



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 30, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Kennedy, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening remarks: "Good evening and welcome to the first virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. We are living in extraordinary times. Both the State of Ohio and the City of Dublin have declared states of emergency. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the duration of the Stay at Home Order, we will be holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible. We welcome your comments on cases, please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. This is not a perfect system, but we will do our best in these difficult times. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mayor Amorose Groomes administered the Oath of Office to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) re-appointee Warren Fishman.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes, Jane Fox, Warren Fishman

Commission members absent: Lance Schneier

Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Nichole Martin, Zachary Hounshell, Aaron Stanford, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Thaddeus Boggs

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Ms. Call moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to appoint Kristina Kennedy as Vice Chair for the term of April 2020 through March 31, 2021.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.
[Motion passed 6-0]

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to appoint Rebecca Call as the Chair for the term April 2020 through March 31, 2021.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion passed 6-0]

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of March 5, 2020.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.
[Motion passed 6-0]

Ms. Call 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. Call swore in staff and members of the public who intended to address the Commission on this evening's cases.

Ms. Call stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. Cases 1 through 4 may be approved by consent if the staff, applicant and the Commission agree on all conditions.

There was no request that a Consent item be moved to the regular agenda for discussion. No public comments were received regarding these cases.

CONSENT CASES

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to approve the following cases by consent:

1. Deer Run Estates – Subarea A, 20-030AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Lot dimension and easement adjustments to a previously approved Final Development Plan for a site west of Dublin Rd, ± 850 feet north of the intersection with Memorial Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

APPROVAL WITH ONE CONDITION:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to re-establish the required landscape screen along the northern property line.

2. Deer Run Estates – Subarea A, 20-030FP, Final Plat

A revision to a previously approved Final Plat to revise lot dimension and easements for a site west of Dublin Road, ±850 feet north of the intersection with Memorial Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH ONE CONDITION:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments prior to submitting the plat for Council acceptance.

3. Sundai Student Tutoring, 20-042CU, Conditional Use

An educational and research use in an existing 1,150-square-foot tenant space west of Frantz Road, ±950 feet north of the intersection with Blazer Parkway, zoned Planned Unit Development District (Millennium Office Complex).

APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE WITH NO CONDITIONS

4. Townplace Suites Marriott, 20-058WR – BSD-C, Waiver Review

A waiver to allow building vents and louvers on street facing facades for a site on the south side of Upper Metro Place, ±550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road and zoned Bridge Street District - Commercial.

APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER WITH NO CONDITIONS

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

PREVIOUSLY TABLED CASES

5. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road, 17-061/PDP, Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

6. Dublin Gateway (Gorden Development), 7270 & 7150 Hyland-Croy Road, 17-061PP, Preliminary Plat

Ms. Call stated that Case 5 is a request for a recommendation to City Council for a rezoning with a preliminary development plan of ±45.4 acres from Rural District to a Planned Unit Development District to facilitate the future residential and institutional development of approximately 12.7 acres of open space. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy and Post Roads. Case 6 is for the same site, and the request is for a recommendation to City Council for a Preliminary Plat to subdivide the site. The Commission will hear the cases together.

Staff Presentation

Proposal

Ms. Martin stated this is a request for a recommendation to City Council for a rezoning with a preliminary development plan and preliminary plat for Dublin Gateway. This is the second step in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. In 2015, a Concept Plan was reviewed by the

Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), and the applicant has proceeded to the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan stage. Ultimately, this plan will proceed to City Council for final approval. The Commission will review a Final Development Plan in the future, which will contain all the details regarding the structures, site landscaping and signage.

Site

The ±45.4-acre site is located northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road. The site is generally rectangular with 3,300 feet of frontage along Hyland-Croy Road and 500 feet of frontage along Post Road with an average width of approximately 550 feet. The site is comprised of two parcels. The parcel to the south contains a historic farmstead and outbuildings, which are accessed via Post Road. The parcel to the north contains two single-family homes, each with their own private driveways with access off Hyland-Croy Road. The site is surrounded by established single-family neighborhoods, including Post Preserve and Park Place. Recently, a new multi-family development, Jerome Grand, has been constructed within Jerome Township on the west side of Hyland-Croy Road. Because Hyland-Croy Road also is within the jurisdiction of the Union County, the City of Dublin and Union County Engineer have coordinated reviews of this application.

History

In 2015, the Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for this project. On January 9, 2020, the Commission reviewed a Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat for Gateway Dublin. The applications were met with opposition from the Commission and adjacent residents concerning the proposed density and size of the assisted living facility, as well as the setbacks and lot sizes between the proposed residential space and the adjacent neighborhood. PZC members expressed concern regarding the overall lack of alignment with the Community Plan. The applications were tabled at the applicant's request, and following the hearing, the applicant worked with staff to revise the plans to address the concerns of the Commission and residents. On March 5, 2020, the applications were tabled without hearing at the applicant's request. Tonight's packet contains the materials provided for the March 5 meeting packet with some minor updates. The following updates were made to the plan that was originally presented:

General

- Updated open space plan dedicating all reserves, with the exception of Reserve A, to the City.
- Eliminated allowance of any vinyl cladding or trim in Subareas A and B.
- Street tree provisions, including planting and selections, per the City Forester's direction.

Subarea A (Adult Congregate Living Facility)

- Age restriction to 55 years and older per the Fair Housing Act.
- Building height reduced to a maximum of two stories and 35 feet in height.
- Added a maximum height of 25 feet for accessory structures.

Subarea B (Single Family)

- Increased the number of base building elevations from 4 to 6, which equate to approximately 15 homes of each building type among the 90 proposed units.
- Eliminated the provision allowing fences.
- Increased to 50 percent the permitted percent of the front façade that can be garage.
- Commitment to provide an open space maintenance plan with the Final Development Plan.
- Updated sign provisions to create consistent standards for signs associated with

Subareas A, B and Post Preserve.

