



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 5, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Kennedy, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes
Commission members absent: Victoria Newell, Jane Fox, Warren Fishman
Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Nichole Martin, Aaron Stanford, Thaddeus Boggs

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Call seconded to approve the January 23, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the February 6, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

Ms. Kennedy stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. In such 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. Kennedy stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. For Cases 1 and 2, the Dublin Gateway (Gorden) cases, the applicant has requested that the cases be tabled. The applicant would like the whole Commission to be present to review these previously tabled cases. The cases will be heard in the order in which the agenda was published.

TABLED CASES

1. Dublin Gateway (Gorden), Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Kennedy stated that this case is a request of a rezoning of ±45.4 acres from R, Rural District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District to facilitate the future development of 90 single-family lots and an Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) with ±12.5 acres of open space and five public streets. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road. Along with this request is also a request for review and an approval recommendation to City Council. The applicant has requested this application be tabled.

2. Dublin Gateway (Gorden), Preliminary Plat

The subdivision of ±45.4 acres into 90 single-family lots, rights-of-way for five public streets and eight open space reserves. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to table the requests for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and for the Preliminary Plat.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

NEW CASES

3. Tuller Road Townhomes, John Shields and Village Parkways and Tuller Road, 20-028CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Kennedy stated that this application is a request for review and feedback of a future possible development to include 168 attached, single-family homes in 35 buildings with three public streets, and associated site improvements on an 11.61-acre site at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. This site is BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and a recommendation of approval for a Concept Plan for the construction of 168 attached, single-family homes with .9 acres of open space, three public streets, and associated site improvements on ±11.61 acres located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). The BSD development process for new, large-scale development proposals includes three steps, beginning with a Concept Plan. The Concept Plan when intended to be tied to a development agreement requires the Commission to make a recommendation to City Council regarding whether the concept could fit within the District. If approved by Council, it will be followed with a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan. The site is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. Recent adjacent development includes Tuller Flats, which is a for-rent apartment complex. Greystone Mews, an attached, single-family home development, is located to the south. Office and service-oriented uses are located to the north and east. The Bridge Street District Special Area Plan was established in 2010 and a Code for development of that area was adopted in 2012. In May 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission informally reviewed a proposal for a 2.48-acre portion of the site to be developed as townhomes and multi-family lofts. That proposal did not go forward. The BSD Code

establishes Neighborhood Districts where special attention to location and character of buildings, streets, and open spaces is important to establish a coordinated mix of uses that fulfill the objectives identified in the BSD Special Area Plan within the Community Plan. The Sawmill Center Neighborhood District is one of four neighborhood districts located within the Bridge Street District. The neighborhoods are intended to allow for special attention to location and character of streets, buildings and open spaces to establish a coordinated mix of uses. This neighborhood was envisioned to support a mix of uses, including entertainment and service uses supported by residential and office uses. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active mixed-use environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. The Bridge Street District Street Network is the backbone of the BSD Code. It establishes regional connectors, district connectors, and neighborhood streets. With this application, the applicant will be creating that backbone for development. The undeveloped site is located north of John Shields and west of Village Parkway. The existing tree row bisecting the site will be removed.

