



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 9, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening remarks: "Good evening and welcome to the virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government and will be holding our meetings online and live-streaming on YouTube until further notice. 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. Those questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We welcome your comments on cases. Please provide a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. We want to accommodate public participation and comments to the greatest extent possible. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier

Commission member absent: Jane Fox (excused)

Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Jesse Shamp, Nichole Martin, Zak Hounshell, Chase Ridge

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of 5-21-20, 6-4-20 and 6-11-20.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, 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 intends to address the Commission on any of the administrative cases must be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. One case is eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case 20-117 Final Plat for a re-subdivision of portions of the University Boulevard Phase 2 Plat. No member requested that the case be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Call swore in those who intended to address the Commission on this evening's cases.

CONSENT CASE

6. University Boulevard, Phase 2, 20-117FP, Final Plat (Re-subdivision)

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request for a Final Plat and a request for variances to the lot size to address County requirements for parcels crossing school district boundaries and to create a parcel for the preservation of a historic cemetery. The site is north of Shier-Rings Road, west of the intersection with Avery Road and zoned ID-1, Research and Development in the West Innovation District and Planned Unit Development District.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the following variances from the Subdivision Regulations:

- 1) To permit the creation of Lot 1D at 0.566-acre instead of meeting the Zoning Code required 3-acre minimum.
- 2) To permit the creation of Lot 6 at 0.127-acre instead of meeting the Zoning Code required 3-acre minimum.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

Mr. Fishman moved to recommend approval of the Final Plat to City Council with the following condition:

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

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

CASES

Ms. Call stated that Cases 1 and 2 would be heard together. Both cases are related to a proposed half-day preschool.

1. Ivybrook Academy, 3755 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 20-091MPR, Minor Project Review/Waiver

The first case is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review that includes a Parking Plan and associated site improvements and a Waiver for use-specific standards associated with Outdoor Recreation Areas (outdoor classroom).

2. Ivybrook Academy, 3755 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 20-115MSP, Master Sign Plan

The second request is for a Master Sign Plan that includes two ground signs and a window sign for an existing 5,500-square-foot tenant space on a 0.97-acre site. The site is southwest of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road and Sawmill Road and zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Parking Plan, Waiver and Master Sign Plan for a daycare (pre-school only) use on the 0.97-acre lot on a site located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Sawmill Road and W. Dublin-Granville Road. [Site photographs shown.]

Proposal

The proposal is associated with a new pre-school occupying an existing structure within the BSD. Pre-school is not a use that is contemplated by the BSD Code. The most appropriate use classification is Day Care, Adult or Child, and that Use classification has specific standards defined in Zoning Code Section 153.059(C)(2)(c). To retrofit the site in accordance with the BSD Code standards, parking provisions, and sign allowances, review and approval of the following items is requested:

- 1) A Waiver to the use specific standards associated with Outdoor Recreation Areas (outdoor classroom) to permit it forward of the building;
- 2) A Parking Plan which is required to address the unique needs for daycare uses; and
- 3) A Master Sign Plan (MSP) to utilize two existing monument signs.

Waiver Request

The first request is for a waiver to permit an outdoor recreation area forward of the principal structure. The applicant is proposing an approximately 1,100 sq. ft. outdoor classroom to be located east of the building on the Sawmill Road frontage. The use classification of Day Care, Adult or Child has specific standards defined in Zoning Code Section 153.059(C)(2)(c). The standards require that, "Outdoor recreation areas shall be located to the side or rear of a principal structure and be enclosed with a perimeter fence. The outdoor recreation area shall be screened using fencing and/or landscaping to provide a minimum 50% opaque screen". Given that the Code does not contemplate an outdoor classroom, the area is considered an outdoor recreation area. Due to the existing site layout, the proposed area forward of the building is the only feasible location. The proposal includes two wood tables. To meet the requirements of the use specific standards, the area should be enclosed with a 4-foot tall, wrought-iron-style, black metal fence. The area should be screened with evergreen hedges, subject to staff approval, and the associated site furnishing details should be constructed of high quality, weather resistant materials. Following the distribution of the packet materials last week, the applicant has submitted inspirational images for potential classroom equipment. Should the Commission wish to consider the potential classroom equipment, it would be necessary to accept the additional documents into the record. A waiver is requested to permit the requested location of the outdoor classroom.

Parking Plan

The second request is for approval of a proposed parking plan. Parking plans are required to demonstrate adequate site circulation, including pick-up and drop-off areas for daycare uses. For zoning districts outside of the BSD, the Code requires day or nursery school facilities to provide one parking space per teacher/employee, plus one parking space per six students. The applicant has indicated the business will employ 14 full-time adult employees and host 96 students, which would require 30 parking spaces for the site. The site currently has 32 parking spaces; two of the spaces are accessible spaces. No site modifications for parking or circulation of the site are proposed; however, the applicant has indicated the primary traffic flow for drop-off and pick-up will be one-way from W. Dublin-Granville Road to Sawmill Road.

Master Sign Plan

The applicant is proposing to utilize two existing monument signs located on the site. Due to the site being developed prior to the BSD Code, it is required to meet the requirements of Zoning Code Section 153.150 until the site is redeveloped. Non-residential daycare facilities that have at least 100 feet of frontage on two streets are permitted to have two ground signs that are 20 square feet in combined size and 8 feet in combined height. The two existing monument signs have a total of 27 square feet in combined area and 10.8 feet in combined height. Due to the existing signs exceeding the maximum requirements for a daycare use, the applicant is required to obtain a Master Sign Plan (MSP) to utilize the existing monument signs as they are built. The applicant is proposing new sign faces for the two existing monument signs. The first monument sign is located along W. Dublin Granville Road to the east of the entrance. A white polycarb sign insert that is 72.25 inches in width and 18 inches in height is proposed for the existing 4-foot tall monument sign. It will have a Holly Green background with white vinyl graphics. The insert will be the same design and size on both sides of the existing monument sign. The second monument sign is located along Sawmill Road

to the east. The applicant is proposing a white polycarb sign insert that is 126.5 inches in width and 30 inches in height for the existing 6.8-foot tall monument sign, to be inserted on both sides of the existing monument sign. Also proposed is a window decal for the front doors of the building. The business logo is less than one square foot, which generally does not require a sign permit. Generally, MSPs are intended to allow for one-of-a-kind, whimsical, unique signs that employ the highest quality materials and construction while allowing flexibility to deviate from the standards of the BSD Sign Code provisions. In certain instances it may be appropriate to permit flexibility for existing sites while maintaining a high-quality sign construction; however, staff recommends that the applicant revise the ground sign face designs to eliminate the use of vinyl applique and instead use an acrylic push-thru letter with a minimum .25-inch relief.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval as follows:

- Approval of the Waiver to permit an outdoor recreation area forward of the principal structure;
- Approval of the Minor Project Review with Parking Plan with two conditions; and
- Approval of the Master Sign Plan with one condition.

Mr. Grimes noted that it is necessary to accept the additional documents for consideration into the record.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to accept the additional documents into the record.

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

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy inquired if there would be sufficient space for any parking expansion in this location.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the applicant has indicated that the existing parking on the site plan suffices to meet their need. The existing parking meets Code requirements.

Mr. Fishman stated that since that site was built, the ingress/egress has been difficult. He has previously suggested that an egress be provided from the Trader Joe Shopping Center. Has that been considered?