Community Plan

The Future Land Use Map in the Community Plan has two land use classifications for the site. The northern third is Suburban Residential Low Density (1-2 dwelling units per acre), while the remaining two-thirds are Mixed Residential Low Density (up to 3 dwelling units per acre). When calculated across the 45-acre site, the combined recommended density is approximately 121 single-family or two-family residential units. As previously noted, an Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) is being proposed, which is not contemplated by the Community Plan. If contemplated, it would be designated as a General Institutional Use. The Community Plan does not make a density recommendation for that type of use, although it should be contextually sensitive. The Community Plan includes Special Area Plans, which hone in on character details for specific regions of the City. This site falls within the Northwest Glacier Ridge Special Area Plan. The Plan recommends single-family, detached homes should be developed adjacent to existing neighborhoods and recommends preserving the rural character of Hyland-Croy Road. Additionally, the Thoroughfare Plan, which is in the Community Plan, designates Hyland-Croy Road as a minor arterial, and despite being within the Union County jurisdiction, recommends a planned right-of-way of 100 feet to accommodate future improvements. Hyland-Croy Road has a rural corridor character, typified by generous 100-200-ft. setbacks. In 2016, the City and adjacent jurisdictions including Union County, Jerome Township, and the City of Marysville, undertook a multijurisdictional planning effort, the Crossroads Area Plan, to evaluate existing conditions and propose common land uses, infrastructure, and economic development strategies for the area located at the crossroads of US33/S.R.161/Post Road, and Hyland-Croy Road. The recommendations of that plan are consistent with the Community Plan.

Subareas A and B

The proposal is for 45 acres divided into two subareas. In Subarea A, the ACLF is proposed at the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road; it will contain up to 150 units located on 10 acres with open space along the frontage. Subarea B will contain up to 90 single-family lots on 35 acres and will be developed in two phases. Subarea B is bisected by the north fork of Indian Run, which is protected by a stream corridor protection zone; therefore, large reserves of open space are recommended. The applicant is proposing five new public rights-of-way with this project, as well as 8 reserves of open space and 3 access points. The development standards have been modified to address the Commission's concerns. The permitted uses remain the same. The ACLF is permitted to be up to 14,500 sq. feet per acre with a maximum lot coverage of 70%. Parking spaces are permitted at .5 - 1.0 parking spaces per unit. The minimum standards for Subarea B are designated by interior lots and perimeter lots. The perimeter lots are intended to maintain the character adjacent to the neighborhood on the eastern and northern boundaries. The interior lots are intended to provide a mixed residential per the Community Plan with a variety of lot sizes at varying price points. The minimum lot size is approximately 6,000 sq. feet. The proposed lot coverage for interior lots is up to 70%, and for perimeter lots it is up to 60%. Open space in the development will comprise 12.4 acres, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 5 acres. Subarea A contains 2 open spaces; Subarea B contains 6 open spaces. The HOA will maintain the open spaces within Subarea B, but the City will own the open spaces. The City will maintain all the stormwater functions of the basins, as well as the shared-use paths. Four (4) signs are

proposed: one (1) 20-sq. ft. sign for the ACLF; two (2) signs at 20 square feet each for the subdivision; and one (1) sign for Post Preserve.

Traffic Impact Study

A traffic impact study is currently under review by both the City of Dublin and the Union County Engineer's office. The study provides analysis of the traffic generation, as well as proposed mitigation. At this time, the study is not complete, although it must be completed prior to City Council review of the project. Eight (8) intersections, three of which are new with this development, have been studied, as well as trips at the AM and PM peak hours. The preliminary findings are recommending southbound and northbound turn lanes, as well as an intersection control, likely signalization at the Grand Gateway intersection at Hyland-Croy Road. Additionally, the City and Union County anticipate offsite contributions to the Post Road-SR161 intersection.

Preliminary Plat

Review and approval of a Preliminary Plat also is requested. The purpose of a plat is to subdivide land for development, including the parcels, easements and dedicated rights-of-way. Ninety (90) single-family lots are proposed with five (5) public rights-of-way, eight (8) reserves of open space and a remnant parcel for the ACLF.

Staff has reviewed the project against the applicable development criteria and recommends approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with four (4) conditions and approval of the preliminary plat with three (3) conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes requested clarification of the City's perspective on the Grand Gateway Drive ingress and egress.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that there is a long history with this site, with the Post Preserve connection, and the proposed interchange improvements at US33/SR161. Several years ago, improvements were planned for the interchange, which were not funded. However, the City was aware that ODOT would be requiring a change in the access to the Post Preserve neighborhood. The access is currently at Perimeter Drive east of Hyland-Croy Road. There have been public meetings regarding an alternate access point to Hyland-Croy Road for the Post Preserve Blvd. This proposal offers such an alignment. Currently, there is funding for the interchange improvements to begin in 2022.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the theory is that signalization of the Grand Gateway Drive intersection would better handle peak hour traffic volumes.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that, currently, signalization is proposed based upon meeting the minimum volume thresholds per State and Federal Guidelines. That aspect will be analyzed as the study progresses. At this point, it appears a traffic signal could be warranted with the addition of this development and the redirection of the Post Preserve neighborhood roads and an increase in volume on Hyland-Croy Road.

Mr. Grimes inquired if there is an anticipated time for the completion of the traffic study.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that it has not yet been resubmitted. There is a proposed condition that would address this timeline.

Ms. Martin stated that a condition is included that requires, "The applicant continue to work with the City and Union County to complete the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Union County Engineer, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council." Essentially, that defines the timeframe for completion. The following condition addresses a companion document, "That the applicant work with the City of Dublin and Union County to develop an Infrastructure Agreement for consideration by City Council. This should be submitted in conjunction with the submission of the rezoning to City Council."

