



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 17, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:45 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 appreciate your patience."

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Jane Fox
Commission members absent: Kristina Kennedy (excused)
Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of 08-06-20 and 08-20-20 as submitted.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, 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 are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. If no Commission member requests to remove them from the Consent Agenda for review, two cases are scheduled for the Consent Agenda this evening -- Case 2, 20-037 and Case 3, 20-129, both of which are Conditional Use cases.

No Commission member requested the cases be removed from the Consent Agenda.

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

CONSENT CASES

2. **UFit, 6631 E. Commerce Parkway Unit L, 20-037CU, Conditional Use**

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request to permit a physical fitness use for a Fitness and Recreational Sports Center - an inclusive fitness-training center and gym in an existing tenant space. The 2.89-acre parcel is northwest of the intersection of Commerce Parkway with Perimeter Drive and zoned Suburban Office and Institutional District.

3. Dublin Salon, 7215 Sawmill Road #210, 20-129CU, Conditional Use

Ms. Call stated that this application is a request for a Personal Service Use salon in an existing tenant space ±200 feet northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Billingsley Road and zoned Suburban Office and Institutional District.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the Consent Cases with no conditions.

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

TABLED CASE

1. Chase Bank, 6515 Sawmill Road, 20-107MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for a deviation from the Code to permit three, building-mounted signs and one monument sign for a ±4,100-square-foot, one-story bank. The 0.84-acre site is northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Banker Drive and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval for a Master Sign Plan associated with the construction of a new bank located on a ±0.84-acre site located within Bridge Street District (BSD) – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The site is located west of Sawmill Road, northwest of the intersection with Banker Drive. On August 6, 2020, Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Preliminary/Final Development Plan with Conditional Use and Parking Plan for an approximately 4,200-square-foot bank on the 0.84-acre, vacant Boston Market site. However, the Commission tabled the Master Sign Plan application, per the applicant's request. Commission members had requested more diversity in the proposed signage, and that the signs more closely adhere to the Bridge Street District design guidelines. Bridge Street Zoning Code permits this location two ground signs (one per frontage) and two wall signs (one per frontage).

Proposal

The applicant is proposing three building-mounted signs and one ground sign. The original proposal included three wall signs and one window transom sign. Chase Bank is permitted, per the Bridge Street Sign Code, to have a maximum of two wall signs and two ground signs, one of each to be located on the Sawmill Road frontage and the Banker Drive frontage. Each sign type is only permitted to be located on a frontage street. Wall signs within the Bridge Street District are required to be no taller than 15 feet in height and are allowed 0.5 square feet per each lineal foot of building wall on the façade, not to exceed 50 square feet. Ground signs within the Bridge Street District are required to be no taller than 8 feet in height, be placed a minimum of 8 feet from the street right-of-way, and be no larger than 24 square feet. The original proposal included three wall signs and one window transom sign. The revised proposal has eliminated the transom sign and the wall sign on the north elevation. Instead, the applicant has proposed a monument sign and a canopy sign. The previous wall signs were 36.9 square feet, halo-illuminated channel letters, had the Chase blue octagonal logo and were constructed of aluminum. The revised wall sign on the east elevation along Sawmill Road will be the blue Chase logo; it is 25 sq. ft. in size, 18'-10" in height, made of aluminum, and internally illuminated with blue LED lights. The wall sign on the south elevation, which faces Banker Drive, will be similar to the original proposal but only 20.6 sq. feet, 14'-6" in height, also constructed of aluminum and internally illuminated with white and blue LED lights. With the current proposal, a canopy