Mr. Hounshell responded that it has not been proposed with this application.

Ms. Call asked if the proposed MSP is requesting an increase from the permitted total of 20 square feet in signage to a total of 27 square feet.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the concrete wall on the side of the property where the outdoor classroom is proposed belongs to the neighboring property or to this property. Where would a four-foot fence be placed within the context of a playground area and a parking lot next door? He is concerned about the placement of this playground area in conjunction with the parking lot next door and the concrete barrier.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the required setback for this fence is 5 feet from the sideyard. This proposal meets the required setback, and it will not be up against the stonewall. He does not believe the stonewall is maintained by the owner of this property. The applicant has obtained the necessary approvals from AEP to be within their easement.

Ms. Call clarified that the Commission is discussing the outdoor area specific to the classroom use. The classroom will have play equipment that an indoor classroom would have, but is not a play area.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the application as submitted included the open classroom space with only two wooden tables. If the Commission should desire to consider the additional equipment proposed, that could be added as an approval condition.

Ms. Call stated that, typically, parking lot spaces are calculated according to the building's square footage, but in this case, it is calculated by the number of students and employees. Are there other portions of the Code where the square footage of the building determines the amount – signage, for instance – that is

permitted? She is trying to determine the implications of considering the outdoor area as a classroom area versus a play area.

Ms. Husak responded that the Bridge Street Code does not contain a parking requirement for a daycare use. It requires the submission of a parking plan. They have looked at the remainder of the City where daycare uses do have a parking requirement, and found that they are based on the number of students and employees. Using that factor, this site would require 30 parking spaces, and there are 32 parking spaces onsite. The outdoor area has no bearing on how many children can be at the school. It is a state requirement. From the sign perspective, the Code has specific requirements for all daycares. Because the use here was previously a retail use, the sign allowance for retail was used. The applicant is asking to use the existing structure.

Ms. Call responded that the Commission looks at potential future issues; for instance, if this facility were to expand, if there would be lot coverage issues. She is looking for the caveats that should be considered upfront so as not to cause future issues.

Ms. Husak responded that staff was comfortable recommending approval of this waiver because it is not what is considered a playground for a daycare. It has no slides, swings or elevated equipment typical for daycares.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the existing signs, which were appropriate for retail, need to be larger for a daycare use.

Ms. Husak responded it is the reverse. A daycare use would not be permitted to have the same amount of square footage and height. Because the applicant is requesting to use and re-clad the existing structures that are larger than a daycare use permits, a Master Sign Plan is necessary.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the request is for more square footage than previously existed.

Ms. Husak responded that the request is for the same square footage.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the existing parking spaces would be available for use by the surrounding retail facilities – a shared use condition.

Ms. Husak responded that they would not, and that is where the wall becomes a factor. Those conversations occurred before consolidating entry drives. The elevation between this parking lot and the Trader Joe's parking lot are different and have a retaining wall between them.

Applicant Presentation

Evan Lee, franchise owner, Ivybrook Daycare Academy, 3755 W. Dublin-Granville Road, Dublin, OH stated that they provide a half-day, Montessori-type program with an emphasis on hands on learning. Their curriculum and philosophy is very different from a traditional daycare program. The outdoor space will be considered only an outdoor classroom, not a recreation area. There will be no large play equipment. The images shown tonight propose optional equipment; the primary need is for an outdoor space, which is crucial to their program.

Drew McWilliams, Ivybrook Academy founder, Ivybrook Daycare Academy, 3755 W. Dublin-Granville Road, Dublin, OH stated that the images are pictures of equipment used in other facilities around the country. The emphasis is to have a fenced outdoor space in which to teach the children about the world around them.

Paul Genges, Tube Art Group, stated that he would like to emphasize the importance of the requested signs. Per Code, they would only be permitted one sign, which would significantly limit their exposure. Because the school is offset on the site, the public would not be able to see a wall sign. Utilizing both monument signs located on the road will provide Ivybrook the best opportunity of drawing awareness of their business. They will not be changing anything, simply replacing the slide-in sign panels.

Commission Questions of the Applicant

Mr. Grimes inquired if the half-day program would mean two sessions per day would be held.

Mr. Lee responded that the plan is eventually to have two sessions, but for the first year, only one session would be held.

Mr. Grimes inquired if they could have over 90 students in one session.

Mr. Lee responded that it would be closer to 85. The number for a second session would be less, as two-year olds would not attend, due to nap times.

Mr. McWilliams stated that although the occupancy permit allows 90 students, the desire is to cap the number within the 80s, in order to have a better student-teacher ratio.

Mr. Grimes noted that the State might be limiting that number in the near future; how would that impact their plans?

Mr. McWilliams responded that currently, the State limit is a maximum of 10 students per classroom. That is a benefit to new preschool facility owners. Current facilities will be required to reduce their number of students, and some students will be looking for new daycare programs. They will be happy to accommodate that need.

Mr. Supelak stated that with two sessions, there would be a need to stagger student dropoff and pickup times. Are there any concerns about the ability to stagger that activity in a way in which to control traffic flow?

Mr. McWilliams responded that they have no concerns, due to the number of parking spaces on this site. They have some daycare facilities in even more urban environments and with only 20-22 parking spaces, and there, a staggered schedule is utilized.

Ms. Call stated that in looking at the map, it appears the small sign is located adjacent to the west entrance on Dublin-Granville Road. The larger sign is located amidst the trees on the corner of Sawmill Road. The current signs appear to be in good shape, and the request is simply to retain the existing cabinets and swap out the sign panels.

Ms. Kennedy inquired what is the precedent for this type of situation. If use of the existing monument sign has not been approved, has the applicant been required to remove it?

Mr. Hounshell responded that these signs have been in place for two previous users, which were commercial uses. If the applicant had wanted to retain one monument sign, staff would have recommended removal of the other sign.

Ms. Husak clarified that the applicant is permitted to have two monument signs. Per Code, they are permitted 1-1/3 of the maximum allowable height and square footage of one sign. They gain a little additional square footage because there would be signs on two frontages of rights-of-way.

Mr. Fishman stated that there have been previous situations in which the applicant was required to shorten or remove a sign pedestal. This is the first case he has seen where the recommendation is that the applicant be permitted not to meet Code because they do not want to remove or change the pedestal. He is concerned about setting a different precedent. However, this is a great use for this location. With the previous retail uses, the access/egress was always difficult.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the applicant is allowed to have a wall sign on the building.

Ms. Husak responded that they are not, unless the ground signs are removed. The Bridge Street Code (BSC) states that buildings in existence before adoption of the BSC and not built under the BSC are subject to the previous Code. That is the reason they are permitted only two wall or two monument signs subject to the daycare requirements.

Ms. Call inquired how the window and door decals are addressed in the existing Sign Code.

Ms. Husak stated there is an allowance for a window sign of small square footage. Informational window signs, such as hours of operation, are not regulated and are not required to have a sign permit.

The window/door decals would be part of the Master Sign Plan. The regular Code permits them, but the amount of square footage is reduced from the window or ground sign.

Mr. Fishman stated that the temporary banner sign is located at a lower height than the existing signs, but it is sufficiently visible.

