged engineers to conduct traffic studies for the infrastructure project. There is some diversity in the OSU and City drawings, and analysis and coordination of the two studies is underway. A public meeting is scheduled on October 15 to share the final roadway plan to the public. At an earlier public meeting in August, Shier Rings Road and the new University Boulevard were shown as disconnected. Following that public input, traffic studies were re-evaluated. Although there is a significant level of access management to consider, there will be a Shier Rings Road connection to the new University Boulevard.

Ms. Call inquired if the Commission would receive a full transportation plan for this area.

Ms. Cox responded affirmatively. This is a preliminary plat. A final plat will be brought before the Commission at a future meeting, and more details will be shown at that time. Due to the distance between the two ends of University Boulevard, completion of the road extension likely will occur with the development of those parcels.

Ms. Call stated that her concern is not just this particular plat. Per her review, the existing University Boulevard appears to be approximately 1.25 miles away from the new roadway. She is concerned about using a name for the proposed roadway that is already in use in the other location, although the intent is that eventually they would connect. The land between is owned by several property owners, who could or could not choose to develop it for some time.

Ms. Cox responded that the City has previous experience with disconnected streets, some of which have not been connected for many years. The City Thoroughfare Plan and Community Plan provide guidance to assure that those connections will be completed.

Mr. Supelak stated that at the Commission's previous discussion, the roadway topic was very important to both the public and the Commission. The sooner everyone can understand the final roadway plan, the better decisions the Commission will be able to make.

Mr. Fishman concurred. He also is concerned about the timing. Will the road be in place before the people and the buildings?

Ms. Cox responded that the EDA contemplated all those issues, including the synchronization of the OSU and City construction schedules so that the road will be open and available when this medical facility is ready.

Mr. Fishman inquired when the Commission would be able to see a complete plan.

Ms. Cox responded that it would be provided to the Commission with the final plat. It may be necessary to add some easements as the project proceeds through final design.

Ms. Husak stated that the Commission serves as an advisory board to City Council in terms of platting of property, but the Commission does not approve proposed infrastructure projects.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the road primarily would be on Dublin property, although private property is also involved.

Ms. Cox responded that is correct. Some right-of-way acquisition from the private property owner will be necessary.

Mr. Wilson inquired if discussion had been initiated, and the property owner was in agreement.

Ms. Cox responded that the property owner is aware of the project. However, the acquisition process cannot begin until design has occurred, plans are available, specific land needs are known, and appraisals have been completed. Most of that work will occur next year.

Ms. Call stated that recent public meeting comments reflect a predominant concern regarding traffic. Were other concerns expressed at the last meeting that have not been addressed by the applicant?

Ms. Husak responded that a majority of the comments were infrastructure or traffic related. Some residents expressed concerns about the lighting. City Code requires lights to be lowered after certain times of the day, and a reference to that Code section is included in the development text. Details about the fixtures, lighting levels and isometric plans will be provided at the Final Development Plan review.

Ms. Call inquired if there were any items not addressed by the applicant.

Ms. Husak responded that there were not.

A rendering of the regional roadway network map was shown, depicting the proposed roadway extension to the north behind the Sports Ohio facilities and connection to existing University Boulevard near SR 161/Post Road. Ms. Cox stated that the distance is similar to the improvement from Avery Road to Eiterman Road. It will be a four-lane, divided roadway with bike lanes, consistent with the existing road section near the OU/SR161/Industrial Parkway roundabout.

Mr. Call inquired if there would be sidewalks on both sides of the roadway.

Ms. Cox responded that a shared-use path would be on one side and a sidewalk on the other.

Ms. Fox inquired if the bike lanes would have a protective barrier.

Ms. Cox responded that they would not; they would be striped lanes, similar to those on Muirfield Drive.

Ms. Fox inquired if there was any consideration for making them protected lanes.

Ms. Cox responded that was not requested by the Bicycle Advisory Task Force. However, the lanes will be widened to five feet, a foot wider than the bike lanes on the existing University Boulevard section.

Ms. Call inquired the width of the shared-use path.

Ms. Cox responded that it would be the standard 8-ft. width.

Ms. Fox stated that the WID has been under scrutiny for the last several years. Is there an updated, current Master Plan?

Ms. Husak responded affirmatively. An update of the WID Special Area Plan in the Community Plan was approved in 2017. Consultant Brian Atkins developed the plan, and public input was obtained.

Ms. Fox inquired if a master layout of the anticipated pedestrian connectivity was available, even though details could not be available until development occurs.