sign is included on the west elevation; it is 36.9 square feet in size, 13 feet-7.5 inches in height, made of aluminum and internally illuminated with white and blue LED lights. The previously proposed signage on the north elevation has been removed in lieu of a monument sign on the northeast portion of the site. The revised MSP includes blue linear downlights under the roof cornice on the south, east and west elevations. The building will be illuminated at night. On the southeast elevation, the jewel box structure will be illuminated from the inside of the building. New to this application is a 6-square-foot monument sign at the entrance of the site from Sawmill Road. The sign is 4 feet in height and is set back 20 feet from Sawmill Road. The monument sign cabinet will be constructed of aluminum panels. The sign mounted to the cabinet includes approximately 1.8 inch deep, internally illuminated channel letters with the Chase logo. The base of the sign will complement the materials of the building, with an illuminated blue acrylic strip separating the cabinet and base of the monument. Planning staff has reviewed the application against the Master Sign Plan criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Jennifer Carr, Chase Bank, regional signage lead, 1111 Polaris Parkway, 2A, Columbus, Ohio 43240, stated that they took into consideration the Commission's comments at the August 6 meeting. They added architectural lighting to highlight the southeast corner and emphasize the gateway effect to the Bridge Park area. The jewel box will glow at night, and the linear blue lights will highlight the building on that corner. The octagon logo on the east location will serve as a beacon to emphasize Chase's presence on that corner. The sign on the south elevation was lowered from a 34-inch letter set to an 18-inch letter set to better fit that elevation. On the west elevation, the canopy sign will be important in view of the Piada and Penzone signage within that area. These three changes improve the effect but remain consistent with the Chase branding standards. The monument sign on the north side of the plan will be helpful in directing southbound Sawmill Road traffic to the site entrance.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Commission Questions/Comments

Mr. Supelak stated that the linear lights that will wrap around the south end of the building will be very nice. All the changes in the sign package are great. The canopy extension that has been restored in the updated rendering of the west elevation is a nice touch.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the changes made in the sign package, including the linear blue lights along the roof line. When this project is completed, they might want to replicate the design at the Frantz Road branch!

Mr. Fishman stated that the applicant considered the Commission's comments at the previous meeting, and he appreciates the changes that have been made. The revised MSP looks great!

Mr. Schneier stated that he echoes fellow Commissioners's comments. He is looking forward to seeing the blue linear lights in place. They are a fun touch!

Ms. Fox expressed agreement with the preceding comments and inquired if the transom window had been eliminated on the west elevation.

Ms. Carr responded that it was removed due to the sign changes that have been made. Ms. Fox agreed that it was a positive change and inquired if the color of the canopies also was changed in the revised design.

Tim Meseck, The Architects Partnership, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1020, Chicago, Illinois 60604 stated that with the revision, the elongated canopy was revised to a darker finish, as reflected in the package submitted for this meeting.

Ms. Fox stated that she really likes that change. In regard to the jewel box feature – are there projections from the windows, or are they tight to the window?

Mr. Meseck responded that the jewel box will be a curtain wall, so it does have a shadow line. In the night rendering, the blue interior lighting shown will emphasize that corner element.

Ms. Fox stated that considering the brand restrictions with Chase, what has been accomplished with the exterior of the building is impressive. This design is a “jewel box,” and she is very happy with the revised sign package!

Ms. Call requested that Ms. Carr explain the manner in which the canopy letters would be mounted.

Ms. Carr explained that, typically, a raceway or box is mounted to the top of the canopy. The letters are attached to the raceway to sit along the edge of the canopy. There will be a distance between the letters and the building.

Ms. Call inquired the approximate distance between the letters and the building, in comparison to a wall-mounted sign.

Ms. Carr responded that she does not have the exact distance.

Mr. Supelak noted that they appear to project three feet from the wall.

Ms. Fox stated that, originally, the applicant had requested 115 square feet of signage. Now with the ground sign, they have a total of 90 square feet of signage. Although there is less square feet of signage, the building is much more noticeable. The lighting and the design achieve an attractive element, which brings awareness to Chase. They have created signage with other elements, not letters.

Ms. Call stated that the purpose of a Master Sign Plan (MSP) is to offer an applicant flexibility for a sign package that deviates slightly from Code. With this revised MSP, a proposed wall sign will be replaced with a ground sign. However, the revised sign package achieves more brand awareness with the blue lighting and the Chase octagon logo. With less square footage, Chase will accomplish more brand awareness, and the City also will have a beautiful building. She appreciates the applicant’s consideration of the Commission’s previous input. We are looking forward to having a beautiful Chase building on this site!

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

- 1) The applicant work with staff to provide a photometric plan and lighting details prior to the submittal of a sign permit.