Mr. Lee stated that as a small business starting up during the Covid19 pandemic, it is necessary for them to consider the costs. Maintaining the existing brick and mortar sign structures and replacing the sign panels would be the simplest and least expensive path.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that a daycare is a great use. He has no objection to the stone and mortar sign structures, but they need to be lowered. The existing commercial signs were controversial when the first retail went in. He believes, whenever possible, the requirement should be to abide by Code.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is supportive of the use and of a waiver to permit location of the outdoor area near the front. He is also supportive of the re-use of the existing signs, which are both attractive and of good quality.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is supportive of the proposed waiver and the proposed parking plan. However, she is not supportive of the Master Sign Plan, and believes the new signs should be subject to Code.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the use and the waivers. He is in favor of re-using the existing monument sign structures. This is a difficult time for business owners, and he believes the City should be supportive of the business to the extent possible.

Mr. Grimes stated that he is in support of the waiver for the outside classroom area. He also is supportive of re-using the existing sign structures. The site has enough exceptions to warrant that. The existing signs are not that visible and easy to miss; smaller signs would be even less visible. He believes if the business grows, there may be a need to identify an easier access to the site. He is supportive of the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Call stated that this use would be a welcome addition to Dublin. She is supportive of the waiver permitting the outdoor classroom. However, she believes the signage should consistent with Code, so is not supportive of re-using the existing sign structures. Instead, the existing sign bases could be re-purposed and other cost-cutting methods utilized.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded to approve a waiver to permit an outdoor recreation area forward of the principal structure with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant work with staff on what is contained within that outdoor recreation area.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with parking plan with the following three conditions:

- 1) The applicant enclose the outdoor recreation with a 4-foot tall, wrought-iron-style, black metal fence, and screen the area with evergreen landscaping, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant provide furniture details for the outdoor recreation area, subject to staff approval.
- 3) The applicant provide outdoor classroom details for the outdoor recreation area, subject to staff approval.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

Mr. Shamp explained that a majority vote of the members present is required for the motion to pass. A tie vote would fail.

Mr. Fishman stated that a minor adjustment of the existing sign structures could make the signs consistent with Code, such as lowering the sign height. Would the applicant have any questions regarding the recommendation?

Mr. Genges inquired if, to utilize both monuments, it would be necessary to lower the bases, or would it be necessary to remove one sign and bring the other sign into compliance.

Ms. Husak stated that the applicant is permitted to have two monument signs. They are allowed 1-1/3 of the maximum allowable height and square footage permitted for one daycare use sign. A daycare sign is permitted to be a maximum of 15 square feet; therefore, 20 square feet would be the total number divided between the two signs. The maximum height of a daycare sign is six feet, so with the additional one-third percent, the maximum height would be 8 feet divided between the two signs.

Ms. Call requested that, in the future, pertinent calculations be provided in the staff reports.

Mr. Genges stated that it would cost the applicant \$17,000-\$20,000 to remove the existing sign structures and for engineering, versus the \$1,000 cost of utilizing the existing signs. That is a significant cost impact to an individual attempting to start up a new business.

Ms. Call stated that if this were a retail use, there would be no issue; however, the Code requirements are different for this use. This can be accomplished by utilizing one sign or two signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission is not asking the applicant to tear anything down, but to be creative and make what exists meet Code. Previous applicants have been able to be creative and meet Code. However, the Commission cannot set a precedent for permitting an applicant not to meet Code. Finances are not a reason to not meet Code.

Mr. Lee stated that he does not believe replacing the sign cabinets with smaller cabinets on the existing stone bases would be an aesthetic solution.

Mr. Genges agreed that a smaller sign on the large bases would not be attractive. If the motion fails, one sign would have to be removed and the other sign cabinet made larger.

Ms. Husak clarified that one sign cannot be 20 square feet and eight feet in height. Those numbers must be divided between two signs. The maximum size permitted for one sign is 15 square feet and 6 feet in height.

Ms. Call stated that if the motion to approve the Master Sign Plan fails, the applicant would be permitted either one sign that is 15 square feet and 6 feet in height or two signs with a total of 20 square feet and a total of 8 feet in height. They could work with staff to achieve that.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with one condition:

- 1) The applicant revise the sign face design to eliminate the use of vinyl letters, and instead to use acrylic push-thru letters with a minimum .25-inch relief, subject to staff approval at sign permitting.

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

[Motion failed 3-3.]

3. The Corners, Phase 1, 20-095CU/FDP, Conditional Use/Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a Final Development application for the construction of ±23,500 square feet of commercial space in three buildings, approximately 2,000 square feet of patio space, a 3.8-acre public park, and all associated site improvements. This is also a request for a Conditional Use for a restaurant drive-thru. The site is west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Blazer Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Report

Ms. Husak stated that this a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of ±23,500 square feet of commercial space in three buildings and approximately 2,000 square feet of patio space, a 3.8-acre public park and all associated site improvements. It is also a request for review and approval of a Conditional Use for a restaurant drive-thru. The site is west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Blazer Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District. The Final Development Plan is the last step in the process, so if approved, the applicant will be eligible to file for building permits.

History

City Council approved Ordinance 70-19 on December 2, 2019 for the rezoning of approximately 13.5 acres west of Frantz Road, north of Rings Road and south of Paul Blazer Parkway from OLR, Office, Laboratory and Research District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District (The Corners) for the future development of up to 70,000 square feet of commercial and office uses and a public park. At the same meeting, City Council also accepted the Preliminary Plat for the site. The Final Plat for the Corners development was recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission on March 5, 2020 and accepted by City Council on April 13, 2020. The site is located within the planning area of the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which was adopted by City Council on September 10, 2018, as an amendment to the Community Plan. Numerous public meetings with stakeholders and neighborhood residents were held during that planning process. The City owns the site. It was purchased based on an economic development strategy to allow the City to build a Smart parking lot for Cardinal Health to locate a facility within the adjacent building vacated by Nationwide. In May 2018, the City initiated an RFQ (Request for Qualifications) to identify a suitable developer to collaborate on the development of this 10-acre site, west of Frantz Road and east of the Cardinal Health offices and associated Smart parking lot. The Daimler Group was the selected developer and their team has collaborated over the past two years with the City on this proposal, which is unique for this site and these uses. The City is the applicant for this project. As part of Ordinance 70-19, a Planned Unit Development Text was approved by City Council that includes all permitted uses and development requirements, addressing among other items the appropriate development pattern, landscaping, and signs. This proposal adheres to that development text. It includes two stormwater retention ponds on the west side, which will address stormwater retention for The Corners and the Smart parking lot. They also will be an amenity in the public park included in the center of this development. The buildings comprise 70,000 square feet of commercial, retail and office use. Shared parking exists throughout the site.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to develop Phase 1 of the Planned Unit Development, which will consist of the public park and three commercial buildings in the northeast portion of the site with a mix of office space and commercial (restaurant & retail) space. A drive-thru and patio spaces are also included in this phase. All associated site improvements, including but not limited to drive aisles, parking, landscaping and lighting are included in this proposal. Access will be provided from Frantz Road, Rings Road and Blazer Parkway, providing circulation throughout the site. Building A, tucked in the corner, is the smaller building with 2,260 square feet. It will have a pocket park. Buildings B and C are located more to the north along the Frantz Road frontage. Building B will have 12,660 square feet; Building C, at the Frantz Road entrance, will have 8,280 square feet. All buildings can accommodate outdoor patio spaces. [Renderings shown]. Building A will be a restaurant with drive-through, patio and a public park. The drive through use requires a Conditional Use approval by the Commission. The stacking for the drive-through has been moved toward the rear of the building. The architecture for The Corners in the development text is described as Rural, Contemporary. The cues are being taken from the open space and Field of Corn on the south side of Rings Road, but it also has modern elements, such as overhangs, metals and many windows. Detailed elevations have been provided, which show metal roofing, board and batten siding and sign locations for future tenants. The architecture for Building B, a commercial/retail building, has evolved since the Preliminary Development Plan, as reflected in the Minor Text Modifications requested. Building C also will be a commercial/retail building of similar architectural character, materials and colors as the other two buildings. [Frantz Road frontage views of Building B and C and location of entry feature sign shown.] A 3.88 acre public park will be located in the

center of the site, between the two stormwater retention ponds and the commercial buildings. The park will have a circular design and include seating and landscaping. Planning staff has met biweekly with the applicant and Engineering and Parks staff on finalizing the design. The City will be responsible for maintenance of the public park.