Ms. Husak responded that it is available to some extent. The Thoroughfare Plan, which is included in the Community Plan, shows a road connection from Shier Rings Road to the northwest. With the OSU project, that roadway will take on more importance than originally contemplated. Although a roadway was always planned, the developer or user that would eventually drive those decisions was unknown. With this infrastructure, walking paths and bike lanes will be important, particularly so in this District. OU also included this extension in their Master Plan for future development.

Ms. Fox stated that with the anticipated AEP project, realignment of Cosgray Ditch, construction of a new roadway, and a major new development, there is a need for a comprehensive overview of this intended "live, work, play" area. Although the development is at an early stage, it would be helpful to have an understanding of what is anticipated.

Mr. Husak pointed out that it is not possible to make 11,000 acres across the City walkable everywhere, but it does make sense for certain areas, particularly OU and OSU.

Ms. Call stated the concern is that we do not want to repeat past mistakes, for instance, those with the Perimeter Center.

Ms. Fox inquired what changes OSU had made responsive to the Commission's previous recommendations.

Ms. Husak responded that OSU had included walkability drawings for both development phases. Much work still needs to occur with the interior layout of the building, which will inform much of the exterior functionality of the site. Rules in the text address many of the items the Commission requested, and an updated drawing has been provided tonight.

Ms. Fox stated that in the parking lots, little islands with two trees remain in the plan, but there are no dedicated pedestrian walkways through the parking lots. Pedestrian benches have been added on the outer perimeter of the parking lots, but more seating areas are needed between the perimeter and the building. An Ambulatory Care Center must address the pedestrian needs.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, attorney, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, OH stated that he is representing Ohio University Wexner Medical Center. With him are OSU representatives and consultants, Dan Like and Keith Myers.

As a brief overview, OSU took the Commission's input at the previous meeting very seriously regarding the need to be connected with the community, provide pedestrian access to/from the parking areas, and the creation of inviting pedestrian places. The reason they preferred to do a PUD was that it is difficult to provide a high level of detail at this point as they continue to design a very complex building. For instance, Ms. Fox referred to the pedestrian benches, which appeared to be located far from the front door; however, the parking lot area will have several such pedestrian seating opportunities. When they return with the Final Development Plan, they will be able to show a greater level of detail. This is the reason the two-step PUD process works well. In the first step, the rules are set; in the second, the execution of the rules is shown. With the existing zoning, they would not have had that opportunity, as it would have been necessary to show all the detail now. This is one of three facilities being designed simultaneously for the University. The building is continuing to evolve. The inside-out nature of the design affects how the building footprint works, what the architecture will be, and the exterior amenities designed for the patient experience. He believes the Commission will be pleased with the level of detail provided at the next review. They are comfortable with the rules being set. The plan is advanced sufficiently to be able to make those commitments, but it will continue to evolve between now and the time the Final Development Plan returns to the Commission. After the previous hearing, an attempt was made to evaluate opportunities for pedestrian connections and public spaces. They do not want this building to be an island in and of itself, so more progress will be made in that regard. The text is lengthy because it contains a high level of commitments. Sometimes it is hard to provide in words what can be seen on a plan, so they have tried to marry the two to the extent possible. This is a public-private partnership, which involved extensive work on the EDA, as well as the conveyance agreement. If the roadway is not operational, the medical facility will not be able to open; therefore, the timing of the two projects is important. Per the agreement, specific timelines must be met. The City did not want to sell OSU the land if they did not move forward with developing it. As soon as it is approved, the project will proceed immediately to permit designs. The university has a financial investment in the public infrastructure, as well. Although OSU is receiving an incentive package, they are purchasing the land at its per acre value and contributing 32.5% to the costs of the infrastructure. That percent was based on the amount of the infrastructure that the facility would use, per its frontage. The project began approximately a year ago and continues to evolve. When it next comes before the Commission, a greater level of detail will be available for discussion.

Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Fox commended the applicant for presenting conceptual ways for providing a pedestrian perimeter for the medical facility, their clients and the community. Her request is that when Phase 2 proceeds, those pedestrian spaces are not minimized, that the natural spaces are not reduced to small spaces around walkways. With its style of architecture and the amount of landscaping contemplated, this site can become an attractive area for the community. The landscape design should not only highlight the building but also invite people to enjoy the surroundings. That is a wellness factor for their clients and for the community.