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

NEW CASES

2. Popeye’s Louisiana Kitchen, 5150 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, 20-123AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for exterior modifications to an existing drive-thru restaurant building. The 1.37-acre site is northwest of the intersection of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with Bradenton Avenue and is zoned Road Planned Commerce District (PCD), Subarea A1.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for site and exterior modifications for an existing drive-through restaurant. The Amended Final Development Plan is the fourth and optional step in the Planned Unit Development Process. The AFDP allows for modification over time, particularly when combined with Minor Text Modifications, as is proposed. This site is located northwest of the intersection of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and Bradenton Avenue within the I-270/Tuttle Road Planned Commerce District (PCD), Subarea A1. In 1989, City Council approved the I-270/Tuttle Road Planned Commerce District (PCD), including the subject site as part of an approximately

400-acre office/commercial development. In 1993, City Council approved a rezoning for approximately five acres along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to permit retail/restaurant uses with unique standards to address architecture, landscaping, and signs. On November 4, 1993, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Final Development Plan for Boston Market in alignment with the adopted standards for Subarea A1. This site, along with the Bob Evans and McDonald's sites, was rezoned for retail use. The site is presently vacant.

Proposal

This proposal is for exterior modifications for an existing drive-thru restaurant. The existing building is proposed to remain largely as is with exterior modifications to renovate the building and to integrate the Popeye's brand. The development text requires that buildings within Subarea A1 have "a common architectural theme and good aesthetic quality." The color palette in Subarea A1 is limited to muted and natural earth tones with accent colors in brighter hues permitted for features such as awnings, doors, and trim. The applicant has worked with staff to retain the established character of the surrounding area. The building's characteristic elements, including the brick façades and pitched, standing seam roof are proposed to be retained. The standing seam roof is proposed to be repainted black. The existing EIFS panel will be repaired and painted Moonlight White. The main, south-facing entrance will be re-clad in a vertical Vintage Wood style, Cedar color Nichiha panel. New orange double doors are proposed to coordinate with the orange gooseneck fixtures to be installed along the south, east, and west elevations. Six new red metal canopies with black metal tiebacks are proposed to accent key areas of the building, including the drive-thru window and the main entrance. The applicant has worked with staff to modify the prototypical Popeye's architecture to be responsive to this location within the City, recognizing the established PCD. While the proposal does contain some of the Popeye's brand elements, bright teal shutters and modern parapet roof are not proposed. The applicant is proposing both site and building modifications. The site will remain largely the same. The site layout, access and circulation are retained. The parking lot is being sealed and striped. The site was originally developed in 1993 with 62 parking spaces where 66 parking spaces would have been required for a restaurant. The applicant is proposing a total of 60 parking places. Staff is conditioning that they provide 61 parking spaces, which would be 62 spaces minus one for a dumpster expansion. The expanded dumpster, which will include recycling, is architecturally compatible with the building. New bronze light fixtures will be installed on top of the existing light poles. Staff is conditioning that the light poles be painted bronze to match the new fixtures, and that a photometric plan be provided. That plan was provided today, but staff has not had an opportunity to review it. Because Boston Market has vacated the site, many of the trees and shrubs on this site have not received maintenance. With these modifications, the landscaping will be revived. The building's characteristic elements, including the brick façades and pitched, standing seam roof will be retained, and the standing seam roof will be painted black. The existing EIFS panel will be repaired, as needed, and painted Moonlight White, and a new entry feature with accents is proposed. The development text requires natural materials and select accent colors. The west elevation faces Bob Evans and is where the drive-thru is located; the east elevation faces Bradenton Avenue.

Signs

This site is eligible for two signs. The applicant is proposing to use an existing brick sign face along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. An approximately 16-square-foot channel letter sign is proposed on a 49-square-foot brick monument. The primary text "Popeye's" is fabricated of individual letters attached to a raceway, and the secondary text or tagline is a box sign. New landscaping is proposed around the sign base, as required by Code. The development text permits a second building identification sign in addition to the ground sign provided the signs are along different frontages. Building mounted signs are only permitted to include the primary name of the business. Wall signs are limited to 1 square foot per linear foot of frontage not to exceed 80 square feet and 15 feet in height. The building has 81 feet of frontage along Bradenton Avenue. The proposed wall sign is 33 square feet in size mounted at 14 feet-5 inches in height to the top of the sign. The sign is fabricated of individual channel letters.

Minor Text Modification

An electronic menu board and ordering canopy are proposed to the rear of the building. The Code limits menu boards to 32 square feet in size. The code requires that menu boards not be visible from the public right-of-way, and in all cases prohibits travelling, flashing, scrolling, or animated signs.