Following review of the applicable criteria, staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions; approval of the Minor Text Modification with three modifications; and approval of the Final Development Plan with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Paul G. Ghidotti, The Daimler Group, 6840 Macneill Drive, Dublin, stated that a large team is with him tonight, including: Carter Bean, the lead architect; Steve Kolwicz, POD Design, land planner; Katie Baumann, EMHT, civil engineer; and also a couple of his partners. This ground has sat unused for many years. Originally, this development proposal contained a residential component. However, they were encouraged to identify a different plan, and the residential component was replaced with a public park concept. They have been working on that concept for approximately a year, and tonight, they hope to have the proposed park improvements approved and be able to proceed with construction of the three road accesses yet this year. Fortunately, a primary retail anchor has been identified, and it is the type of retail that everyone desires. It is important that the first retail be the right user. This is a well-designed plan. The drive-thru is one of the smartest designs he has seen. Planning staff has worked with them many hours on this project, and it is a testament to a public-private partnership working together to create a great project.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated that the architecture is attractive; all the massing has a brown finish with white trim, with indications of some elements to break up the massing, such as awnings. A layer of personality will come with the tenants. However, with some of the larger buildings, it would seem that some material changes between the six shells, such as stone or use of another color, would break up the series of masses. Is there a reason that approach was not taken?

Mr. Ghidotti responded that they initially considered that approach, and they still could do so. However, collectively, they all really liked the barn concept, which would have one color.

Mr. Supelak stated he is not advocating for a different approach. However, using the stone as an integrated material with the barn vernacular could break up the massing.

Mr. Ghidotti stated that outdoor seating areas will be included with each of the buildings, which will be helpful, as well. It is important to design the patios based on what retail locates in the end use.

Carter Bean, lead architect, The Daimler Group, Inc., 1533 Lake Shore Drive, Columbus, OH 43204 stated that there was significant conversation about variety in the development. Traditionally, a rural farmstead will have a collection of buildings with similar characteristics, colors and materials. This is only one-quarter of the development. They foresee the other quadrants being developed with variety. They did not want to be carried away in this particular section due to the story that would be told with the collection of compatible buildings.

Ms. Call stated that the staff report indicated that "the desire of the neighborhood is for a preference for an architectural theme for this PUD with a contemporary interpretation of the traditional, rural and agricultural structures of the area." Ms. Call requested details about the Building A drive-thru, queue lane, menu board, etc.

Ms. Husak stated that vehicles would travel through the western travel lane and queue into the drive-thru lane, accommodating as many as 14 vehicles. There will also be a bypass lane. There will be no other circulation around the building, only the L-shaped drive through lane. Along the eastern, Frantz Road frontage, there will a small patio space for the user and a pocket park.

Ms. Call stated that the queue lane is well designed. Vehicles in that lane will not block parking spaces.

Mr. Fishman stated he is thrilled with this plan. This is not just a strip center, and he loves the park. The architecture style does have significant straight lines, but he believes landscaping will soften its lines. It has been indicated that Building A will have a pocket park. In a previous instance, a public space next to a restaurant evolved into an extension of a restaurant's patio. It will be important to demark that space as a public park. He commends Daimler and the City for the result of what he recognizes was an arduous process.

Mr. Grimes referred to the Minor Text Modification that would allow additional secondary building masses, and the permitted secondary forms or masses that can be incorporated. Is that intended to be a broad or a restrictive language?

Mr. Bean described the roof elements. Although the primary element is a pitched roof, a smaller, secondary flat roof component will be included.

Public Comment

The following public comments were received:

Mary Daney, 5775 Settlers Pl., Dublin, OH 43017

The Corners building elevations as presented look quite industrial/commercial. It's lacking the neighborhood charm that could warm up the space! Given that it is so close to several neighborhoods, and across from one of Dublin's famous landmarks, it makes sense to make it more visually appealing to locals. Awnings, shingles, benches/outdoor patios, extensive landscape, warmer-feeling exterior materials are just a few ideas to help bring an approachable feel to the space. If the aesthetic is to go more farmhouse, adding barn doors could be a nice touch. Thanks for your consideration!

Clay Daney, 5775 Settlers Pl., Dublin, OH 43017

A water feature under the park pavilion would be nice for visitors. Something similar to the water wall fountain planned for Riverside Crossing Park at Bridge Park. The farmhouse architecture is great. However, the early renderings of the project showed many more natural materials. The use of stone is non-existent in this plan. Stone is timeless and will ensure the project stands the test of time. Stone in the middle of Buildings B and C would break up the massing of the large buildings. White Hardie barn siding could also be a nice way to add some variation to the exterior -- perhaps white siding on the North "barn" of Building B and South "barn" of Building C. The white "end-caps" may tie the two buildings together more. The metal roof is missing dormer windows. This would make add more interest to an already expansive roof. Incorporating dormers and Barn doors would add the neighborhood charm this plan is currently lacking. Buildings B and C should be slightly further apart with benches and a water feature between the 2 patios. Families would gather between the patios after dinner.

Patrick Murtagh, 4189 Haymaker Ln., Dublin, OH 43017

Overall, the development plan looks really nice. It would be great to see some outdoor seating options for any of the commercial space that will be utilized for restaurants; also, a water feature in the park or some local art would be a nice touch.

Bill Reed, 4670 Bridle Path Lane, Dublin, OH

I want to let you know how upset I am about the Corners project. I just cannot believe that Dublin would consider cheapening our wonderful neighborhood like this! It will lower the property values, increase crime and ruin the whole ambience of Dublin. I am so proud of the field of corn and having this project across the street will ruin this wonderful art display. This will only be a few blocks from my property. Please consider NOT approving this! Please do not ruin our neighborhood! Thanks for your consideration.

Betts Carpenter, MD, PhD

I want to express my concern about this project. Please do not ruin our wonderful neighborhood! This will increase crime and decrease our property values. Please do not be influenced by developers and destroy our neighborhood. I live in Llewellyn Farms. Thanks so much for your consideration.

D. Glen Vanderbilt

Re: Corners project plans

Thank you for the reply and links. If I read the drawings correctly, it looks like a major feature of the commercial development is a drive thru diner. Really? Do the planners really think we need another one of those? What about all of the empty restaurants on Tuttle? The land on the SE corner of the property is not filled with ground plans or features. Nor do I see it labeled for anything. Do you know what the plan is for that? Can it be green space?