Keith Myers, Vice President of Planning, Architecture and Real Estate, OSU, stated that they agree with Ms. Fox's comments. The scale at which the improvements are drawn is deceiving, but to address the Commission's comments at the previous review, thousands of feet of trail have been added. Although not yet fully designed, seating enclaves will be added. There is a large greenspace between the parking lot and the drop-off area. They concur that the exterior spaces are as important to health as the interior spaces being constructed.

Ms. Call stated that OSU's contribution of 32.5% for the infrastructure, which is a savings for the residents, is appreciated. The Commission understands that there is an incentive package, but appreciates that OSU is willing to partner with the City on this amenity for the City.

Public Comment

Randall Ayres, 5940 Roundstone Place, Dublin, Ohio, stated that he is a resident of the Ballantrae community. This project seems premature. The Planning staff member with whom he spoke indicated that staff was advised there was a need to move quickly on this project. At the public meeting in August, the Ballantrae community expressed significant opposition to the proposed plans for Shier Rings Road. Earlier, Mr. Supelak referred to several different maps that the Commission had seen. That has been the experience of the community, as well, and the residents are in opposition to most of them. Many Ballantrae residents travel Shier Rings daily, and they have been provided different information from City staff. At the August public meeting, Engineering staff informed them the project was very preliminary and that City staff would be getting back to them. This is September and neither the community nor the Commission know the plans because staff is unsure of them. The Commission is being asked to approve a project on which they have inadequate information and knowledge, and the community objects strongly to a change being made to Shier Rings Road. OSU representatives have commented on how much the University will be contributing; however, it pays neither real estate nor income taxes. While the City may be partnering with OSU, the University is not paying its share. The City purchased this property last year, and residents were told in March 2018 that this development would not happen for 5-15 years. Now this project is being pushed forward without sufficient time for people to understand any details. The Commission is being asked to make a decision without time to obtain adequate information. How will University Boulevard impact Shier Rings Road and the traffic, particularly the significant amount of eastbound traffic? How will Ballantrae residents access US33? How many roundabouts will be constructed? He has seen a map with three proposed roundabouts between Shier Rings and US33. In summary, he is concerned that the Commission is being asked to make a decision on a project about which staff is unsure of some plans.

Dan Rippeth, 5960 Roundstone Place, Dublin, Ohio stated that he is a Ballantrae resident and has lived in Dublin for seven years. He has spoken with many of his neighbors. Their biggest concern is not the hospital, but with the plans to shut down Shier Rings and the redirection of traffic up and around Eiterman Road and through a series of roundabouts. He asked for confirmation regarding the closing of Shier Rings Road. Staff indicated that the road would not be closed.

Mr. Rippeth stated that if Shier Rings will not be shut down, that information addresses one of the residents' greatest concerns. The intersection at Eiterman Road and Shier Rings Road is dangerous. There was an accident there earlier this evening. There is a concern about the

generation of additional traffic. If Shier Rings remains with the addition of a roundabout at Shier Rings and Eiterman Roads, perhaps the traffic issue will be addressed.

Ms. Husak stated that when the project was introduced to the community at the August public meeting, significant opposition to the roadway plans was expressed by the Ballantrae residents. Consequently, the City is no longer considering the termination of Shier Rings Road. Another public meeting is scheduled for October 15 at the Dublin Community Recreation Center, and Engineering staff will be providing updated plans. Public notice of the meeting will be made. City staff has heard and responded to the residents' concerns.

Mr. Rippeth responded that the residents love living in Dublin and appreciate the fact that the City has listened to their concerns.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy thanked Mr. Ayers and Mr. Rippeth for sharing their opinions. Although the Commission does read the public meeting reports, it is helpful to hear directly from the citizens.

Ms. Fox inquired about preservation plans. On the City-owned property, certain trees are at risk, due to construction: Tree #299, a 56-in. diameter Silver Maple and Tree #300, a 43-in. diameter Silver Maple, are located near the entrance. Is there any possibility those trees could be saved?

Ms. Cox stated that the trees, shown on page #10 of the information, are located opposite the City Service Center. That is where the confluence of the relocated creek will be located. They are required to plant a certain number of trees with the relocation of the stream, and may be able to save those two trees. She will check into the situation.

Ms. Fox responded that the relocated stream would border Shier Rings Road, which will be a viewshed. If there is opportunity to preserve those trees with the relocation of that stream, that should be included in their design focus.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has commented on the need for synchronization of the building and roadway construction. Is the creek relocation, a third major project, not a timing concern, as well?