Ms. Fox inquired if, dependent on the traffic study, there is an understanding that there will be an expense to develop mitigation to accommodate the number of homes that will be developed under this proposal.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded affirmatively. There are turn lanes that the developer would be expected to install and a traffic control device, either a traffic signal or roundabout, added at the main entrance, as well as off-site infrastructure improvements. In addition to the existing access points, three additional access points would be installed along Hyland Croy Road.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the jurisdiction in which Hyland-Croy Road lies, and whose responsibility it is to pay for infrastructure along that roadway.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that whenever there is a rezoning, the site development is responsible for mitigating their impacts to the roadway network. Hyland-Croy Road is shared by jurisdictions. Union County owns and maintains the frontage of this site. Farther north, near Brand Road, Hyland-Croy Road lies within the City of Dublin.

Ms. Fox stated that for this project to proceed, there would need to be an agreement between Union County and the City of Dublin addressing infrastructure improvements and maintenance.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that there would need to be a formal infrastructure agreement with the private development, Union County Engineer's Office and City of Dublin. In regard to long-term maintenance – the public right-of-way would be maintained by the jurisdiction in which it lies.

Mr. Fishman stated that the 100-ft. setback along that roadway is very valuable. Would it be lost in this area with this development?

Ms. Martin responded that it would not. The applicant is dedicating 50 feet of new right-of-way, in addition to the existing 100-ft. setback.

Mr. Supelak stated that the history on this project reflects continuous concerns about the density. A list was provided of a few comparable developments that were approved, relative to coverage. Are there also examples of developments with comparable lot sizes?

Ms. Martin stated that the most comparable neighborhood recently approved would be Hamlet on Jerome, which was approved in 2018. The minimum lot size in that neighborhood is 5,000 sq. feet, and the maximum permitted lot coverage is 70%. That is consistent with the interior lots that are proposed. The other two subdivisions, developed in 2017 and 2015, are Autumn Rose Woods and the Riviera subdivision. The lots in those subdivisions are more comparable to the perimeter lots in the proposed development. Autumn Rose Woods' lots are required to be a minimum of 9,100 sq. feet with a maximum lot coverage of 45%. The Riviera subdivision has three different standards: a minimum of 13,000 sq. feet with a maximum of 45% lot coverage; a minimum of 9,750 sq. feet with a maximum of 45% lot coverage; and a minimum of 7,200 sq. feet with up to 70% lot coverage.

Ms. Call inquired if staff is aware of the distribution of those units. Is it 33% across each type?

Ms. Martin responded that she is not aware of the distribution percentage; however, the total density of Riviera is 1.22 units/acre. Subarea C has the fewest number of lots.

Ms. Husak stated that, per City Code, the standard is 45% lot coverage for residential zoning districts including Planned Districts, unless an alternative standard is approved in the development text. The maximum coverage is 60%-70%. Even if the lots are smaller, often, the homes are large. Many homeowners prefer to have less area to maintain.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if it is typical for the open spaces to be owned by the City but maintained by the HOA.

Ms. Martin responded that it is standard for the City to own all the open spaces, excluding commercial open spaces. For that reason, the City would not own the open space within Subarea A of the proposed development. The City does pay the property tax on those open spaces. The maintenance responsibility varies between neighborhoods.

Ms. Fox inquired what is Post Preserve's density and lot coverage.

Ms. Husak responded that the lot coverage is 45%. The density is approximately 1.8 – 2.0 units per acre.

Ms. Fox inquired how the units per acre would be determined for the proposed 90 single-family homes. Is it calculated by number of units or by square footage of building on square footage of acreage? What is the density of the 90 units on 35.5 acres?

Ms. Martin responded that dwelling units per acre is calculated by taking the number of dwelling units and dividing it by the total acreage; therefore, 90 units divided by 35.5 is 2.5 units per acre. The ACLF is not calculated the same as the single-family residential, because it is a commercial use. That calculation is made in square feet per acre. They are allowing a maximum of 14,500 square feet per acre, which is decreased from the 15,000 square feet originally proposed in December, and they have eliminated the option for a Conditional Use to request additional density.

Ms. Fox inquired if allowing an increase in lot coverage also would be permitting a greater density on the acreage.

Ms. Husak responded that each lot is permitted one unit. The density calculation does not take into consideration how large the unit is.

Ms. Fox stated that if the coverage is 70% versus 45%, the density of the space appears greater, as well.

Ms. Martin stated that what she is describing is the difference between density and intensity. She would agree that the intensity of additional coverage is perceived as greater density.

Ms. Fox stated that in the Community Plan, the historic structure on this site is identified by its address as a preservable structure. Has there been any discussion on that factor?

Ms. Martin responded the Glacier Special Area Plan does identify the structure as a preservable structure. She was not employed with the City when the preliminary discussions began regarding this site, so is not familiar with any early discussions. However, the City encourages preservation of historic structures. This structure is not protected in the Appendix G listing of outlying historic properties, although it potentially could be added if the property owner was in agreement.

Ms. Fox inquired if there were any discussions providing more clarity on the proposed architectural style of the structure in Subarea A, other than the fact that it will be two stories. The development text appears to allow a variety of architecture.

Ms. Martin responded that no further details were provided regarding the ACLF structure. With the Final Development Plan, the applicant must provide those details, including building elevations.

Ms. Call stated that the presentation indicated that the two subareas combined would constitute 121 residential units. How were the additional 31 units calculated? Is it based on square footage per acre?

Ms. Martin responded that the calculation is based upon the Community Plan's two different recommendations. She took the acreage associated with each area's recommendation and calculated the maximum density. One-third of this site was calculated at the low-density recommendation; two-thirds of the site was calculated at the mixed-density recommendation, assuming that a residential use was being pursued and not a commercial facility. Because the Community Plan did not contemplate this type of commercial facility, there is no way to calculate it in the recommendation.