David Venne, 56 S. Riverview St., Dublin, OH 43017

I would appreciate an increase in the number of bike racks available in the development. I see two areas with bike racks. Outlook+Loop and Building A. Perhaps the designer would be able to include a bank of racks between Buildings B and C. It would be a missed opportunity to have a development right on the multi-use path to not adequately accommodate users. Additionally, I hope the developer considers ways in which to reduce the environmental impact of their development. The roofs of B and C look like they would support solar arrays or skylights to reduce energy usage. I suggest the addition of a bank of vehicle chargers for EVs somewhere in the parking lot. The City has ChargePoint units around the City. It would be beneficial to expand this network whenever additional parking is added to the area. Thank you for your time.

Beth Wicker, 5827 Coventry Lane, Dublin, OH 43017

I would like to express concern over the inclusion of a drive-thru in The Corners mixed retail space planned at Frantz/Rings Rd. The presence of a restaurant drive-thru in close proximity to our neighborhood at Rings/Dublin Rd. increases potential for excessive traffic, noise, littering, loitering, late night disturbances, etc. There are several drive-thru options for drivers to access located nearby that do not disrupt local neighborhoods. Including a drive-thru in this new development which is geared toward "serving nearby companies and neighborhoods" takes away from the appeal of a walkable, family-friendly amenity.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy referred to the public comment about EV chargers. Are there any requirements that they be included with new developments?

Ms. Husak responded that they are not required.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if there is any requirement that would require a local art element to be included.

Ms. Husak responded that there is no such requirement.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she was impressed with the package submitted because consideration was given to light pollution into the adjacent neighborhood, including the incorporation of glare shields. She appreciates that Mr. Ghidotti has called out and responded to the concerns of the neighborhood residents.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City has been interested in starting a tradition of incorporating outdoor art elements. This would be a good place to do so. In regard to the comment about EV chargers, Tesla will do so at no cost, if the land is provided for it to be placed within.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a very attractive, well-designed project. The landscape design is well developed. A wealth of details have been provided, including seating, bike rack specs, awnings, pocket parks, circulation access and generous patio space opportunities. He posed the opportunity for breaking up the masses. They do have stone in their palette; a couple of choice locations of stone could break up the massing. There are some long rooflines, so perhaps a series of dormers or adjustments to the roofline could help break up the roofline. He appreciates the fencing detail provided.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is very impressed with this plan. It is obvious that a significant amount of time was invested. He would hesitate responding too quickly to the EV suggestion, and a Tesla supercharger may not be desirable. He does not believe this is necessarily the best time or format in which to take up that issue. It can be considered a little later.

Mr. Grimes stated that this an incredible project. Walking along the east side of Frantz Road and seeing this development -- a little bit of country with midrise buildings behind -- what a great way to break up the view of what is currently a sweeping field. This phase will set a precedent for what the rest of the development will look like. It is an interesting project with a good amount of public space. Perhaps incorporating an art element in the bigger park space will be possible, although it is not an option for this phase.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she loves this project. She is not advocating for the EV element. She mentioned it only to give the City an opportunity to respond to the public comment suggestion.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is thrilled with the project, as well. He admires the result of all the work and planning invested. An EV element was only a suggestion. The vertical landscaping indicated will be fantastic.

Mr. Ghidotti suggested that they work with staff to see if there is a good site on which to locate an art element -- perhaps in the larger park to the west. In addition, they are willing to work with staff on the possibility of breaking up the massing with some differing materials. Finally, if they can afford to incorporate a couple of EV smartchargers, they would love to do so.

Ms. Call stated that adding landscaping or awnings to the long stretches of the buildings would be very helpful. She believes the Commission is comfortable with the developer working with staff regarding the building articulation and siting of an art piece.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Conditional Use.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modifications:

- 1) To allow additional secondary building masses such as projecting bays and entrance features;
- 2) To permit secondary forms or masses that may incorporate pitched and/or straight parapet rooflines; and
- 3) To permit beadboard as a façade material and restrict fiber cement materials to a smooth surface finish to promote a contemporary aesthetic.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

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

- 1) That the parking plans be updated to reflect the required number of bicycle parking spaces;
- 2) That the developer continue to work with staff on the final layout and species selection for the park landscaping;
- 3) That the developer work with staff to assure adherence to the text and the landscape code during the permitting stage of this proposal;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff on the utilization of an art piece; and
- 5) That the applicant work with staff on the building materials and articulation.

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

4. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-096CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request for facade improvements, new signage, and associated site improvements at an existing bank that needs modernization and remodeling. The site is located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Post Road and is zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for a Concept Plan review for facade improvements, new signage, and associated site improvements at the existing Heartland Bank, which is located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Post Road. Following approval of the Concept Plan, the applicant may work with staff to develop a Preliminary and Final Development Plan for submission to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Those two steps can be combined if determined appropriate by the Planning Director. The 0.82-acre site is an outparcel to the Dublin Plaza Shopping Center. [Photographs of all elevations shown.]

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a modernization and remodel of the entire exterior of the existing structure. The renovation concept replaces the combination of flat and hipped roofs with a modern, simplified flat roof system. The drive-thru overhang will be rebuilt, extending the flat roof from the building toward West Bridge Street. The building will be primarily clad in a new exterior material with a wood aesthetic. The applicant has not finalized an exterior material choice, however, has provided one potential material for reference. The siding is an aluminum panel product with a wood grain texture and light cherry color. Staff is recommending that the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure appropriate cladding materials are chosen. The existing brick veneer walls will be opened up on the north and west sides with increased glass for a more modern, open appearance. All the remaining exterior glass, which is not insulated, will be replaced with a new glazing system. The remaining exterior brick masonry will be painted a dark grey/black color to coordinate with the new color scheme. The existing square wood posts on the east and west sides will be replaced with steel I beam columns that extend up to hold the overhang. With the exterior modernization, the applicant is proposing four new signs for the site. A new monument 4.5-foot high ground sign will be located at the northwest corner of the site. The sign structure is clad in a material that appears to match the proposed building material in a slightly darker color. The sign would have white lettering. Staff is concerned with the proposed location close to the intersection of West Bridge Street and Frantz Road, potentially within easements and the required sight triangle. There are also three wall signs proposed, one on each of the east, west and north sides of the building. On the west side, the applicant is proposing an approximately 135-square-foot wall sign that includes the bank name and the institution's logo in a vertical format. The lettering is proposed to be white, using the cladding as the background. The north-facing sign is a horizontally oriented sign with only the institution's name. The 36-square-foot sign will be located on the drive-thru overhang, facing West Bridge Street. Finally, the east-facing sign will consist only of the institution's logo. The sign dimensions are not identified, but it appears to be significantly smaller than the other signs proposed. It is also located on the drive-thru overhang, facing the neighboring McDonald's property. Staff has reviewed the application with the applicable criteria and recommends approval with four conditions.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the siding on the building that appears to be cedar is actually aluminum.

Ms. Call noted that aluminum is not permitted as a primary material, only as a secondary material.

Mr. Ridge stated that the applicant has not finalized the cladding material; however, the aluminum siding has been proposed as the primary cladding material. A condition has been recommended that the applicant work with staff to select an appropriate cladding material.