Ms. Cox responded that the creek relocation has reached 50% design completion and been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers and the Ohio EPA for permitting. Staff will be responding to their feedback and completing the design. There will be a public notice in the Columbus Dispatch on Monday, per EPA public notice requirements. Permitting should be completed in the spring of 2020, and construction of the stream relocation will commence. The roadway construction will begin in 2021. A conservation easement is noted on the plat, and protective fences will be placed on the site. The new plants around the relocated creek must be protected and monitored for five years. Due to the creek and the level of traffic on Shier Rings Road, staff has been contemplating locating construction entrances off Eiterman Road to mitigate the impact of the large building and large roadway construction occurring at the same time.

Ms. Call inquired if the standard is a 2-to-1 vegetation mitigation for the stream relocation.

Ms. Cox stated that she does not have that information with her, but getting the planting established is a major concern. The stream must be healthy and the area viable for plants and animals.

Ms. Newell requested, for the benefit of the public, that staff clarify what is considered with traffic studies. There was a comment that the decision for a new road appears to be rushed. The Commission has information from the traffic studies that is not always available to the public.

Ms. Cox responded that the City has a Thoroughfare Plan. Over-arching traffic modeling for the entire City occurs based on Future Land Use Plans in the adopted Community Plan. That is how the size of roadways, including number of lanes, is determined. With a proposed development, the developer is required to look at their uses compared to the Future Land Use Plan. There are federal guidelines regarding the traffic generation based on land use. For instance, a restaurant generates traffic at a level different from a single-family home, and the traffic generated by a medical office is different from that for a regular office building. A comparison is made between the modeling for the adopted Community Plan and the modeling for the proposed development. If the anticipated traffic will be more, plans for handling the traffic must be determined based on its origination and destination. The prediction occurs by counting traffic at the existing intersections then projecting the traffic increase based on the anticipated land use. They try to determine what improvements might be needed to the intersections, to the links of the road between the intersections, and the impact of the development. The proposed development is required to mitigate their impact. That may be made by a financial contribution or by building turn lanes, a roundabout, or another intersection improvement.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that the situation is the same with this application as with a standard planning application. The traffic impact study is due when the applicant commences the preliminary development plan. This team was a little ahead of schedule, so its study is under review. The unique element involved is the additional CIP roadway project. Dates were established in the EDA with the developer to make sure the timing is on track.

Ms. Newell inquired how many years out a traffic study projects.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that a study looks at a 10-year horizon from the opening day. Year 2022 is the target opening of this facility, so the 10-year horizon would be 2032. The City's traffic study projects out to year 2042.

Ms. Husak stated that it is unique to have both the developer and the City conduct traffic studies and be evaluated together. Although the applicant's traffic engineer completed a study, the City was looking at potentially terminating Shier Rings Road. That traffic study is not approved at this time, however, because more work is to be completed.

Ms. Newell thanked staff for the explanation for the public.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is considering a preliminary development plan for the medical center and a preliminary development plat for a new roadway, University Boulevard, and not the termination of Shier Rings Road. There will be a roundabout on the southeast section of the new roadway, a roundabout immediately in front of the building, and then the roadway continues to its connection with Eiterman Road.

Ms. Husak stated the new roadway ends at the eastern boundary. Whatever happens further to the east on Avery and Shier Rings Road is not part of this consideration.

Ms. Cox clarified that the plat creates the right-of-way, the parcels around the right-of-way, and the new road. They are still working out the details regarding the connectivity of Shier Rings Road, the drive into the Dublin School transportation facility, and the City Service Center. The preliminary plat lays out the worst-case scenario. Currently, those connections are contemplated via a roundabout. The plat allows that to occur, should that be determined.

Ms. Call inquired if the Commission would see this again as a Final Plat.

Ms. Cox responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification that the intent is that a roundabout will make a connection to Shier Rings Road.

Ms. Cox responded that the connectivity of Shier Rings would happen in that area. They are completing the details on the accesses to the City Service Center and the Dublin Schools bus site. They believe this layout of the right-of-way provides sufficient area for those accesses without having to change the plat.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the two trees Ms. Fox was referring to are near the proposed roundabout. Ms. Cox stated that those two trees are outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Supelak responded that they are slightly to the west of it within a small curve. Trees #288 through #308 are an average of 30 inches each, a total of 600 caliper inches. Is it possible to give consideration to saving those trees?