Proposal

The proposal is for 168 attached single-family units distributed across 35 buildings, which vary in size from three units to eight units, and 0.9-acre of open space on an ±11.61-acre site. The proposal includes the extension of McCune Avenue and two new public streets and will be developed in four blocks: A, B, C, and D. The blocks are proposed to be established by squaring off the intersection of Village Parkway and Tuller Road, and the extension of McCune Avenue (east-west) and creation of two new public streets (north-south). The primary access is centrally located along John Shields Parkway. There is one secondary access point along John Shields Parkway, and two secondary access points along Tuller Road. The site is also accessible along Village Parkway via McCune Avenue. Six internal private drives are proposed. The drives access the rear-loaded garages associated with each unit. The street network map establishes standards for structures that front two streets. Some of the District connectors are established as principal frontage streets. That designation can be added to any street type, although typically not a neighborhood street. John Shields Parkway, Village Parkway and Tuller Road are all principal frontage streets. This designation is intended to minimize the number of vehicular conflicts along those frontages as well as establish a continuous, pedestrian-oriented, street-focused character. All of the buildings in the development will face a principal frontage street or a publicly accessible open space. With the roadway improvements, the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway, which is currently curved, will be squared off. That proposed roadway project is one of the primary reasons the plan will be forwarded to Council for consideration of an infrastructure agreement. Some of the proposed private internal drives will terminate adjacent to principal frontage streets. Staff recommends these elements be revised prior to the Preliminary Development Plan, as principal frontage streets are intended to have building frontages and not visible access to parking areas. Additionally, there are several units where the rear of the unit faces a principal frontage street. For further development of the plan, the applicant will need to address the character of those rear elevations or modify the site layout to screen the elevations. In regard to the proposed four blocks, the Code establishes maximum block lengths and perimeters. The purpose of the regulation is to ensure that the blocks are walkable. The applicant is meeting all of these Code requirements. Further analysis will be provided with the Preliminary Development Plan.

Building Types

Building types are used in the Bridge Street Code versus Permitted Uses, which increases the flexibility of uses within the District. Based on the type and use, the Single-Family Attached

building type is anticipated to be the building type selected in the Preliminary Development Plan. Each building type includes development standards, which are reviewed conceptually in context with the District. This includes the siting of buildings within required build zones; maximum height; lot coverage; permitted materials; parking requirements; and open space.

Architecture

Proposed renderings depict 3.0-story to 3.5-story contemporary buildings emphasizing geometric forms, with parapet roofs emulating a flat roof or pitched roof appearance with a neutral color palette. The applicant has provided two options: Option A, with two variations -- a flat roof or a pitched roof, and Option B. The options are the same base building with alternative exterior characters.

Option A

The difference between the Option A - flat roof and Option A - pitched roof variations is that the pitched roof option allows for a 3.5-story structure with an upper story loft and roof terrace. Staff recommends Option A with a flat roof due to the established modern character of the District. Staff has recommended that the flat roof parapet with a pitched roof should be investigated further by the applicant. The majority of the proposals depict an architectural character that is contemporary and geometric in form, similar to other developments in the Bridge Street District. The base of the structures are clad in brick with cementitious siding on the second and third stories, and in selected areas, some cementitious panels. Staff has recommended that select units be completely brick in order to provide diversity across the elevation and reduce the application of cementitious siding. Also recommended is that the character of the auto-oriented areas, as well as the sides, ensure four-sided architecture. Staff recommends that the garage doors be painted within the auto-oriented areas. Staff has also recommended that the brick on the side elevations should be maintained at the same height as on the front elevations, but could be reduced on the rear elevation. There is a lack of fenestration on the side elevations, which can be revised.

Option B

The applicant has indicated that the intent is that the entire development be of one character. Option B is a side gable structure with decorative front gable elements to add visual interest. This proposal has significantly less brick than the Option A variation. It uses a mix of cementitious materials including horizontal siding, vertical board and batten siding and panels.

Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with nine conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired the reason the applicant desires to redesign the roadway intersection to remove the curve. How would that affect the flow of traffic within the area?

Ms. Martin responded that with the formation of the Bridge Street District in 2010, a traffic study was conducted on the entire 1,000-acre area. As a result of that study, a street network with street classifications was established. A street grid network was also created for the purpose of distributing traffic efficiently. This anticipated squaring off of the intersection was included in that grid, which has been in place since the Bridge Street Code adoption in 2012.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is currently on-street parking on John Shields Parkway. Could there be on-street parking on some of the surrounding streets, as well, such as Tuller Parkway, Village Parkway and the proposed Public Street A? These streets make up the perimeter boundaries. Ms. Martin responded that at this point, the recommendation would not be to re-design those portions of Tuller and Village Parkways. However, the new streets and the extension of McCune could be designed to accommodate on-street parking with bumpouts, in coordination with the Engineering Division.

Ms. Call requested information about the tree line that would be removed. That information is lacking in the packet.