Mr. Fishman stated that in regard to the reference to density and intensity, he is concerned that the project is quite dense. With the 70% coverage, larger homes with more residents could be built. When the Commission first considered this case, the discussion focused on small, empty-nester homes. He assumes the traffic study will be based on the density. There is a difference between a small home with two residents and a larger home with five or six residents. How has the 70% coverage been rationalized?

Ms. Martin responded that a traffic study does not consider the details of lot coverage. It does consider the overall density of the project, not the market distribution of the homebuyers.

Mr. Fishman responded that therein lies his concern. There are other areas within the City where the expectation was for smaller homes, but large homes were built. The result has been traffic back-ups during peak hours. He is concerned that a 70% lot coverage will have the same result in this case.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz stated that there are some slight differences in trip generations between residential units. The most conservative approach that is typically taken is to base the assumption upon the development of standard single-family homes. Engineering has checked their calculations for other areas of the City to verify that those single-family home developments are generating traffic at the same rate as the national equation. They have confirmed their calculations for suburban residential are consistent with the national averages, regardless of the square footage of the homes.

Ms. Husak noted that the market drives the size of homes that will be built on the lots. For instance, in the first phase of Deer Run, it was not anticipated that the empty-nester homes built on those lots would be nearly \$1 million in price.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is not concerned with the cost of the homes, only the number of people and number of trips generated. Not only is the proposed density high, the lot coverage is high, as well. That will result in too high of a density for this neighborhood.

Ms. Call requested confirmation that when traffic studies are conducted to determine if the intensity and density of a development will exhaust a roadway, they are using the national average. Is it also correct that Engineering staff recently completed an analysis that confirmed their calculations match those of the national standard?

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that is correct in terms of trip generation.

Ms. Fox stated that this roadway has caused significant controversy, due to its traffic volume. In the best scenario, with all the proposed infrastructure in place, will this roadway continue to be difficult to travel? The Community Plan calls for a development that maintains the rural character there. If we increase the intensity of the development, will it cause more roadway issues here, even with mitigation?

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that the traffic issue on Hyland-Croy Road has been a challenge for Union County and the City of Dublin. Conversations are occurring at a higher level regarding a potential long-term solution, which would change that corridor. Potentially, the number of through lanes could be increased. However, the responsibility of any developer with a rezoning is just to mitigate their impact to the roadway network.

Ms. Fox inquired if it could require a future widening of the roadway.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that both jurisdictions foresee potential need for more than one lane in each direction.

Ms. Fox inquired if that, then, would eliminate the 100-150-ft. setbacks that we are struggling to maintain.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz responded that she believes the Thoroughfare Plan has anticipated the need for a wider corridor, and the developer would be dedicating the appropriate amount of right-of-way and the setback would be based off that wider right-of-way footprint.

Ms. Martin stated that the Community Plan correlates those items. The Thoroughfare Plan and the Special Area Plan work in tandem to recommend preservation of those generous setbacks for all developments approved under this Community Plan.

Ms. Fishman stated that he does not understand the reason mitigation is not occurring as the area is developed. This is a rural road; the Community Plan recommends that it remain a rural road. Why would we add more density that cannot be accommodated without major infrastructure improvements?

Ms. Call stated that, before continuing with this discussion, she would like to compliment City staff for their recent traffic mitigation efforts -- the addition of two traffic signals -- in the Hyland-Croy corridor. Members of the public have expressed their appreciation.

Laura M. Comek, 17 S. High Street - Suite 700, Columbus, Ohio 43215, stated that she is representing the Schottenstein Real Estate Group, the applicant for this project. She shared a presentation of the updates made to the plan since the 1-09-20 meeting, at which the case was tabled. During this break, they have taken advantage of the time and made even the most minor of changes that could address the concerns expressed at the previous hearing. In the context of this particular area, this project will support the changes that will be coming with the US33/SR161/Post Road interchange. In a regional context, this property is located between a major thoroughfare and the rest of the community. The new freeway exchange makes Hyland-Croy Road the off-ramp right up to the front door of this development. In addition to the new off-ramp that feeds into Hyland-Croy Road, a Post Preserve closure will mandate a roadway

network through this property. There are also site development priorities that must be considered. The new roundabout, which is an off-ramp from the freeway, comes right up to the front door of this neighborhood. That makes this site freeway frontage property. In attempting to build a high-quality development, they are dealing with the constraints of the roadway network and the accesses at Springview Lane, Stillhouse Lane and Holbein Drive. Although Hyland-Croy is no longer a rural road, they will be maintaining the rural character setback with this development. This property addresses the reality of the fixed points and the remaining developable area. The proposed mixed-use development will provide a transition from the existing homes to the freeway. She provided a list of the requests made at the January 9 meeting and the responsive follow-up; all the concerns expressed have been addressed.

Commission members had no questions for the applicant.

Public Comment

Ms. Husak stated that the following public comment has been received:

Robert Sweeney, 6800 Royal Plume Dr., Dublin states that, "As someone who lives immediately next to the proposed development, the density seems too high for the homes, the lot sizes too small, and the 70% lot coverage is too high, as well. The examples given as recently approved developments offer patio homes. What is proposed does not seem to be an 'apples to apples' comparison. Given the issues with the pending closure of the front entrance to Post Preserve, their entrance would move to this new development. The first thing visitors to the neighborhood would see is a high density residential development."