Ms. Cox responded that it may not be possible to work around all of the trees. Perhaps only a couple can be saved, because that is the corridor for the realigned creek. They prefer to save trees, if possible, but there are competing factors. There is a required landscape density for the relocated stream. EMH&T experts will be conducting the planting to ensure the requirements are met to obtain the federal permit.

Mr. Fishman inquired if City Code required that the tree caliper be replaced.

Ms. Newell stated that it does; however, Federal EPA regulations usurp City requirements.

Ms. Cox stated that the City replaces the street trees removed for a capital project. This project also will have plantings in the medians. With those plantings and those added with the creek relocation, there will be more trees than exist now.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the City arborist conducts an assessment of the trees.

Ms. Cox responded that the condition assessment of the trees has been completed, and that report was included in the packet.

Ms. Husak stated that the arborist on Planning staff verifies species, size and health. This is a Preliminary Plat. More detail will be available with the Final Plat.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the details on the Eiterman Road access would be provided for public review and comment.

Ms. Cox responded that the details will be available for the October 15 public meeting at DCRC.

Mr. Wilson inquired if it is a ditch or a creek that will be relocated.

Ms. Cox responded that it is named Cosgray Ditch, but it has been referred to as both a ditch and a creek. It is a manmade drainage channel for the farming community.

Mr. Wilson inquired if a ditch would not move as much water as a creek.

Ms. Cox responded that there are no such definitions. The relocated stream will handle the same amount of water that it currently handles. No flooding will occur up or downstream due to the relocation. It is an open channel relocation with meanders and a large amount of plants in a tiered system – grasses, shrubs and trees, within the 135-ft. conservation easement.

Mr. Wilson stated that the stream currently is shown as running south, then east and under the roundabout, then reconnecting with the current channel. Are they still determining the new route?

Ms. Cox responded that the stream currently exists on the south side of Shier Rings Road. They looked at several potential routes before selecting the one shown. The selected route works best with the roads and utilities and will provide a buffer to the residents on the south side of Shier Rings Road from the future commercial element. They are contemplating a shared-use path on the interior, which would provide pedestrians access to that greenway and tie Shier Rings to University Boulevard. The public will be able to enjoy both sides of the new waterway.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the conditions.

Mr. Underhill indicated that they were in agreement with the conditions.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Wilson seconded to recommend to Council approval of The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center rezoning and preliminary development plan to Council with the following eight (8) conditions:

1. That the development text and the sign plan be updated to address the discrepancies prior to Council review, including the correct nomenclature and permitted sizes, permitted lighting and permitted number of secondary monument signs;
2. That the applicant update the development text to clarify that peninsulas may count in the interior landscape requirements;
3. That the smaller trees shown on the plans in the interior landscape areas be permitted on the development text;
4. That the development text be revised to include bio-retention measures, as appropriate, in the parking lot areas to aid in stormwater management and provide for irrigation of trees; this should include the elimination of the requirement of curbed islands;
5. That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
6. That the building elements and mechanical equipment areas be screened per Code in the text;
7. That the applicant work with staff to identify areas where new trees are appropriate to reduce the need for future removal during Phase 2 and update the text accordingly; and,
8. That the applicant coordinate with ODOT for necessary approvals to remove any dead, invasive or hazardous vegetation along the frontage.

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

(Motion passed 7-0)

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval of the following variance from the Subdivision Regulations:

- 1) To permit the creation of Lot 1 at 1.23-acre instead of meeting the Zoning Code required 3-acre minimum.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Wilson seconded to recommend to Council approval of the preliminary plat for University Boulevard, Phase 2 with the following condition:

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

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

[Cases 3 and 4 were considered together.]

3. The Corners, PID: 273-010749, 19-081, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Newell stated that this is a proposal for a Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan of a ±13.5-acre site from OLR to PUD to facilitate the future development of an approximately 70,000-square-foot office and commercial center and a public park.