Ms. Martin stated that, at this time, the request is whether the Concept Plan can be further designed and developed under the Bridge Street District Code. If approved, the applicant would be required to provide that level of detail with the Preliminary Development Plan, which would include a tree survey. Any trees that cannot be replaced on site would require a fee paid in lieu of to the City's Tree Fund.

Ms. Call stated that according to her calculations, the open space numbers appear to be off. Perhaps she is missing an area calculation. Is the intent that the small triangular space at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway be included in the open space calculation?

Ms. Martin responded that it should not be included in the calculation, as it will not be Open Space. It is included in the calculation of impervious area.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a definition of what constitutes a park. Are minimum amounts of amenities required?

Ms. Martin responded that the Bridge Street Code includes a table that provides minimum and maximum sizes for each open space, as well as development requirements regarding what can be included. The applicant would need to follow that, if they proceed with the design.

Ms. Call stated that these buildings are required to front principal roadways. There are some good examples of how that has been accomplished, but most are larger structures. Are there examples within the Bridge Street District of smaller parcels such as this that front on multiple corner lots? She is trying to understand how, when there are buildings that oppose one another, there would be buildings that wrap frontages on all four corners.

Ms. Martin responded that the most analogous development would be Tuller Flats. However, they do not have three sides on principal frontage streets. They are two-sided on principal frontage streets or cornered by neighborhood public streets.

Mr. Grimes inquired if, in context with the development further down the street, staff would have any preferences in regard to the roofs and architectural materials in the proposed development. What would staff recommend continuing, changing, or making more unique?

Ms. Martin responded that the Building Code requires building diversity not only within one development but also across developments. Staff would recommend this plan address that context, as a modern, contemporary, infill project, diversifying it from other projects.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio stated that also present for this case is Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, who will be covering the housing product and other locations within the nation where the builder is building this product. This will be one of the first locations in this area for this particular product. He will provide some background on this site. Previously, an independent living facility project was proposed for this site, with which he was involved. After undergoing numerous hearings with the Commission and City Council, the project was abandoned. He and Mr. Callahan have tried to take information from those earlier hearings and use it in developing this proposal. One of those earlier concerns was the monolithic building with significant street frontage. This new proposal includes multiple buildings. There were also earlier concerns about the lack of open space along John Shields and lack of opportunities for interaction between buildings and the community. There are balconies on the backs of these units; there may be ways to have those on the fronts, as well, or in lieu of rear balconies. That is a level of detail that would be covered in the Preliminary Development Plan, not the Concept Plan stage, of the development. Staff's concerns as identified would be addressed in that next stage. This is a "for sale" product for which a range of buyers is anticipated – empty nesters, young professionals and families. Pulte's history in other markets reflects this buyer trend. Pricing will be in the mid-\$300K. There is a rental product to the west, and Bridge Park has a unique mix of residents. They believe the proposed product will meet a market niche between the two. The squaring off of Tuller Parkway is proposed, and is the primary reason that this application will be reviewed by City Council, as well. A development agreement will be necessary to accomplish a land swap. It will involve some financial assistance from the City via a TIF or other means, due to the fact that it is a project that will benefit the area at large.

Architecture is a difficult topic, because it tends to be in the "eye of the beholder." With the previous project, the applicant received conflicting feedback during reviews. One opinion directed them to follow the Tuller Flats example; another requested more traditional architecture. With this new proposal, they have provided two options of different directions. The examples are not specific proposals for Dublin; they are examples of other projects they have built. Their goal is to obtain clear direction on which direction to take this project, which they will then Dublinize as they proceed.

The applicant is in agreement with all of staff's recommended conditions except the third condition, which is related to maximum parking. The calculations appear to suggest they are greatly exceeding the maximum Code requirement. However, the nature of this product – having a garage that is internal, beneath and behind the living space – lends itself to needing a small driveway. With a "for sale" product, there is an expectation for a driveway. Backing out directly onto a community driveway is not the expectation here; that would be more common with an apartment complex. They believe this is a situation where a deviation may be warranted; although, they are open to providing other places in which guests could park outside of the proposed spaces.

Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, stated that Pulte Homes is best known for building conventional, single-family homes throughout central Ohio, with a few isolated townhome products. In some of their other urban markets, townhomes are their primary product type. In central Ohio, they have been looking for the right opportunity and location for this product. When the previous application for this site was being considered, he was present for another case but recognized the opportunity for this site. They have studied the Bridge Street Code and looked at the context of the surrounding area, and have developed an approach and

proposal that they believe fits well within the District. They have offered an affordable option for purchasing a new home within the Dublin community.

Greg Chillog, Principal, Planner/Landscape Architect, The Edge Group, Inc., 330 W. Spring Street, Columbus, 43215, stated that this plan essentially designed itself due to the prescriptive nature of the Bridge Street Code. The primary task was to understand the Code. He will attempt to identify where and why the open spaces are where they are. John Shields Parkway is the spine through the District, and they would like to create a rhythm of different spaces and different sizes of the project viewed along that roadway. Beginning at its intersection with Village Parkway, that roadway extends down to the river. At its halfway point, the Tuller Flats community has a large, prominent park, so what they have attempted to provide is a gateway element, such as a pocket plaza with some pavement, seating and perhaps a community feature or some branding element for the District. Continuing along John Shields, there would be two additional pocket plazas before reaching the large, central greenspace. Before reaching that central greenspace, there would be a diversity of building frontages and open spaces along the roadway. Inside this development, along the public streets, will be some smaller, more traditional pocket parks with a community amenity, such as a mailbox kiosk. They have worked hard to provide mid-block crossings for pedestrians through the development. From east to west, the grade drops approximately 25 feet across the site. That helps with the rhythm of the buildings, allowing them to adjust the grade between the buildings. This building type provides more opportunity to do that, as opposed to larger, more monolithic structures. They have worked on providing 22- to 24-ft. wide private vehicular driveways along the private roads or alleyways, which will provide access to the rear of the building with the attached, integrated two-car garages and vehicular stacking space in front of the garages. In the next phase, they will address ways in which to integrate and screen that private stacking space separate from the public space in the front. These driveways are essential for a "for sale" product.

Keith Philipkowski, Pulte Homes, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that he is the architect for this project. [Displayed slides of streetscape views of the proposed community.] He understands that the Bridge Street Code establishes specific measures to account for building variety, and color and massing differences in the homes are ways in which to promote that diversity. Their intent is to customize the elevations for the community as a whole. Although not shown in the Concept Plan, finer details such as the screening of utilities are very important and will be addressed as the project proceeds. The inspiration of their design is primarily Tuller Flats, due to the similar geography. There is also an option for a more traditional appearance. At the Concept design stage, they are very open to design suggestions and would appreciate that feedback to ensure they pursue a desired direction. They have worked on both a flat roof and a pitched roof design, attempting to blend some features. Some detail is provided regarding how the overhang reacts with a gabled roof. The community may be able to see a gabled roof from the front façade and the ends of units more readily. Staff has recommended the flat roof option; however, that option may be problematic for achieving a third-level walkout onto rooftop terraces. Part of the inspiration for rooftop terraces is the intent to create an opportunity for outdoor living. To achieve that, rooftop terraces are very important. Decks also will be provided on the rear elevations to promote the outdoor living aspect. In regard to four-sided architecture, the side elevations will be addressed in a more pronounced manner as the plan proceeds. In regard to the Code requirements for fenestrations, windows will be added where possible, simultaneously protecting the interior configurations of the homes. If the window opportunities become too limited, they are interested in collectively identifying a solution. For any floorplan Pulte introduces,

there is a lengthy 12-step process, beginning with ideation and ending with a prototype building. Virtual visualization is utilized, as well as consumer feedback testing. The concept is to have a floorplan shell with interchangeability. For instance, the floorplan rendering shown would be re-configured based on kitchen placement. Although the townhouse product is not the core of Pulte's business in Ohio, in Cleveland they do offer a variety of townhome series. The core of their business is in New England. The floorplan shown is one of their most successful in urban markets. Over time, it has been fine-tuned to cater to the market. The Option B alternative shown has a more traditional look, but other traditional looks are possible, dependent upon the Commission's feedback. He requests the Commission's preference regarding a flat vs. a pitched roof.