A Minor Text Modification would be required to permit an electronic menu board. In 2018, the Commission approved an electronic menu board for McDonald's located in Subarea A4 of the I-270/Tuttle Road PCD. This Minor Text Modification incorporates all the conditions of approval applied to the McDonald's site. The proposed menu board includes three menu panels plus a menu topper and extender. The total size of the menu board is 27 square feet in size, not including the proposed topper and extender. The Commission has previously limited extraneous additions to menu boards including pre-browse menus. Staff recommends the menu board design be revised to eliminate the menu topper and extender. The text modifications are related to the 61 parking spaces and the menu board. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the two Text Modifications concerning parking spaces and the menu board and approval of the Final Development Plan with six conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Kasey Kist, Keystone Building Contractor, 7187 Fodor Rd., New Albany, OH 43054, stated that he has no additional comments. They have no objection to the proposed conditions.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that the staff report indicated the pavement would be re-sealed, but it is in such poor condition that re-sealing may not be sufficient.

Mr. Kist responded that they have re-assessed the pavement, and a complete mill and re-pave of the entire site is needed or will be done?????

Ms. Fox stated that she would like that to be added as a condition of approval. There is another item that is currently being addressed along Sawmill Road, which she believes also is important to address on Tuttle Crossing Boulevard – that of creating a sense of vibrancy and walkability. She believes it is important to retain an outdoor seating area that is inviting. Currently, there are concrete picnic tables, which can provide outdoor seating. She did not see outdoor seating included in the proposed plan.

Mr. Kist responded that, typically, the Popeye's restaurants do not have outdoor seating associated with the restaurants, as they are near high-traffic roads. This location could be an exception. Area does exist to accommodate that, and they would consider doing so.

Ms. Fox stated that she would encourage them to do so. As the City is re-developing Frantz Road, it is attempting to bring energy back along the perimeter of the City. During this pandemic, we have seen people utilizing the option to eat outdoors. It is likely the City will request this consideration of most restaurants. In regard to the architecture and color palette – did they consider options for breaking up the massing and making the brick look more interesting? Were any other options considered?

Mr. Kist responded that in working with staff, they were under the impression that their architectural options were limited in regard to the existing brick and pitched roof, which will probably remain and be painted black.

Ms. Martin stated that is the direction that staff gave the applicant. Staff believed it was important the existing brick remain intact, but it does have a soldier course detail throughout.

Ms. Fox stated that, personally, she would have liked the turquoise shutters option along the side to provide the Louisiana flavor. It seems canopies are part of Popeye's new remodel look; she prefers a softer canopy. Mr. Kist stated that there have only been two Popeye's locations developed with the new prototype.

Ms. Fox stated that it is difficult to make an existing building look like the new prototype with a repaint and flat canopies added. She would prefer that they take the existing building and create the best Popeye's look possible using their brand. She prefers a softer canopy, and does not care for the flat red line across the façade.

Mr. Fishman stated that they appear to have achieved a good conversion with the building. He has no objection to the architecture. The parking lot is very unsightly, and they have already indicated that it would be re-done. The landscaping is quite shabby; he is hopeful it will be redesigned, not simply supplemented.

Mr. Kist responded that they have committed to working with the City's landscape architect to take the original landscape plan but augmenting it to make it fresher. Some of the existing trees have died recently.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the reason the menu board topper and extension were eliminated. Ms. Martin responded that menu boards have been discussed extensively in recent history. Recently, McDonald's re-did their menu boards at their three locations in the City. Previously, the Planning Commission prohibited the use of pre-browse menus or additional menus beyond 32 square feet. The proposal is a 27 square feet menu board; it is safe to assume addition of a topper or extender would increase the square footage beyond the 32-square-foot limitation.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would like the Commission to re-visit the topic at a later date. He believes there should be a way in which to harmonize the utility of those menu boards and the technology with the desired look and feel. However, if the applicant has no objection to their removal, no further discussion is needed at this time.

Ms. Call requested that staff schedule that topic for a future refresher discussion, as the majority of Commission members are relatively new.

Mr. Grimes stated that he agrees that the parking lot and landscaping need to be addressed. In regard to the menu board, he believes customers can view the menu from their phone, so have less need for menu board extenders. In looking at the Popeye's color palette, he really likes the Louisiana feel of the shutters; it is an attractive brand feature. In regard to the number of parking spaces, there could be the option of adding a few subcompact parking spots for smaller vehicles; however, it would require identifying signage. He believes Popeye's will be a welcome food alternative in the area.