4. The Corners, PID: 273-010749, 19-082, Preliminary Plat

This is a proposal for a Preliminary Plat for the subdivision of ±24 acres into three lots for the future development of approximately 70,000-square-feet of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is currently zoned Office, Laboratory, and Research District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council regarding a rezoning with preliminary development plan for a 13.5-acre site for the future construction of up to 70,000 square feet of office and commercial space and a public park. Secondly, there is a request for review and recommendation to City Council for a Preliminary Plat to subdivide 24 acres into three lots for the future development of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Rings Road and Frantz Road, south of Blazer Parkway. The plat contains a parking lot, which the City constructed and owns. The boundaries for the development are Rings Road, Frantz Road and Blazer Parkway. Preceding the Informal Review for the development on June 20, there was a long public process with the DCAP Plan, which has informed some of the proposed development on this site. The City has entered into an agreement with the developer to develop this site. Many public meetings preceded tonight's meeting. The rezoning will include the two retention ponds, the park and buildings along Frantz, Blazer Memorial Parkway to the north and Rings Road to the south. Phasing is required to be

included in the preliminary development plan. None of the access points were included in the first phase, nor access to the parking area. The site lines will be revised to ensure adequate access in and through the site before this plan goes forward to Council. Three new subareas will be created. The park will be one subarea. A large amount of development will be located on the east side of the access drive, primarily retail, commercial and restaurants. On the other side of the drive could be office or commercial uses. The applicant has included commercial or office uses for the subarea located along Rings Road, excluding any type of auto-oriented uses. The buildings are relatively small, so a grocery could not be located there. Patio spaces and open spaces are included throughout the site. Even though the DCAP does permit residential for this district, it is not included in this proposed rezoning. Sign requirements are included in the text. The architecture style will be the same "rural feel" as was presented for the Informal Review in June. The City will develop the public open space, which will be programmed in a future CIP budget. The plat includes The Corners development, the park space, retention area, and the existing City parking lot, of which the City will retain ownership. The City also will retain ownership of the ponds and the park. There are three lots in the plat. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan with the following conditions:

- 1) That the preliminary development plan be revised to accurately reflect all Subareas, as outlined in the text, prior to Council review;
- 2) That the applicant revise the development text to address the maximum permitted encroachment of building canopies, awnings, eaves, and projecting signs along the Frantz Road frontage; and,
- 3) That the applicant revise the phasing plan to include adequate circulation in Phase 1.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat with the following condition:

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

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that in Subarea B-1, the Permitted Uses include all administrative and business offices, professional offices, organizations and associations uses permitted in Dublin Code Section 153.026. However, Section 153.027 is commercial and neighborhood uses, which would include a grocery store, bakery, and farm market. These are the uses we had hoped to see in this development, but they are not included. Why is it restricted to Section 153.026, when the more attractive uses are in the following Code section?

Ms. Husak responded that Section 153.026 is included because it addresses the office uses. The second paragraph covers the additional uses she has referenced without having to include that Code section. If unclear, the Code section can be included.

Ms. Fox stated that Section 153.026 also allows for some uses that she would not expect to see here, such as institutions.

Ms. Husak responded that is the reason it specifically states all administrative, business and professional office uses. That eliminates the conditional uses.

Ms. Fox stated that is not clarified. It states "uses under 153.026," so it would appear to include them all. She would request that for later ease in implementation, clarification be made.

Ms. Newell concurred.

Ms. Fox inquired the reason that Permitted Uses was limited to simply business and office in Subarea B3, as identified by Section 153.026(a). Could a mixed use be permitted, such as office on second level and retail below?

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 Macneil Drive, Dublin, 43017, Daimler Group, stated that accompanying him tonight are Architect J. Carter Bean and Land Planner Steve Kolwicz. In looking at the DCAP, that plan referred to was a transition step from retail moving to the west. It seemed that office use should be there, as the retailers do not want to be in that location. This area presents the best opportunity for build to suit, owner-occupied office sites in the entire development. This location is a good space for the professional office user – along the pond, with good access on Blazer Parkway.

Ms. Fox stated that she does not disagree but did not want to limit it.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that they have no objection to expanding B3, if it would not have a negative impact on their traffic impact study. They do not want to re-do that study.

Ms. Fox responded that she was not requesting that use be included, rather questioning the reason for the limitation.

Ms. Fox inquired about the setback requirements. The DCAP calls for a 30-ft. setback. What the Commission is looking for is energy at the street, patios, etc. If they are already finding that placing patios in front results in canopies and awnings encroaching in the setback, is a 30-ft. setback sufficient?

Mr. Ghidotti responded that 30 feet is a workable setback. It still allows them to have outdoor seating areas at either the north or south end of the building and wrap it around closer to the street.

Mr. Fishman stated that 35 feet would be appropriate. There are large trucks travelling Frantz Road, next to people sitting in patios drinking coffee. That is his complaint about SR161 in downtown Dublin where people are sitting in the outdoor space at Starbucks while semi-trucks pass.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that this space would not be similar. They have lost so much of the proposed density in the last year and a half with this project that they are hoping the project still works. Retailers like density and activity. If they continue to shrink the plan, have larger setbacks and lose parking space, they will lose development area as well.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important for the City to create a landscape design in conjunction with this development. The DCAP calls for spaces to linger and the use of placemaking principles. The Daimler Group is designing their piece, which must interact with the City's piece. If the City does not have a plan that directly relates, it will not appear cohesive. Is the City's Parks and Recreation Division working on a plan?