There was no public comment.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired if the floorplan has sufficient flexibility to provide a mix of front and rear terraces.

Mr. Philipkowski stated they had discussed that concept, but preferred the public-facing opportunity for outdoor living. He believes there may be that flexibility, but it would require further vetting. If that is an element the majority of the Commission would prefer, they would focus their efforts on achieving it for the next phase of the approval process.

Mr. Grimes inquired about the intent for provision of mail and for refuse/trash pickup. Would it be the homeowners' responsibility or would there be a common area for collection?

Mr. Callahan responded that there would be a private trash pickup for each home. The homeowner association would handle that contract, and the cost would be included in the monthly HOA fees. In regard to mailboxes, the USPS has new regulations requiring all new communities to have centralized mailbox facilities. This is also the case for new single-home communities. In this particular community, the plan includes two centralized mail facilities along the McCune Avenue extension. Those areas would be gathering spaces, as well, not just centralized mail locations. The space could include benches, gazebos and trellises.

Ms. Call stated in regard to parking:

- a. If there is a balcony overhang on the rear elevation, having a street with cars driving immediately beneath would be undesirable. Therefore, she has no objection to individual driveways on the back of the units, which would provide two exterior parking spaces in addition to the two interior garage spaces.
- b. What is the anticipated parking occupancy rate? The proposal would provide 364 spaces in excess of what is required for the project. Could it be an over-parked product? Is an interior garage parking rate of 80% anticipated? If so, what would the anticipated exterior parking rate be?

Mr. Callahan responded that with owner-occupied homes, private parking is very desirable to owners. Some owners use their garages for storage, so will need the additional exterior parking spaces for their vehicles, keeping them out of the public drives and roadways. They do not believe the proposed community will be overparked. They are currently building a townhome community in the Pickerington market, which is a distinct, very different approach for townhomes. At the request of the existing homeowners, they have added additional parking areas to the community.

In attached-unit communities, parking becomes a premium, and often is insufficient. He does not believe this project could be overparked, but they will work with staff to identify the correct solution.

Mr. Chillog stated that from the design perspective of the townhome product, interior parking inside the structure is an essential. It provides the homeowner parking privacy and security.

Ms. Call stated that the principal roadways here are John Shields Parkway, Village Parkway and Tuller Road. The Code requires that a building structure face the principal roadway, but where there are two 90-degree angles, that is difficult to accomplish. How would those corners appear if they were fronted by buildings?

Mr. Chillog responded that those corners are very important. Extra time and attention will be necessary to achieve the best appearance possible. The streetscape is as important to Pulte as it is to the City. It is essential that there be accent features in these key places for the product to present well. It may be necessary to over emphasize four-sided architecture here. It is difficult to articulate how it would look without actually designing it, however.

Ms. Call stated that she believes staff's concerns are with two particular road stubs. Four-sided architecture may address the building itself, but it would not address the fact that the frontage needs to be fronted by a building. Are there other incidences in the District where multiple sides of the same building have a frontage requirement?

Mr. Chillog responded that they do not have an L-shaped building with this product type that would satisfy the Code requirement on that corner. This is an opportunity for them to come up with a creative solution that provides a visual barrier from the public side to the private side. It may be architectural, landscaping or both.

Ms. Call stated that they mentioned mailbox structures and benches in the interior pocket parks. Are any other amenities being considered for those interior pocket parks?

Mr. Callahan responded that ideas have been discussed for these gathering places, such as covered structures. Particularly for the pocket parks on the north side of McCune Street, they want to articulate with some design features. They will bring back more evolved ideas on those features at the Preliminary Development Plan stage. In regard to the earlier question about the building frontage on the corner – treating those key points via the buildings and through site and landscape architecture - planning will be important. What occurs on the ground and in the surrounding areas has as much visual effect as what occurs on the building. A combination of both will be utilized to come up with the best solution.

Ms. Kennedy, referring to the lower left corner of block B, stated that a road dead-ends there. The materials refer to a masonry or wrought iron element being placed in that location. The "feel" between the buildings is abrupt. Due to the amount of material already present at that corner, what is the logic in adding such an element at that location?