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated she has reviewed the history of the previous discussions. The request for the age 55 and over restriction was not for the assisted living facility, but for the single-family residential development. Although it was indicated that the single-family homes would be small, there was a concern that the residential development would impact the school district. The neighbors requested that the single-family development be age restricted to ensure that it was, in fact, empty nester housing. She appreciates the applicant's argument that a regional change is occurring here that will result in more traffic. However, she believes that if a Community Plan with Future Land Use recommendations is in place, those recommendations need to be considered when future rezonings and changes in use and density are contemplated. It is essential to ensure that the benefits of the proposed development would outweigh the variance from the Community Plan. The area plan for this area calls for maintenance of a rural district. She understands that the west side of the roadway has changed, but it does not lie within the City of Dublin jurisdiction. The east side of the road lies within the City's jurisdiction, and the residents of Post Preserve built or bought their homes with the expectation that the City would adhere to its Community Plan. Several changes are proposed here: (1) significantly increasing the density, and increasing the lot coverage, which increase the intensity; (2) adding a commercial use in Subarea A, which was never intended in this neighborhood; and (3) removal of a historic structure that emphasizes the rural character of the roadway. Although the Community Plan is only a set of guidelines, Section 153.052(B1) of the Code specifically addresses that point. In her opinion, approving a higher density, changing the character, approving a commercial use never intended and removal of a historic structure identified by address within the Community Plan is a significant move away from the intent of the Community Plan. She is concerned if the Commission allows the Hamlet on Jerome, which is quite a distance away, to be the measuring factor, the intent for

the entire Hyland-Croy area to be rural and low density will disappear. How can our residents trust the City to follow its Community Plan, if every time a higher density development is requested with the argument that there is more traffic or the region is changing, we discard the Plan's recommendation?

Mr. Fishman stated that he is in complete agreement with Ms. Fox's comments. The small lots, higher density and higher lot coverage will destroy the rural roadway character. Although we are aware of the coming regional changes, that does not mean that we must turn a rural road into a 4-lane highway. We do not need to do so, if we do not approve this level of density. He does understand locating a commercial use next to the highway. If the density were reduced and the single-family were age restricted, it would be possible to maintain the rural roadway and character with an ACLF located there. Although road improvements are intended, he is concerned about the additional traffic that will be generated. Although the applicant has attempted to make some positive changes, they are insufficient to address his concerns.

Ms. Kennedy stated that per her review of the case, she believes the ACLF would make a good barrier for this community, particularly since the highway will be moving closer to the edge of the neighborhood and the proposed facility, She lives near a senior housing community, which also provides a good barrier. It is not a facility that generates a high level of traffic. Therefore, she has no objection to that use in Subarea A. However, she does agree with the comments made regarding Subarea B, from a density perspective. Although two parking spaces within the driveway would be provided per house, the additional on-road parking will present an issue, given the density of the community. The traffic study has not yet been completed, and there are three conditions specifically pending the completion and approval of that traffic study. That appears to present a red flag, at this point, as they have not been approved and finalized before asking this Commission to approve the development.

Mr. Grimes stated that he also reviewed the history on the case, and it appears that the applicant has made significant changes to the previous plan, including the reduction in height of the ACLF. He is also concerned about the traffic on that roadway. However, one developer cannot be made responsible for addressing that entire situation, and they are making a significant contribution to a mitigation solution. The development would provide a good transition between the neighborhood and the proposed major roundabout exit from the freeway. Likely, this area near Brand and Post Roads will not experience traffic relief until development heads north and northwest, when alternate ingress and egress routes would occur. In addition, the proximity to health care will be a significant incentive to senior homebuyers. He is not particularly concerned with the preservation of the historical structure, as there are many other structures more worthy of preservation. Given that the interchange improvement and intersection change will occur, what is the best development that could occur on this site? He believes the ACLF would be an attractive development for that particular location. He likes the changes to the plan that have been made in response to the previous concerns raised.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would reiterate many of the comments that have been made. He agrees that the quasi-commercial development of the parcel nearest the thoroughfare would be a good barrier. However, the history of this project reflects continuing concerns about the density and intensity. Similar developments that were approved made sense in those particular pockets of the community. They were also a substantial variance to the City's lot size and lot coverage requirements. A PUD provides a special set of rules for a parcel, but the Commission must be

convinced that there would be a greater benefit in allowing the proposed exceptions. He is not convinced of that. There are also concerns regarding the ACLF, including how it interfaces with the adjacent community. Although the development of Hyland-Croy Road is inevitable, and the appearance of it will change, that is not reason to cause the next development to bear the burden of all the future development. Even if Hyland-Croy does develop into a larger thoroughfare, the rural character intent for this neighborhood remains. The proposed density is a concern; it would be a significant exception to the City's standards. At this point, he is not convinced of the merits of that.

Mr. Fishman stated that the residents in the existing community were told that the proposed single-family would be primarily for empty nesters. At the previous meeting, a member of the audience requested that the housing be restricted to age 55 and over. The applicant refused to do so. Therefore, we have nothing to convince us that these will not be large homes impacting the school system. If they had been willing to add that age restriction, the Commission could be assured of small, single-family homes accommodating fewer residents.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has a question for the applicant. There is much good in this plan. The ACLF makes sense in the context with the area, as it would provide a buffer between the neighborhood and the roadway. That said, the density issue remains. In the past, some applicants have provided far more developed architectural concepts, including elevations and floorplans, albeit still in the preliminary development stage. The Commission has been provided no architectural information throughout the process for the residential development. In 2015, a concept was provided for the ACLF structure. What will be the square footage of these homes? The setbacks (20-ft. front, 30-ft. back, and 5-ft. side) will not permit a house that is 70% of the lot.

Ms. Comek responded that they have provided conceptual elevations. At the January 9 meeting, the City's attorney clarified that the architectural details are not required until the Final Development Plan. The homes will be 2,200 sq. feet+/- . They will be designed specifically for empty nesters and for maintenance-free living. These homes actually will be fewer square feet than the existing senior living homes located on Perimeter Drive. There has been a suggestion that they are not complying with the Community Plan. However, they are following the City's Community Plan, which calls for a mixed-use development. The idea for a transition development in this area also is referenced in the Community Plan. That may be in recognition of the fact that the land across the street is zoned for big box retail, which is appropriate at a freeway interchange. In regard to the density, they are not requesting more density than is called for in the Community Plan. In fact, it is less than staff's density calculation as prescribed by the Community Plan. The Community Plan calls for something different from what the Commission is accustomed to. They have tried to transition from what exists in Post Preserve by providing similar lots around the perimeter of the proposed residential development. The parameters they have suggested are not exceptions; they are based upon the City's Community Plan.