Ms. Husak responded the intent is that when the rezoning goes before City Council for consideration, their materials will include the development agreement and estimated costs of an associated landscape project.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to see a tentative design plan.

Ms. Husak clarified that, at this point, the rules for the development are being established. With the future Final Development Plan, the Commission will see every building, parking lot and access point, as well as the park development.

Ms. Fox inquired if the loss of density the applicant referred to was the result of the parking requirements.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that it was the loss of the uses to the west, which were shown at an earlier November meeting and no longer included that impact the density.

Ms. Fox inquired if the parking numbers were based on current City Code, or are they relaxed due to the fact that this is a walkable environment.

Ms. Husak responded that it is that, as well as the intent to have uses with different parking peak times. The patios are permitted not to have any dedicated parking spaces.

Mr. Fox inquired the reason that the architectural styles have changed from the front to the back of the development.

Ms. Husak stated that there was conversation about how to transition into an office building. They are permitting the office use not to adhere to that particular style.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that it will be a different use, likely Office use to the west, but also a transition from the retail frontage.

Ms. Fox inquired if there would be elements that will enable all to relate. Rings Road faces the Field of Corn. Because that is a signature corner, the architecture was chosen with the intent that it would relate to the sense of the overall area. On Rings Road, will it seem odd that the front reflects that sense of area, and the back will look contemporary? She inquired if the applicant had considered a 3-story building at the rear.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that they would not be able to provide parking for a 3-story building.

Ms. Call inquired if parks are typically developed by the City when open space requirements are met on a parcel.

Ms. Husak responded that they are not.

Ms. Call inquired if, typically, parks are provided by the property owner.

Ms. Husak responded that this park was the result of a neighborhood request. The developer was not required to provide open space.

Ms. Call stated that because this is preliminary, the only request she would make relates to parking. Because this plan is underparked per City Code, with the Final Development Plan, she would request that the staff report provide comps on a shared parking agreement. Parking needs are also based on the number of people who want to visit an attraction. She would also request information be provided on the possibility for adjacent parking rather than on the drive lane itself, which circles the Field of Corn. The land is City-owned, and there appears to be space for it.

Perhaps if some parking spaces could be provided there, it would reduce the demand on this development's parking.

Mr. Wilson stated that with the Informal Review, the Commission was shown a clear path from Blazer Parkway to Rings Road. Now, it appears to be a labyrinth. Are there only two ways to access this site?

Ms. Husak responded that there are three access points -- from Rings, Frantz and Blazer. At the June meeting, it seemed that the majority of Commissioners preferred that there not be a direct travel path through the site.

Mr. Wilson stated that with the curves, there will be a need for stop signs for the traffic moving through that space.

Ms. Husak responded that when the Final Development Plan details are provided, the circulation will make better sense.

Ms. Kennedy stated that with the Informal Review, Commissioners commented that they did not want a high level of busy traffic next to the City park area. She was pleased to see the traffic route broken up with the revised plan to avoid the potential for speeding traffic next to an area where children might be playing.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that it was for other purposes, as well. There is a desire to create a strong connectivity within the site that extends to the Cardinal Health site. They want to encourage the 3,000 Cardinal Health employees to visit this development during the day or at the end of the day. Speeding vehicles would discourage that desired pedestrian traffic. The pedestrian connections on the east side of the site, on the frontage and the east-west connection between the ponds to Cardinal Health are very important to this development.

Mr. Fishman inquired about traffic turning at Frantz Road.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that it would be right in/right out traffic only.

Mr. Fishman inquired about the timing of the park development. The park is an integral part of this development to the residents. He requested that information be provided for the next review.

Ms. Husak responded that when this plan goes before Council, it is likely they will address the timing needs. Presently, this project is not included in the CIP.

Mr. Fishman stated that if the traffic on Frantz Road increases, there might be future need for a turn lane. However, there is no opportunity for one to be added.

Mr. Ghidotti responded that Engineering will not permit a cut onto Frantz Road; the developer already made that request. The traffic impact study did not support even a left turn into the site.