Mr. Chillog responded that at the Concept Plan level, it is suggested because the Code requires it there. Although it is responsive to the Code requirement, they recognize that a 3-ft. high masonry wall does not work there.

Ms. Martin stated that staff has a collaborative relationship with the applicant, so they will be working together to identify an appropriate resolution.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if staff's preference would be a landscaping element.

Ms. Martin responded that they would begin by looking at the site layout with the applicant to determine if the smaller building closest to the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Public Street A could become more than a 4 or 5-unit building and the 8-unit building on Public Street A become only a 5-unit building. Thereby, the drive would terminate at the rear of the John Shields building. These are some of the options that could be discussed as the plan develops.

Mr. Callahan stated that it is important that they remain consistent with the rest of the building structures. When he refers to emphasizing character at a corner, they will be mindful of not being out of character with the whole, as well. They would prefer to integrate other methods of addressing the corner rather than physically changing the layout. He does not want the expectation to be anything different than they would consider to be appropriate in the end.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if, with the flat roof variations of Option A, the pitched roof would be necessary to have rooftop terraces.

Mr. Chillog responded affirmatively. As he considers how best to achieve that solution, it is very important to have feedback from the Commission on the flat roof option with rooftop terraces.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the product would be consistent throughout the four blocks, or would there be a mix of floorplans, perhaps differing in the blocks.

Mr. Chillog responded that one or two primary floorplan configurations would be used throughout the community, but those floorplans can be diversified throughout the units.

Mr. Grimes inquired about the roads.

Ms. Martin responded that all of the new and extended streets would be public neighborhood streets designed to public standards. The driveways or alleyways accessing the units will be private and maintained by the HOA, as established by the developer.

Mr. Callahan referred to the pitched roof rendering, and noted that this design concept is interesting. The buildings have the appearance of flat roofs because of the parapet extension off the front; however, they have pitched roofs, which provide ability for rooftop terrace, third-floor living. They are interested in having the Commission's feedback on this option.

Mr. Chillog stated that one of the ways variety is achieved is through roof design. In instances where they may not elect to have rooftop terraces – such as building sites less suitable for that feature -- there would be ability to lower those roofs.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that Mr. Underhill has requested Commission feedback particularly in regard to flat versus pitched roofs and the parking deviation.

Mr. Underhill responded that is correct. On everything else, they have clear guidance.

Ms. Call stated that she has no concerns related to the proposed parking. Of note, the Code's minimum is also the maximum permitted. She would like to see some integrated on-street parking, particularly in the pocket park areas. There is some on-street parking along John Shields Parkway, but there should be some opportunity for visitor parking outside the unit driveways. In regard to the pocket park amenities, a mail kiosk is not really an amenity, although they can look attractive if located within an enclosure as opposed to consisting of a multi-tenant mailbox

arrangement. She would not visit a park to look at the pretty mailboxes, but she and her children would have gone there to use play equipment, for a picnic, for Frisbee golf, or other real amenities. In the urban areas of Dublin, people want to live, work and play. While a resident could take a walk to see a movie or go to a farmers market, what are the true amenities for this particular neighborhood? Dublin likes to be "a cut above," so the Commission is interested in partnerships. That is the reason the Commission asks detailed questions – to formulate that partnership and learn how amenable the applicant is to such a relationship for the purpose of achieving the best product possible for present and future Dublin residents. She really likes the roof terraces, so prefers the pitched roof option that looks like a flat roof, particularly with the rear terraces, as depicted in the meeting materials. She also likes the variety of open spaces, which creates an interesting visual experience along the street to the culmination of the new park on Riverside Drive. She is excited with the degree of opportunity here and is interested in a collaborative effort to realize it. This Concept Plan proposes a fantastic product, and she is looking forward to seeing it completed.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the rooftop terraces, as well. It is a very nice feature that distinguishes the product. He is concerned about the view when travelling down John Shields Parkway. The property located above this development, and residents travelling down Tuller Road will be looking at this product as the gateway piece. This will be a highly visible product from all directions. Care must be taken as to how it presents from all angles, not only as the face of this product. but for its "feel" to the greater community.