Mr. Supelak stated that the 70% lot coverage is an exception.

Ms. Comek responded that it is an exception commonly granted, i.e. Riviera and Hamlet on Jerome.

Mr. Supelak noted that two examples do not necessarily suffice to be referenced as what is common. The lot coverage standard is 45% Citywide, although there are a few exceptions.

Ms. Fox stated that the Community Plan's reference to mixed-use within this area is a variety of housing styles, not a mixed-use containing commercial. She is not completely opposed to a commercial use on that site, but she is concerned that Subarea A is not defined in terms of design, layout or appearance. The only definition provided is that the building will be 35-ft. in height, a maximum of two stories, and will cover 70% of the lot. That lack of definition and the vagueness of the development text do not provide any protection for the Post Preserve neighborhood. Currently, 8-10 homes are located along that boundary. This site is a gateway to Hyland-Croy Road, a rural road. However, not many businesses or homes want to be located at a roundabout, so maintaining the historical structure there as a landmark would not be a bad idea. Additionally, if senior single-family housing is proposed, it should be stated that it is a 55 and up community. The square footage of the homes also should be defined, so there is assurance regarding the size of these homes. It is the Commission's responsibility to consider the burden that would be placed on the roadway, the City and the Schools. She believes it is essential to consider the Future Land Use Plan and ensure we do not deviate too far from it.

Ms. Call stated that, like Mr. Grimes, she is not particularly concerned about preservation of the historical property, as it is not presently listed in the Appendix G listing of historical properties in the City. Staff has stated that if the owner was willing, potentially, it could be included. The Commissioners' comments reflect that they disagree with staff's analysis and believe that certain items in the following criteria have not been met:

- # 1 - Development building standards;
- # 2 - Community Plan recommendations;
- # 3 - The general welfare of the residents in the vicinity;
- # 8 - The traffic study has not been completed and ingress/egress issues thoroughly evaluated, although the traffic issues have been partially mitigated by staff's recommendations;
- # 9 - The relationship of the building structures to each other;
- #10 - The density, setbacks, and lot coverage;
- #12 - One of the benefits of a PUD is that there is always a tradeoff, such as clustering and density may be permitted to provide a larger open space. Typically, a balance is achieved between the benefits received and the amenities provided. Because the criteria was not met, a balance has not been achieved.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant requests that the application be tabled or that a vote proceed.

Ms. Comek responded that the applicant does not wish to table; the vote may proceed.

Ms. Call requested a motion to approve or disapprove the application.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would recommend that the motion be made in the affirmative.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend approval of the Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan to City Council with the following four (4) conditions:

- 1) The applicant coordinate with Engineering to establish final approved street names and the applicant update the plans and development text prior to Council.
- 2) The applicant update the development text prior to submittal to City Council including all conditions.
- 3) The applicant continue to work with the City and Union County to complete the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Union County Engineer, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council.

- 4) That the applicant work with the City of Dublin and Union County to develop an Infrastructure Agreement for consideration by City Council. This should be submitted in conjunction with the submission of the rezoning to City Council.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Kennedy, no; Ms. Call, no; Mr. Supelak, no.

[Motion failed 5-1]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat to City Council with the following three (3) conditions:

- 1) The preliminary plat be updated in accordance with any modifications and improvements approved with the rezoning and preliminary development plan application prior to City Council submittal.
- 2) The applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.
- 3) The applicant coordinate with Engineering to establish final approved street names and the applicant update the plans prior to Council.

Vote: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, no; Ms. Kennedy, no; Ms. Call, no.

[Motion failed 5-1]

NEW CASES

7. Midwestern Auto Group – Ferrari, 19-127AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for approval of a Final Development Plan for construction of ±7,040-square-foot showroom and sales office as part of a vehicle sales campus - Midwestern Auto Group, on a 15.5-acre site south of Perimeter Drive and ±250 feet west of the intersection with Venture Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for construction of an approximately 7,040-square-foot Ferrari showroom located at 6325 Perimeter Loop Road within the MAG Planned Unit Development District, Subarea A. The site is located in the southwest corner of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Venture Drive. On February 1, 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission conducted an Informal Review of the proposed redevelopment of the existing Land Rover building in the northern portion of Subarea A for the construction of two separate showrooms for the Porsche and Ferrari franchises. In February 2019, an Amended Final Development Plan was approved for the Porsche showroom. The stormwater management modifications for the Porsche development accommodated the additional impervious area for the Ferrari development. The applicant will need to continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances. Due to the location of the 7,040-square-foot Ferrari showroom, it does interfere with the existing parking arrangements for the site. Based on this proposal, the total parking required for Subarea A is 455 spaces with 404 spaces provided, leaving a deficit of 51 spaces. However, Subareas B & C contain supplemental parking to ensure sufficient parking