Mr. Fishman clarified that he was referring to a dedicated right turn lane from Frantz Road to the site.

Ms. Call inquired if a turn lane from Frantz to Rings Road already exists.

Ms. Newell responded that there is none at that location. There is one further south.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that, currently, the southbound right turn movement is shared with the through lane on Frantz Road. There are three opportunities to turn right into this development -- at Blazer, in the middle access to the site, and at Rings Road. If one of the three becomes congested, it will balance out on Frantz Road.

Mr. Supelak inquired the reason for the phasing.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that it is to make the park work. Once the park is constructed, the access points must be available. They are hoping to have the text approved. With that assurance, they can begin to market the site and attempt to secure the type of users that are desired. They have been reluctant to do so, because the plan has evolved. Once the text is approved, they have already engaged a marketing firm that focuses on specialty type retail. If the park was ready, and they had one of the frontages ready to go, those details would be provided in the Final Development Plan. When the first development comes in, they will need the three access points. The infrastructure needs to occur simultaneous with the development.

Public Comment

Mark Martin, 4211 Rings Road, Vice President, Llewellyn Farms Homeowners Association, Dublin requested confirmation that with this revised plan, there would be no gas station or apartments. Ms. Newell responded that is correct.

Mr. Martin inquired if the retail uses would be located along the main roads and office buildings to the rear near the ponds.

Ms. Husak stated that the retail is on the Frantz Road frontage. There is also a building that is permitted flex space, either retail or office. All the buildings are permitted to have some office use; a 50-50 mix is permitted.

Mr. Martin thanked everyone for listening to the residents' concerns and making the changes.

Terry Downing, 278 Longbranch Drive, Dublin, inquired if there was any update related to the timing of this development. At an earlier public meeting, residents were informed that it would be 5-10 years out.

Ms. Husak stated that the DCAP has a 5 – 15 year vision. This project is ahead of the zoning that will come with the DCAP. The intent is that this plan will be zoned by the end of this year. The market will drive the actual development.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff is in the process of drafting the zoning code amendments for the DCAP. The draft will be completed and the review process will begin within a couple of months.

Ms. Downing stated that she is concerned about the intent not to have like tenants with the same peaks in parking, due to the limited parking. There is already a traffic issue due to the Cardinal Health site, and now there will be additional traffic. She would request that the City consider ways to prevent parking and speeding traffic on her street. The residents on the street already experience issues whenever there are traffic backups. They appreciate the Commission considering the residents' concerns expressed at the previous public meeting.

Ms. Newell thanked the residents for their comments.

Commission Comments

Ms. Fox stated she is aware that the Final Development Plan will provide more details. In order to draw the Cardinal Health employees to this development, it is imperative that the City work with the developer to create focal greenspace on both sides. Perhaps the walkway could come in and broaden to a focal point with a fountain or other placemaking elements that would encourage the public to linger. The public should be drawn to the development for lunch and to stay awhile. In Metro Place, the office workers walk during their lunch hour, but have no place to go. It is the City's responsibility to develop that component, but she encourages staff to work with the developer to create a cohesive look.

Ms. Newell inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the proposed conditions.
Mr. Ghidotti responded that they are in agreement.

Ms. Call moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to recommend to Council approval of the rezoning and preliminary development plan with the following amended conditions:

- 1) That the preliminary development plan be revised to accurately reflect all Subareas, as outlined in the text, prior to Council review;
- 2) That the applicant revise the development text to address the maximum permitted encroachment of building canopies, awnings, eaves, and projecting signs along the Frantz Road frontage;
- 3) That the applicant revise the phasing plan to include adequate circulation in Phase 1;
- 4) That the development text be revised to limit the office uses in Subarea B to the office uses in the Zoning Code Section 153.026(A)(2) and the professional uses in Section 153.026(A)(3) ;
- 5) That the text be revised to allow the uses in the Neighborhood Commercial District in Code Section 153.027(A); and
- 6) That staff provide shared parking data comparing the proposal to others in the City with a Final Development Plan.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Call seconded to recommend to Council approval of the preliminary plat with the following condition:

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

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
(Motion passed 7-0)

Communications

Ms. Rauch stated that staff is in the process of making the updates to the Historic District Code and Guidelines. Ms. Fox and Ms. Kennedy, who were not present at the previous meeting for that

review, have provided their input. A final draft will be prepared to begin the formal review process later this year.

Ms. Rauch introduced new Planning Assistant, Kenny Ganter. Commission members welcomed Mr. Ganter to the City.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council