Mr. Supelak stated that he entirely agrees with the points made about four-sided architecture. Sensitivity can solve some of the corner and rear of building conditions. This item is addressed by #6 in the recommended conditions. He concurs with Ms. Call on the unit driveways. They are an important amenity to homeowners. There is also merit to having opportunities for on-street parking adjacent to pocket parks. It may be nice on Public Street A. On-street parking provides opportunity for front door approaches to the homes for visitors, as opposed to garage approaches. In regard to the architecture, he recognizes that this is a product already used in other areas that is being adapted to this community, but it is a good product. With this many buildings, diversity will be very important. With rowhouse buildings, there are some opportunities for diversity on the elevations. However, the end units have opportunities to be massed a little differently, and thereby be addressed through four-sided architecture. There are some end units, for instance, that do not face another unit. Larger bumpouts can change the relief on a side unit and provide opportunity for a second balcony, perhaps. Empty nesters often prefer living space without stairs. There is opportunity to reduce the height of end units. In the bottom of the left corner, there was a suggestion to swap the building on Public Street A with the building on John Shields Parkway. However, if the building on Public Street A were to be repositioned slightly and a special unit added at the elbow, that would close the street up and create an intentional corner. There would be no need to add wall features or other articulations. Focusing on sensitivity with the corners will begin to define those opportunities. An additional level of design is needed at this point. Staff provided material recommendations for the facades. On the third level of some buildings, all brick was used. On some elevations, there were multiple types of brick or stone. Two materials rather than one will help with diversity, so he concurs with staff regarding the need to extend the diversity up the façade. If a parapet is used with a flat roof solution, he would advocate for adding more vertical relief. He likes the rooftop terrace concept, if the roofline aesthetics succeed. It is a selling point and an amenity that will enrich this community. Balconies on the front façade would provide diversity on that side. He likes the proposed approach to open space and amenities.

He recognizes that the plan is in the concept stage, but the landscaping appears to be low-lying. He would encourage incorporating vertical landscape elements to the building facades. Chimneys can add articulation, perhaps in the end units, which are aesthetically lacking. He is confident this experienced builder will address such issues, and if the corner conditions are addressed well, he is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is in agreement with other Commissioners regarding a preference for Option A with a pitched roof. She likes the open space continued here as it is in other areas of Bridge Park. There are opportunities in this area for great views. As mentioned earlier, she would prefer the proposed masonry or wrought iron element be replaced with a landscape element. She concurs with the comments on the building wrap-arounds and how those are represented on the corner spaces. The pocket park areas facing John Shields Parkway are so small that they are likely unusable. She would like to see some additional considerations for those open spaces. Perhaps having fewer small spaces in favor of some larger spaces. She concurs with Mr. Supelak's comments that there are some opportunities to make the architecture more expressive and interesting. At this point, it seems too sterile. She would like to see more character and dimension. The proposed structures are similar to apartment buildings – flat fronts without diversity. She would encourage a more individual character, a different look from anything around the site. With those recommendations, she is very excited about this proposed addition to Dublin.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had received responses to his questions and had clear direction. There are some Commission members absent tonight.

Mr. Underhill responded that they appreciate the feedback and consensus among the members present. Their guidance is appreciated.

Mr. Chillog inquired if, as he works on refining the proposed design, he is unable to accomplish all of the direction given, would the Commission be opposed to his changing directions to a completely traditional architectural character. Is the Commission interested in seeing only a contemporary style of architecture?

Ms. Call responded that she much prefers Option A with the pitched roof over Option B, or a contemporary, minimalist design, assuming the quality is high.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Bridge Street Code is more amenable to one architectural approach over another.

Ms. Martin responded that the Bridge Street Code principles can be applied to any architectural style. The traditional style must meet the development character defined in the Code.

Mr. Supelak that he concurs with Ms. Call's comments, but Option B is also good, as the dormers help in breaking up the roofline. If not Option B, any other traditional design could do so, as well. Pulte is an experienced builder, and he is confident that they can work with staff and achieve the best design solution for this site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she prefers a traditional design. It is different and would stand out more as opposed to matching everything around it. It is more similar to the construction at The Grand, which achieves more diversity. However, she is supportive of either design approach, as long as it is of a high quality and meets the required characteristics for this site.