is provided throughout the campus, which is permitted in the development text. In addition to the Ferrari showroom, a new battery storage room is proposed south of the Ferrari showroom and southeast of the Porsche showroom. The design of the structure emphasizes the modern architecture established throughout the MAG campus. The main entrance is located on the north elevation. Staff recommends that the main entrance color selection be revised to match the neutral color palette seen throughout the MAG campus. The service drop-off is located to the east of the showroom and is connected to the main building. The drop includes overhead service doors that are oriented towards the access road, which is similar to other showrooms throughout the MAG campus. The primary materials include glass, aluminum composite material, concrete masonry, and stucco, all of which are permitted materials in the MAG development text. The finishing colors of the primary materials will include Brilliant Silver Metallic and Dusty Charcoal II. The proposal includes the installation of two signs: one wall sign on the front (north) elevation, and one ground sign located northeast of the building. The proposed wall sign is constructed of two-inch deep acrylic channel letters with a mirror-polished stainless steel face and a two-inch deep acrylic Ferrari logo. The sign is located on the front (north) façade. The sign is proposed at a size of approximately 25 square feet and will be installed at a height of approximately 20 feet from grade. The sign meets all applicable requirements of the development text. The ground sign is classified as a brand sign on the site plan. The proposed brand sign is 40 inches in height and 23 inches in width. The aluminum face will be painted red, and will display the acrylic logo for the Ferrari brand. The brand sign meets all applicable requirements of the development text and complements the sign standards used throughout the campus. The ground sign will not be lit; the wall sign will be lit, which is permitted by the development text. Staff has reviewed this application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Brad Parish, President, Architectural Alliance, 49 E. Third Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, stated this project will complete the campus; there is no remaining land on which to build. The last building will be the Ferrari showroom. It is a showroom only; no service component will be in the building. There will be a delivery area for new cars and service cars. The service will be handled in the main facility. The Ferrari showroom currently resides in the larger building, but will be moving to this new facility. They have attempted to keep the design consistent with the development. The proposed red portal will provide a pop of color to this elevation for a higher line vehicle.

Public Comments

No public comments have been received.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Fishman inquired if the applicant is in agreement with the two conditions.

Mr. Parish responded that he would prefer to know the Commission members' opinions regarding the red portal.

Mr. Fishman responded that the Commission previously has denied requests from the other automobile brands on this campus for a logo color. When the development was approved, it was sold as a development that would not look like a car lot, and a neutral color palette would be used. Diverting from that would set a dangerous precedent. The Ferrari ground signs will provide adequate wayfinding on the campus. Therefore, he would not be supportive of the red entrance.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is in agreement with staff's recommendation that the red portal on the building should not be permitted.

Mr. Grimes concurred with staff's recommendation, as well.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees, as well. She would suggest that if the dealership is looking for something to emphasize the entrance, there are many materials in the neutral palette that would add interest through texture and finish.

Mr. Supelak stated that he does not object to use of the red color. However, in the context of the overall MAG campus, the red portal would be a substantial use of color and would change the character of the entire campus. There are other ways to work the Ferrari red into the building, perhaps not on the exterior. He is in agreement with other Commission members.

Mr. Parish stated that he is in agreement with the conditions and will work with staff on identifying neutral colors for the portal.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the main entrance color selection be revised to match the neutral color palette seen throughout the MAG campus, subject to staff approval; and,
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

8. Ohio State University Medical Campus, Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for approval of a Final Development Plan for a ±271,850-square-foot medical office and ambulatory care facility and associated site improvements on a 33.73-acre site, north of Shier Rings Road, ±2,800 feet northwest of the intersection with Avery Road and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for construction of a medical office and ambulatory care and surgical facility for The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center. On September 19, 2019, PZC reviewed the proposed rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PUD). On November 4, 2019, City Council approved a PUD Planned Unit Development District rezoning for the approximately 34-acre site. On March 5, 2020, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval to Council for the Final Plat, which created this lot and the roadway serving it from Shier Rings Road to Eiterman Road. Because this is a public facility, building permitting would be conducted through the State of Ohio, not the City of Dublin's Building division. However, landscaping and site permits would be handled by the City.

Site

This is the first of two phases of development on the site. The site plan for this phase of development is laid out in accordance with the approved Preliminary Development Plan. University Boulevard (relocated Shier Rings Road) is the southern site boundary. Per the Commission's

request, pedestrian connections have been provided on the east and west sides of the site and to University Boulevard. Walking paths connect the parking to the front of the building, and along the southern façade, open space and landscaped areas are provided for visitors, patients and staff. Walking paths also are provided along the northern portion of the site buffered from US33 with trees and landscaping, and additional paths break up the large parking areas and provide additional opportunities to navigate to the main building entrances.

Ms. Husak displayed the building elevations for the medical center and ambulatory care center, which reflect extensive use of brick and other materials per the OSU brand. The views of the elevations show the signage, which was approved with the development text. Pedestrian circulation plans throughout the site were reviewed. The areas on the east and west perimeters (depicted in green on the image shown) are not part of this site but are part of the circulation plan and are reflected on the plat. The City of Dublin owns those parcels. [Internal circulation patterns on the site are depicted in red].

Landscape plans were included in the packets, which show the proposed landscape character, particularly along US33. In this particular area, there is a landscape wall located in the building setback. Although it was contemplated, the development text did not include it. The applicant has requested minor text modifications, which will include that and the landscaping that would occur offsite on the east and west sides of the site. This is a very large site with many landscaping requirements. City Council requested that outlets for bioswales also be addressed. The applicant has provided that detail, which is included as an additional condition. The development text currently allows an allowance for one entry feature sign, 11 feet in height and freestanding. After the applicant moved forward in the landscaping design and stonewalls were included, the decision was made to include signs on landscape walls. It is not the typical Dublin wall, but a very modern Dublin wall. This is not typically permitted in the development text; however, it is a high-quality design and less obstructive than the permitted sign of 11 feet in height. An additional text modification is needed to permit the two signs on the stone walls at the entrance. Lastly, there are some discrepancies in the sign plans in terms of the nomenclature and sign sizes, so a condition has been added to address those discrepancies before permitting occurs. Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of the three Minor Text Modifications and approval of the Final Development Plan with five (5) conditions.

Questions for Staff

Ms. Kennedy inquired who would have maintenance responsibility of the off-site landscaping. Ms. Husak responded that it would be the applicant's responsibility.

Ms. Fox referred to the northeast elevation of the medical office section -- as depicted in the current design, it appears that the corners of this elevation are different than an earlier, printed version, which she has before her. The transparent glass element previously existed on both corners; it now appears to be on one corner only.

Keith Myers, Vice President of Planning, Architecture and Real Estate, OSU, stated that no changes have been made recently; the floor plans have been fixed for some time. The printed elevation she has in hand is a very early artist rendition. Since they began to work with staff on this plan, this elevation has had the glass element on one corner only.