Ashley Trout, Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, Dublin, stated they have been working with staff on a conceptual design, and, at this point, the plan is conceptual. Their intent is to continue working with staff on further development of their Preliminary Development Plan. This building was opened in 1993 and has remained unchanged since then. They have been inspired by the recent renovations of surrounding businesses, including the neighboring McDonald's site. Currently, they are working with their contractor, Ruscilli and architects on the conceptual design. In regard to the dumpster, because there are several branch locations at which dumpsters have been eliminated, they anticipate being able to do so here, as well.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that this building is very outdated, so this will be a welcome refresh. The new monument sign is very large. She does not believe it will meet Code and is not proportional with the size of the building. She likes the new roof but not the proposed cladding material. It does not appear complementary to the surrounding area. The four proposed signs exceed Code requirements, so it will be necessary to bring those into compliance.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would object to the aluminum cladding material, unless the millage is sufficiently thick so as not to be susceptible to becoming dented.

Mr. Supelak stated that the refresh of the dated building will be welcome. He has no objection to the proposed cladding material but looks forward to seeing what material is selected. He has no objection to the proposed monument sign, particularly given the fact that they will be giving up the existing, even larger sign. However, the total number of signs does exceed Code.

Mr. Schneier stated that the wood look of the cladding is not objectionable; however, the aluminum material is a concern. He likes the wall signs, but the total number would need to be reduced to meet Code. Overall, this is a great effort.

Mr. Grimes stated he has no objection to the larger monument sign on that important corner, although this site should have adequate visibility. He likes the wood look of the cladding material. He likes the concept overall, but there is much work to be done.

Ms. Call stated that she believes the number of signs requested is excessive. Although the cladding material is not her taste, she believes it is well done. She appreciates the mix of materials with the darker material above. Regarding the planter baskets adjacent to the drive-through lane – they are a separate redwood material, probably for longevity, that appears to clash with the wood material on the building. She would suggest that a different basket material be used, such as a wire basket. The sign package would need to be compliant with Code. However, the building design is well done, and the conditions that have been proposed by staff should address the concerns that have been expressed tonight.

Ms. Trout thanked the Commission for their direction and suggestions.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded to approve the Concept Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) Code compliance;
 - 2) The applicant continue to work with staff to choose an appropriate exterior cladding material;
 - 3) The applicant continue to work with staff on creating an appropriate sign plan for the site;
- and

- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to address the location of the existing dumpster and dumpster enclosure.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

5. Germain Honda, 6715 Sawmill Road, 20-102CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request for exterior renovations, sign changes, and associated site improvements for an existing car dealership. The 12.7-acre site is southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this site is located within the BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. This Concept Plan is significantly more detailed than previous Concept Plans the Commission has reviewed, which is due to the iterative nature of this project. The proposal is for parking lot, landscape and architectural modifications for the existing car dealership located on a 12.7-acre site, southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive. Originally, the dealership campus developed as multiple separate sites including a gas station, office, and automotive dealership. Over time, the parcels have been combined and the uses have been consolidated into a single automotive dealership. The intent of this project is to streamline the site circulation and increase the overall efficiency of the site operations. Staff and the property owner have been engaged in this process since 2017. In 2018, the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed and approved Phase I of the campus improvements, specifically demolition of a vacant 2,000-square-foot building located in the southeast portion of the site, and modifications to parking, landscaping, and lighting for a .64-acre portion of the campus. In 2019, the ART reviewed and approved Phase II of the campus improvements, specifically modifications to parking, perimeter landscaping along Dublin Center Drive frontages and lighting for the remainder of the site. Phase III included interior renovations to the new car store, service drive, and (future) upgrades to the used car store. As the modifications in Phase III were interior only, review and approval by ART or PZC was not required. The application before the Commission tonight is for modifications along the Sawmill Road frontage, parking lot and exterior building modifications.

Vehicular Circulation and Pedestrian Connectivity

The site is located within the BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. (Photographs of frontages and existing buildings shown.) The Sawmill Center applies to the majority of the commercial and service-oriented areas in the BDS. As part of the BSD Code, the Street Network Map establishes the framework for vehicular and pedestrian connectivity to distribute traffic efficiently across the network. The Street Network Map establishes existing and planned streets within the BSD. The Street Network Map defines a hierarchy of street classifications including Corridor Connectors, District Connectors, Neighborhood Streets, and Alley/Service Streets. Corridor and District Connectors may in some cases be designated Principal Frontage Streets. Principal Frontage Streets are designated to ensure certain street types are lined with continuous pedestrian-oriented block faces. The applicant is seeking direction on the required pedestrian connectivity. Staff has encouraged the applicant to provide pedestrian connectivity along both Dublin Center Drive and Sawmill Road. The most notable neighborhood street that bisects this site is the potential connection of Snouffer Road. The Snouffer Road connection is not identified in the City's current 5-Year CIP. With Phase II, vehicular circulation modifications were approved that required the removal of the northernmost Sawmill Road right in/right out access point and an additional access point added in the southwest portion of the site along Dublin Center Drive. This application also includes some parking lot modifications to the east of the used car store, as well as a curvilinear sidewalk extension along Sawmill Road. To fulfill the clear intent of the BSD Code, the applicant should extend the sidewalk along the Dublin Center Drive frontage. The applicant should work with staff to provide sidewalk connections along Sawmill

Road and Dublin Center Drive, while locating the sidewalk to minimize tree removal to the greatest extent possible.

Parking and Lighting

The parking and lighting modifications are in line with those that have been previously approved. Along the Sawmill Road frontage, a pervious paver is proposed, which has an aesthetic as well as functional quality. Comprehensive site lighting will match what was previously approved.

Landscape Modifications/Tree Removal and Replacement

The applicant is proposing landscape modifications to the Sawmill Road frontage. Previously, landscape modifications were approved for the perimeter landscaping along Dublin Center Drive and parking lot interior vehicular use areas. Today, there are a number of mature trees along the Sawmill Road frontage, and the applicant has provided an assessment of the existing condition of the landscaping along the Sawmill Road frontage, which indicates the trees are in a variety of conditions: good, fair, and poor health. The proposal is to remove trees to establish select views into the site while maintaining trees to soften the appearance of vehicular use areas from the public right-of-way. It is important to maintain the mature character of the site along Sawmill Road. With Phase II, a total of 1,240 caliper inches were approved to be removed due to overgrowth along the Dublin Center Drive frontages. With the approval, the applicant paid \$186,019 into the City's tree fund for inches that were not able to be replaced onsite. With Phase IV, a total of 163 caliper inches are proposed to be removed along the Sawmill Road frontage. The applicant is able to replace seven, 2.5-inch replacement trees on site, but a total fee in lieu of in the amount of \$21,834 will be paid in addition to the previous fee. With this tree removal, a comprehensive landscape treatment along the Sawmill Road frontage will incorporate enhancements including a new curvilinear sidewalk, dry laid stone street walls, vehicle display areas, and landscaping with shrubs, grasses, and seasonal annuals. In detail, a five-foot sidewalk is proposed along the Sawmill Road frontage. The landscape design strives to incorporate the archetypal Honda "wave," which has been eliminated from the building design to be sensitive to the context within Dublin.