Ms. Call stated that 66 parking spaces are required; 62 spaces were approved for the previous occupant; and the recommendation for the new applicant is 61 parking spaces. From a business perspective, does the applicant believe 61 parking spaces meet or exceed their needs?

Mr. Kist responded that this site will have the most parking spaces of any of their Popeye's sites. They have eight stores, the majority of which are in the City of Columbus. This site is 1.37 acres; most of their stores are the same square footage but on three-fourths of an acre. Those sites average 42-45 parking spots. Perhaps the previous 62 parking spots were a calculation for fast food/drive-thru restaurants in 1993.

Ms. Call inquired if the City's Code provides different requirements for a restaurant use, a restaurant/drive-thru use, and a primary drive-thru use.

Ms. Martin responded that it does not.

Ms. Call requested that the topic of parking lot evaluation for different types of restaurant uses be included in a future discussion. At this point, do any Commissioners have objections to the recommended 61 parking spaces?

Commissioners had no objections.

Mr. Fishman stated that the parking lot and landscaping have been addressed, so he has no further concerns.

Ms. Call requested clarification on the shutters. Some Commissioners have expressed the preference for the teal shutters to be included in this project. She requested staff to clarify the reason they were not recommended.

Ms. Martin responded that the development text for this subarea states that the primary building colors should be muted, natural tones, and bright accent colors are appropriate only in moderation. Staff interpreted moderation to be one or two bright colors -- in this case, red and orange.

Ms. Call stated that Commissioners reflect a split opinion [per straw poll], so staff's recommendation remains.

Mr. Fox stated that looking at the satellite image of Gentry Lane and Bradenton Drive, there appears to be a large office building to the rear of the site. When there are nearby offices, those employees often walk to a next-door restaurant for lunch. In this situation, there is little opportunity for outdoor dining, but too many parking spaces. Down the street, there are a few restaurants with nicely landscaped frontages with outdoor eating opportunities. Because of the rear street frontage, there could be a similar opportunity here if the landscaping were developed sufficiently to include an outdoor eating opportunity. In regard to the teal shutters, it would have been nice to have seen what the building would have looked like with them.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has pulled up alternate views of the Popeye prototype, one of which he believes fellow Commissioners might find interesting.

Ms. Martin responded that she has reservations about introducing new material at this point in the meeting.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would recommend not introducing potentially evidentiary material at this stage of the meeting.

Mr. Supelak stated that the point he wanted to make is that there are other views of the newer Popeye's prototype, with the newer colors. They show a muted teal shutter, more muted than the other accent colors shown. It also introduces the potential for an applique to be applied to a brick panel. With the long side of the building, there would be opportunity to articulate this prototype a little differently. There are gold-colored goose crane lights that could be continued down the façade, the shutters, and a graphic that would not disturb the brick. In the prototype itself, there is an additional layer of details that could bring this architecture together and make fellow Commissioners more comfortable. He would recommend that Mr. Kist review the prototype and entertain some of the opportunities more fully. The space in front of the building presents opportunities for a patio. He concurs with fellow Commissioners' comments regarding the landscaping and parking lot.

Ms. Call requested staff clarify the next steps of an Amended Final Development Plan.

Ms. Martin responded that after the Commission's decision tonight, the applicant would be able to proceed with application for building permits.

Mr. Supelak responded that although he believes it could be a better, more holistic design, he is comfortable with the application.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would like to add a condition or have a commitment that the applicant enhance the outdoor seating, which currently contains cement picnic tables, with some landscaping.

Ms. Call inquired what the applicant's plan was regarding the existing tables.

Mr. Kist responded that the intent was to remove them and not have a patio. However, he would be willing to work with staff to identify seating that would be a suitable replacement for the concrete tables.

Mr. Boggs stated that a condition could be added that provides guidance about a sufficient replacement, such as architecturally compatible with the building, or composed of natural materials.

Ms. Husak stated that per the zoning code and the development text for this particular planned district, addition of an outdoor seating area requires approval of a Conditional Use by the PZC. That would account for the number of seats, the amount of space, including for people with disabilities. Per the Code, it would also require additional parking. For that reason, she is uncomfortable including it as a condition.

Ms. Call inquired if Mr. Kist would be comfortable filing a future Conditional Use request to provide outdoor seating.