Ms. Fox responded that in her opinion, the removal of the other transparent corner has changed the character of the building, and it now has less visual interest. She is unable to access the Preliminary Development Plan drawings online, but if the design she is recalling was part of that plan, she is concerned with the degree of changes that can occur between the Preliminary and Final Development Plans.

Ms. Call noted that she has pulled up the online February 14 packet, and the drawing is the same as provided then.

Mr. Supelak clarified that the rendering that Ms. Fox is referring to was provided for the August 22, 2019 meeting as a Concept Plan proposal.

Applicant's Presentation

Aaron Underhill, attorney, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, OH stated that he is representing The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center. Also present are OSU representatives and consultants, who are able to respond to questions, as well. The consultants have indicated to him that the glass on one corner of that elevation has been eliminated since the initial Concept Plan. Instead, the glass facing the courtyard has been made more extensive. He finds the timing on this project ironic. What a great project on a number of fronts to be bringing forward at a time like this, not only due to the type of services this facility would be able to provide in such a time, but also for the City to have a project with this degree of economic power despite what is occurring. It is a great advantage to have an OSU facility here, which is able to weather the current situation and continue to pursue the project. As was explained with the Preliminary Development Plan, the exterior of the building is a direct result of what is occurring on the interior. Over the last few months, they have also learned some things from the other project that is already under construction at Hamilton Road and SR161. As he indicated previously, any minor changes that would occur in the architecture would be as a result of the ongoing internal charrettes at the University. They now have a prototype facility, which they are bringing to Dublin. The architecture has been heavily vetted. This facility will offer medical office, ambulatory care, diagnostic testing, and outpatient surgeries and treatments. This will be a high-volume facility. Services provided in other OSU medical facilities within the City will be consolidated here in one facility, for efficiency purposes. They are very excited to be bringing this facility to Dublin.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox complimented the applicant on the landscape plan and their response to the request for pedestrian connectivity and amenities for the adjacent neighborhoods. The neighbors' request has been satisfied beautifully. Is there a deed declaration that this is space for the public to use?

Ms. Husak responded that there is. The two off-site areas (depicted in green) on the west and east sides of the parcel have meandering paths, and on the west side, there is a circular path with benches on the interior. Landscaping is accommodated in those areas. The applicant has worked with the City to structure their deed to ensure that space is publicly accessible, but also maintained by the applicant. That is addressed in the Plat.

Mr. Supelak stated that he appreciates there is a program driving this project. He has raised previous concerns about the massing, which is somewhat basic. This is a large, attractive building, but there is opportunity to make it even more attractive. Abiding by the program that is driving the interior, there are still ways to fine-tune the exterior appearance. Is it the intent that this building look nearly identical to the Hamilton Road structure? Will additional, similar structures be built around the City of Columbus?

Mr. Underhill responded that the Hamilton Road and Dublin facilities are very similar in appearance. That is intentional, as part of the branding strategy for the University.

Mr. Myers stated that the two structures are similar, having many of the same materials, although the Dublin structure is larger. There is a tremendous amount of detail work in the design of the façade, including brick detail and depth to the windows. The architectural firm with whom they are working is Pelli Clarke Pelli of New York, who have a reputation for being very particular in regard to exterior façade details.

Mr. Supelak responded that the west elevation would benefit from addition of a little more interest. If that is a possibility, he would encourage it.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is pleased with the proposed plan and has no concerns. She would like to reiterate Ms. Fox's compliments regarding the modifications that have been made to provide the pedestrian connectivity and outdoor public spaces. In regard to the proposed signage, the sign wall is well executed with an attractive appearance; however, it is important to recognize that approving the sign wall for this facility will set a precedent for other properties that will develop in the area. Overall, she is very pleased with this facility.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is very pleased with the landscaping. Initially, he was concerned about the proposed sign wall, as well. However, the building is so large that it should not be an issue with precedence, unless another building is similarly large and landscaped. He appreciates the public access, landscaping and water features.

Mr. Grimes stated that this is a stellar addition to the City. It will provide a great anchor and example in that corridor. Its connection to the neighborhood and adjoining parcels will set a trend in that area where it is anticipated that in the future, the university boulevards would connect.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees with Mr. Supelak regarding the one long facade. This is phase one of the development planned on the site. In phase two, is a four or five-story building anticipated to flank this building on the east side?

Dan Like, Executive Director, Ambulatory Services, OSU Wexner Medical Center, responded that the structure in phase 2 will be an in-bed hospital, and likely, five-six stories.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees that, if there is opportunity, it would be nice to break up the length of that one facade. In regard to the glass element – she does see that the remaining glass corner is wider than in the original design.

Mr. Like stated that in regard to the southeast elevation, there was a desire to promote the use of the interior stairs, and the stairwell has been located next to that glassed area. In this case, the architecture supports the function inside the building.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the following three (3) text modifications:

- 1) Modify development text to permit required landscape trees to be located off-site.
- 2) Modify development text to permit landscape walls to encroach required setbacks.
- 3) Modify development text to permit two primary entry signs at a size not to exceed 50 square feet each located on entry walls.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the proposed conditions for the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Underhill indicated that the applicant is in agreement.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following five conditions:

- 1) The parking plans be updated to reflect the required number of bicycle parking spaces;
- 2) The applicant work with staff to address discrepancies prior to filing for sign permits;
- 3) The applicant to provide a maintenance plan prior to submitting for permits for the prairie seed mix around the proposed retention basins;
- 4) Aerators or bubblers to be provided for the retention basins; and,
- 5) The applicant to update the plans to ensure the mounding along the parking areas satisfies Code requirements.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch stated that printed packets for the next meeting have been prepared and are available for pick-up at the 5800 Building on Shier Rings Road. The next meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, May 7, 2020 and will be held virtually.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Rebecca Call [Approved 5-21-2020]

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council