Mr. Underhill reiterated the applicant's request to delete Condition #3, related to the parking. With the condition, if they are unable to meet the Code requirement, it would be necessary to

return to the Commission later to request a waiver. They would like to have the ability to resolve the issue without that necessity.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the applicant would be in agreement with the remaining eight conditions. Mr. Underhill responded that the applicant is in agreement.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Call seconded to recommend approval of the Concept Plan to City Council with the following 8 conditions:

- 1) The applicant clarify and update the plans accordingly if 168 or 171 units are proposed prior to City Council review.
- 2) The applicant revise the site layout to minimize the view of auto-oriented drives and the rear of units from principal frontage streets.
- 3) The applicant work with the City Engineer to establish dedicated parking lanes with bump-outs prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 4) The applicant update the plan to meet the maximum impervious lot coverage permitted by Code.
- 5) The applicant revise the building elevations to have four-sided architecture with additional attention to the side and rear of the homes prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 6) The applicant revise the building elevations to limit the application of cementitious siding and panels prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 7) The applicant identify air conditioning unit locations and other utility locations with required screening prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 8) The applicant update the plan to meet the open space diversity required by Code.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
[Motion passed 4-0]

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Kennedy noted that there were no requests to remove the following items from the Consent Agenda:

4. The Corners, Rings Road and Frantz Road, 20-028 FP, Final Plat

The subdivision of ±24 acres into three lots for the future development of ±70,000 square feet of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is at the intersection of Frantz Road and Rings Road and currently zoned OLR, Office Laboratory & Research and PUD, Planned Unit Development District.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend approval of the Final Plat to Council with the following two conditions:

- 1) The applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal, and;
- 2) That the City coordinate the vacation of the retention easement in the southeast portion of the site.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

5. University Boulevard , Shier Rings Road, 20-027 FP, Final Plat

A provision for a subdivision and the dedication of right-of-way for University Boulevard to extend from Shier-Rings Road west to intersect with Eiterman Road and the creation of five lots for development. The 101.4-acre site is north of Shier Rings Road, west of the intersection with Avery Road and zoned ID-1, Research and Development District, and PUD, Planned Unit Development District (OSU Wesner Medical Center Plan) in the West Innovation District.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend approval of the Final Plat to Council with the following condition:

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

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 4-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Staff reported the following:

- At the February 13 joint Council-PZC-ARB meeting, members discussed educational opportunities for members. A recommendation from the joint meeting discussion was that a tour of certain Dublin development sites be scheduled to improve members' awareness. An email was sent to Commission members inquiring what sites the members would like included in the tour. To date, only one response has been received. Remaining members are encouraged to offer their suggestions, as well. Tour plans can be discussed at the April 2, 2020 meeting, at which attendance of all Commission members is anticipated.

Ms. Call noted that information helpful to have beforehand would be identification of which of the tour sites are examples of development that, in retrospect, Council would either encourage or discourage.

Mr. Grimes stated that it would be helpful to have any history or future direction anticipated for the sites.

Ms. Call suggested that staff also point out any projects that resulted in future burden for the City.

Commission members expressed a preference for a Friday afternoon tour date and more than one date, if needed. Opportunities for self-guided tours could be beneficial to some members.

- Commission members are asked to provide updated personal contact information to staff to ensure more timely exchange of information.
- Commission members expressed consensus for scheduling a future PZC meeting at 6:00 p.m. to permit a Dublin City Schools representative to address potential impact of new zoning and development on School District planning efforts.
- The Central Ohio Planning and Zoning workshop is scheduled for Friday, May 8, 2020, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Commission members are encouraged to contact staff if they would like to attend. The theme is "Creating Great Places."

- The National Planning Conference is scheduled Saturday, April 25 through Tuesday, April 28, 2020 in Houston, Texas. Any Commissioner interested in attending should contact staff to register. An email reminder with conference information will be forwarded to Commissioners tomorrow.
- Election of the April 2020 - April 2021 PZC Chair and Vice Chair will occur at the April 2, 2020 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council