Mr. Kist responded that he would have no objection to doing so. The plan with this submission was to eliminate the existing, unattractive cement seating. If he were to submit that request, however, they would be unable to include any additional parking.

Ms. Husak clarified that the Conditional Use process would allow for the Commission to determine that the current parking was adequate to add the outdoor seating. In terms of design discussions, she is not aware at this time if any text modifications would be necessary.

Ms. Call stated that although a couple of ideas have been expressed, Commission consensus is that no specific changes will be required for this application.

Ms. Call stated that she appreciates the applicant's willingness to bring back a Conditional Use request. She also appreciates staff's inclusion of the conditions of the similar McDonald's application. The Commission's review is easier because those conditions previously have been vetted.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Minor Text Modifications as follow:

- 1) To modify the Development Text under Subarea A1, Parking as follows: The existing 3,200-square-foot restaurant located at 5051 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard shall provide a minimum of 61 parking spaces, and parking spaces shall have a minimum dimension of 9 feet in width by 18 feet in length. Should the site redevelop, the site shall be required to comply with the City of Dublin Zoning Code Section 153.200.
- 2) To modify the Development Text under Subarea A1, Signs and Graphics that:
Electronic menu boards shall be permitted, provided that:
 - (1) The sign is located on the property to which it refers;
 - (2) The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way;
 - (3) The sign does not exceed 32 square feet in size;
 - (4) The sign does not contain continuous movement, flashing, scrolling, video, or animation, except for the customer order image, which shall not exceed more than 20% of the menu board sign area;
 - (5) The sign is turned off during non-operational business hours;
 - (6) The sign does not contain any additional speakers or sound; and
 - (7) The sign changes no more than three times per day.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with seven (7) Conditions:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector to ensure replacements are appropriately selected and located, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The final color of the bicycle rack and all bollards (existing and proposed) be earth tone color, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The existing poles be re-painted bronze to match the new light fixtures;
- 4) The applicant should submit a photometric plan, subject to staff approval;
- 5) The menu board design be revised to eliminate the menu topper and menu extender;
- 6) The ordering canopy standing-seam roof be black to match the primary structure; and
- 7) The applicant will mill and fill the parking lot.

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

5. The Country Club at Muirfield Village, 8715 Muirfield Drive, 20-136AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for renovations and exterior modifications to the swimming pool concession building, the club patio and outdoor bar space, and the installation of four pickleball courts and a lounge area. The 79.66-acre site is west of the intersection of Muirfield Drive with Whittingham Drive and is zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for The Country Club at Muirfield Village. The proposal is for renovations to the existing pool house and clubhouse patio bar, and the addition of four pickleball courts. The 79.66-acre site is located west of Muirfield Drive, approximately 1,700 feet northwest of the intersection with Memorial Drive. The site was zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, as part of the Muirfield Village development in the early 1970s. Due to the age of the development, no development text exists to define the types of facilities, uses, parking, size and scale, architecture and materials, landscaping, or other development standards typically required today. All previous improvements on this site have been approved and considered in compliance with the existing facilities and materials.

Clubhouse

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing bar and overhead canopy structure located on the south side of the clubhouse to construct an approximately 850-square-foot outdoor patio bar space with a covered patio structure. The outdoor bar is proposed to be constructed of stacked stone, matching the existing stacked stone in the patio lounge and the stone wall around the patio, with a Santorini Gold Quartzite countertop. The covered patio structure will be constructed of Cedar and stained a Dark Walnut color with an opaque bronze corrugated roof. All materials will be the same and all patio furnishings will be complementary to the addition and existing clubhouse. The patio improvements will include modifications to the south elevation of the clubhouse to include a back bar, a stacked-stone architectural feature, and egress improvements behind the bar. The outdoor bar will include multiple TV monitors and speakers and brown/black wicker furniture to complement the addition. The applicant is also proposing a 217-square-foot pergola to the west of the proposed patio improvements, which will match the existing pergola south of the patio improvements.