Vehicle Display Areas/Street Walls

A total of three vehicular display areas are proposed: one east of the new car store, one east of the used car store, and one at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive. The BSD Code permits street walls or hedges to screen vehicular use areas. Vehicular use areas include parking lots. The frontage along Sawmill Road is required to be screened by a street wall as the vehicular use area is within 20 feet of the right-of-way. Street walls are defined "as an opaque, freestanding wall or opaque combination of landscaping and fencing built along the frontage line...to screen vehicular use areas or service areas and/or to define the pedestrian realm." Masonry street walls are required to be a minimum of 30 inches in height and maximum of 36 inches in height. The proposed street wall is 30 inches in height, but due to the potential sizeable growth of some of the proposed plantings, staff is recommending the street wall be increased to 33 inches in height.

Architectural Modifications

Exterior modifications are proposed to the new and used car stores to align the character with the modern aesthetic of the BSD as well as the updated Honda brand. The applicant is not proposing to use the Honda prototype; rather opting to customize the building character recognizing the context within Dublin. The form of the new car store will remain the same with a new cylindrical entry feature finished in a silver metal panel with glass sides proposed. The existing EIFS panels are proposed to be repainted in a soft white consistent with the Honda brand. The silver accent is proposed along the top edge of the building as well as the southeast corner where there is an existing architectural protrusion. The service entrance on the north side of the building is proposed to be integrated with the showroom. The exterior will utilize the same materials and colors as the primary showroom. The applicant is proposing a blue Honda stripe across the façade of the service entrance, which staff is conditioning be removed.

Signs

The applicant has also requested feedback on a future Master Sign Plan. Today, there are 13 existing signs plus one ground sign required to be removed with Phase I. The existing signs include: 3 Ground Signs (2 plus 1 previously removed), 2 Wall Signs, and 8 Directional Signs. A total of 16 signs are proposed, including: one (1) Ground Sign; six (6) Wall Signs; five (5) Perimeter Directional Signs; and four (4) Interior Directional Signs. Without approval of a MSP, the site is permitted signs under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.150. These provisions do not permit a combination of ground signs and wall signs. One sign type or the other must be selected. For wall signs, one sign is permitted for each building. For sites with 100 feet of frontage or more along two public right-of-ways, a third sign is permitted. The maximum allowable size for wall signs is 80 square feet each, with the total allocated square footage of 240 square feet divided among the three signs. For ground signs, one sign is permitted for each site. For sites with 100 feet of frontage or more along two public rights-of-way, a second sign is permitted. The maximum allowable size for a ground sign is 50 square feet with the total allocated square footage to be divided across the two signs being 66 square feet. All ground signs must be a minimum of 8 feet from the right-of-way and may not be located in an easement. Per Code, directional signs are limited to 4 square feet and three feet in height. Directional signs may not include a business name or logo. [Reviewed the proposed signs.]

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with ten conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman inquired if the sign recommendations of staff would meet Code.

Ms. Martin responded that they do not. Even with staff's recommendations, the proposed signs do not meet Code. The applicant will be submitting a future Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Schneier stated that a great sidewalk extension is proposed, but it appears to lead nowhere, as it dead-ends on both the north and south ends. Is there an overall plan?

Ms. Martin responded that there is a connection plan, which was adopted in 2012 with the Bridge Street Code, although it was conceived prior to that in 2010 with the BSD Vision Plan. The intent is that with the redevelopment of sites within the BSD sidewalks be provided. It is a piecemeal process but will lead to fulfilling the overall special area plan.

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance, 49 East Third Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, stated that the improvements to this site were to make a cohesive design across the entire site, which was previously three sites. Phase 2 was to improve the connectivity and circulation on the site, this Phase 4 is to improve the design, make it appear as one campus and meet the standard of the Germain brand. The desire is to present a great face along Sawmill Road, and they anticipate these improvements will make an impactful improvement along Sawmill Road. They have tried to adjust the Honda prototype to be a cleaner design, and use the design elements in a way that will work with the curvilinear sidewalk. They believe the Dublin Village Center sidewalk improvements, given the City's future plan to have a connector that cuts through the middle of this site, would require extensive work to create a Code-required sidewalk. It would require cutting into the existing mounds, eliminating a significant amount of existing landscape. The work would be too extensive due to the relatively short future plan for this area. They believe their proposed design along Sawmill Road helps to further what the Code is attempting to achieve in regard to walkability in the most impactful area of the site. They are happy to continue to work with staff on the specific details of the plan.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy requested additional clarification of the fee in lieu of tree removal.

Ms. Martin responded that with the tree removal along Sawmill Road, the applicant will need to either replace the trees on site or pay a fee in lieu of the required replacement inches. They will be able to replace seven trees; however, they will not be able to replace all of the required inches, so will need to pay a fee of \$22,000. Ms. Call stated that the purpose is to open up the view corridor to highlight the view of the building and the product displayed on site.

Ms. Kennedy noted that nearly 100 trees already have been removed in a previous phase.

Ms. Call stated that not all of those trees were in the best condition.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the purpose of removal of the proposed trees was to enable a curvilinear sidewalk along the Sawmill corridor.

Mr. Todd responded that for this phase, it is to accommodate the display pads that are being placed in front of the building, which will connect to the pedestrian sidewalk, as well as an attempt to keep the parking areas screened while potentially allowing the areas in front of the building to be more open.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City would rather have the trees than the money. He believes they should re-examine the tree removal plan, which would eliminate many of the beautiful trees that the Commission required to be planted many years ago to improve the appearance of the Sawmill Road corridor. He understands their desire for visibility, but, typically, trees are more attractive than buildings. Does this plan meet the Landscape Code?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes the minimum number of trees should be removed. It is essential to be cautious about removing trees that are 40-50 years old just to see more of a building. He believes the signs should also meet Code, in view of the fact the Commission will continue to deal with this issue in the future.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if any consideration was given to providing open space. Recently, another applicant for a car dealership located near Sawmill Road provided some proposals related to open spaces on that campus to make it more inviting.

Mr. Todd responded that the pads in front of the building are their suggestion for providing a connection to the walkable area along Sawmill Road. The intent of this improvement is to make the site more walkable.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she likes the proposed connection between the sidewalk and the display pads, but if there is opportunity to include some additional greenspace and perhaps a sitting area, she would encourage them to do so.

Mr. Grimes asked if the intent is to have a Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Martin responded that, based on the Commission's feedback, a Master Sign Plan would be required.

Mr. Grimes inquired if it should be made a condition.

Ms. Call stated that it is already a requirement, if an applicant desires to have more signage than the Code permits.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the participatory nature of the display pads with the sidewalk.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided.

Commission Comments

Mr. Fishman stated that what a car dealership needs is for the public to be aware of their location. However, the attempt here is much more – it is an attempt to achieve incredible visibility along Sawmill Road. He does not believe the public needs to see more cars along Sawmill Road. A view of the landscaping, including trees, is more desirable. He could not support this plan with this amount of tree removal and signage. There should be sufficient signage only to make the public aware of the Honda dealership and the service entrance. Additionally, he believes the service area at the rear of the building needs to be well screened; therefore, no trees should be removed along that road. Presently, there is sign clutter on the other side of Sawmill Road; we want to avoid doing so on this side.

Ms. Call inquired, if the front display areas were not display areas but were parking spaces, would staff have provided any recommendations for parking.

Ms. Martin responded that within the BSD, service parking would be discouraged between the building and the street. While this is a very specific type of retail, staff encouraged the applicant to try to engage the retail use with the street because there are not many retail opportunities in this corridor that could engage with the street.

Ms. Call stated that the City prides itself on its trees and discourages overly prominent signage along its corridors. A balance is necessary. Presently, there are two display pads that would require tree. She would prefer that they retain the larger pad in front but remove the smaller adjacent pad and retain those trees. They would accomplish their desire to engage with the street. Future uses could incorporate that space into patio seating.

Mr. Supelak that this is a difficult site. This Honda dealership is immediately adjacent to the street and lacks the usual amount of frontage. He understands their need for visibility. The trees are very thick in this area, and if they commit to the renovation, they do need to open up the view of the site. Perhaps there is a more balanced solution that will draw attention to their site, but with less removal of trees. The amount of signs proposed are an issue; they will need to be reduced. He applauds their effort in regard to the pedestrian connection, and the vehicle display areas that are not just a parking lot.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is not a fan of the new dealership aesthetic, although he understands that its purpose is recognition at the street level. From his experience, this area is confusing, and a large amount of directional signage is needed. There are multiple buildings and multiple ingress/egress points. He likes the proposed formality of this campus. He also likes the two vehicle display pads; they are consistent with the stock and trade, and the visibility is appropriate.

Mr. Grimes stated that much is crammed in these 12+ acres, and improved circulation and signage is needed. Much of their inventory is located off site, and there is much that they are attempting to accomplish and improve here. However, the project does need to fit within the long-term plan for this area. The proposed frontage is a step in that direction. This site is a challenge; there are many conditions with which to deal.

Ms. Kennedy stated that there is no greenspace or open space in this Concept Plan. The street network and pedestrian engagement along Sawmill Road is very well done. The curvilinear sidewalk is very attractive; the vehicle display pads are a great feature; and the building mass seems appropriate. Are they seeking input regarding pedestrian connectivity on all four sides of the site, or on the rear only?

Mr. Todd responded that they were seeking feedback on the Dublin Village Center side, which would be the north and west sides of the site.

Ms. Kennedy responded that they did a good job on the Sawmill Road frontage, and because the other sides are the back entrance to their property, she does not see a need for pedestrian connectivity at this time. She is not in favor of a fee in lieu of tree replacement. She would be in favor of more directional signage than Code permits, because of the confusion related to this site. She is looking forward to the "refresh" of this site!

Ms. Call stated that she would favor a reduction in the number of signs proposed. She agrees with the importance of the brand on the wayfinding signage, but there is only one brand on this site. Council has emphasized the need for reduction of sign clutter, and the Commission takes that charge seriously. She pays particular attention to pedestrian connectivity. At Dublin Village Center Drive, the sidewalk terminates. She does not like to see a conflict created between pedestrians and bicycles with vehicles. In redevelopments where pedestrian connectivity is being added, it is important to ensure a safe pathway. Therefore, she would recommend that consideration be given to extending that sidewalk, understanding the potential impact to trees. She likes the vehicle display pads; however, the smaller display pad, located on the used car side, is within a parking lot. Her recommendation remains to eliminate that display pad and not lose those existing

trees. She believes the building architecture is attractive. Does the applicant need any further direction or clarification?

Mr. Todd requested additional clarification on a sidewalk connection along Dublin Village Center Drive. The potential impact of providing that connection was assessed, and installing a Code-compliant sidewalk on the north and west sides of the site would require the removal of 673 caliper inches of trees. They take seriously the City's desire to replace trees rather than receiving a fee in lieu of. However, a large portion of this site, particularly along the perimeter, is overgrown. Trying to find locations for replacement trees would be very difficult.

Ms. Call stated that would be approximately half of the amount that occurred in Phase 2. However, she remains in favor of adding that pedestrian connection along Dublin Center Drive.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would not be in favor of losing more trees on this site, because so many have been removed already. She does not see much pedestrian or bicycle traffic here. From a sidewalk prioritization perspective, adding that connection here would not seem to be a high priority.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees. He does not want to lose any more trees. It takes 30 years to accomplish what exists, and only a minute to remove them. Perhaps it would be possible to add a sidewalk in some more creative manner, closer to the parking lot. However, he would not support removing more trees with this project. Doing so would result in more blacktop, and this side of Sawmill would look like the other side. He concurs with the suggestion of removing the smaller vehicle display pad.

Mr. Grimes stated that there are many trees along the perimeter here. Because there are fewer trees on the other side of the street, he would be inclined to leave the trees on this site and add the sidewalk on the other side of the street. It is not necessary to have a sidewalk on both sides of the street.

Ms. Call stated that she would agree, if there were a redevelopment application for that side of the street. That may not occur for some time. There was an earlier suggestion of adding a sidewalk in some creative manner. Perhaps it would be possible to add a meandering sidewalk behind the tree line, removing a couple of parking spaces only to do so.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would agree with placing the sidewalk on the other side of the street and not removing additional trees here.

[Further discussion occurred regarding the proposed conditions.]

Tom Hart, Isaac Wiles Burkholder & Teetor, LLC, Two Miranova Place, Suite 700, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that he believes it would be advisable to return to the Commission with an analysis of the work and finances required with providing the sidewalk connection. In addition to significant tree removal, there is also significant mounding in that area. Installing a sidewalk there would damage the root system of many of the trees. Due to the substantial physical barrier on this site, it will be necessary for them to request a waiver for a sidewalk. In addition, the City has a Thoroughfare Plan that calls for re-doing the road system in this area. While it is not in the City's CIP plan today, this area likely has a different future. Any sidewalk at Dublin Center Drive would need to be relocated at that time. Providing full pedestrian connectivity would be more appropriate to add when there is future residential development. At this time, the applicant is attempting to improve a site located along a major entrance to the City of Dublin.

Following discussion of the proposed conditions, Mr. Shamp advised removal of the first condition and revision of the second condition to permit the applicant to work with staff on a recommendation for a sidewalk connection.

Ms. Call requested that when the Preliminary Development Plan is submitted, the staff report clarify the need for a sidewalk waiver. Currently, the BSD calls for that connection, and the decision for this project could impact a future redevelopment project.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the Concept Plan with the following nine conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff to locate a sidewalk along the Sawmill Road and Dublin Center Drive frontages to minimize tree removal and to promote the health of preserved trees while retaining select viewsheds for vehicle display;
- 2) The applicant work with staff to resolve the off-site replacements in an appropriate manner;
- 3) Prior to Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan submittal, the applicant confirm that the holder of the utility easement will permit new trees to be planted within the easement and provide affirmative documentation to the City;
- 4) The applicant resolve Detail 4 on Sheet L3.1 with the renderings to confirm the intended design and provide details for the used car display area and the Dublin Center Drive and Sawmill Road display area;
- 5) The applicant work with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector to refine the street wall height and plant selections prior to the Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan;
- 6) The applicant remove the blue stripe architectural detail on the service center;
- 7) The applicant work with staff to revise the layout of the two protruding display pads immediately east of the used car building;
- 8) The applicant demonstrate the ground sign is located 8 feet from the right-of-way and not located within an easement and provide sign design construction details for all sign types; and
- 9) The applicant eliminate the oval "box sign" above the service drive entrance.

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

[Motion passed 6-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 6, at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council