Poolhouse

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing canopy structure located on the south side of the pool house to construct a 945-square-foot clear translucent canopy structure with an outdoor pool house bar and outdoor dining room seating. The proposed canopy is constructed of cedar wood and is painted to match the Clubhouse. The roof is proposed as a translucent white corrugated roof. The outdoor bar is proposed to be clad in Azure colored wall tiles, and the wicker outdoor seating will be consistent with the proposed seating at the clubhouse. Façade improvements are proposed on the south, east, and west elevations of the existing pool house to improve the indoor and outdoor dining spaces. A new garage door, entrance door, and pass-through service window will be added to the east elevation, which will serve as egress points for interior dining options. The south elevation will include a new entrance door and two sliding track doors behind the outdoor bar. The west elevation will include the addition of an approximately 95-square-foot walk-in cooler north of the existing freezer.

Pickleball Addition

Also proposed are four new pickleball courts and an adjoining patio space southeast of the existing tennis pro shop. The courts will occupy approximately 7,560-square-feet of vacant space and be enclosed by an 8-foot high black mesh fence, similar to the existing fences that enclose the tennis courts on the site. The pickleball area will have an asphalt base and a similar surface treatment as the tennis court surfaces.

An approximately 550-square-foot concrete patio is proposed, which will offer patio seating and a retaining wall with a stone veneer on all sides except the court side. On the northwest side of the patio, a mix of hydrangeas and boxwood plantings are proposed along the retaining wall. The applicant is working with

staff to finalize additional landscaping details with this addition, which will include replacement trees and a landscape buffer between the residential sites south of this proposal.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Toddy, Architect, Design Collective, 151 E Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, OH 43215, stated that he has no information to add but is happy to answer questions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that in his experience, he has not seen a clear corrugated roof that looked good after five years. Typically, they look faded, yellowed and stained. Perhaps this a new type of material with which he is unfamiliar.

Mr. Toddy responded that it is a product with which they are familiar. Historically, if it is well maintained, it does not have the issue that was described.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has the same concern as Mr. Fishman that this material may not be the best solution.

Mr. Toddy stated that this is a corrugated fiberglass. It is fixed, permanent. The reason for the transparent product is that it's to be used at the pool house; tennis court users will use the area, as well. Because it is a seasonal use, the transparency makes sense, providing sunlight on the patio while also providing limited shade and protection from direct UV rays.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a site where the material has been used and proven to retain its integrity after a few years. Is this, typically, a permitted roof material? She is not aware of its presence anywhere in the City of Dublin.

Mr. Fishman responded that it has not been used in Dublin. There are some sites in the Short North in Columbus that have used it. He has inquired about its use there and been told that the deterioration in appearance is typical and is due to sun damage. Glass patio roofs, on the other hand, are easy to maintain.

Ms. Call inquired staff's feedback regarding uses in other places and if use of this material is permitted by Code.

Ms. Husak responded that there is nothing in the Code that would prohibit use of the material. However, she does not believe it has been used anywhere else in the City.

Ms. Fox stated that she has the same concerns regarding the fiberglass roof material.

Mr. Grimes stated that a pickleball court is a good idea. However, the surrounding lot contains rocks and other debris. Is there a plan to landscape the surrounding area?

Mr. Toddy responded that the plan is to provide a buffer with mounding and landscaping between that lot and the new pickleball courts. They are working with staff on additional plantings in the buffer zones on the east side between that lot and Muirfield Drive, and on the south side between that lot and the adjacent neighborhood. The lot provides opportunity for temporary material storage.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the intent is to continue to use that area for that purpose.

Mr. Toddy responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has the same concerns regarding that area. Periodically, trailers and construction materials sit there. The Country Club may need the area for staging events throughout the year; however, it would be preferable to screen it. Additionally, there is a bikepath that runs down that side of Muirfield and truncates at the drive, which does not connect to the neighborhood immediately to the south. Could a condition be added to finish that path?

Ms. Husak stated that the path to the north is private; it is a Muirfield Village path, not a City path.

Mr. Supelak stated that plastic materials have evolved and improved; however, Commissioners are concerned about use of the acrylic product. It may become a condition to remove it, unless the applicant can demonstrate the product more fully, including its UV stability.

Mr. Toddy responded that his understanding is that the material has a 20-year warranty. They would be willing to identify ways in which to assure the Commission of the product's necessary specifications.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that the plan looks great; however, he agrees that the storage lot needs to be screened from Muirfield Drive and the neighbors. It has been an eyesore for some time. With the proposed addition of the pickleball court, there is opportunity to continue the landscaping around the area to provide the desired screening.

Mr. Grimes stated that he understands that some paths are private, but he would like to see it connected. The Clubhouse can use signage to indicate private use.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would be reluctant to deal with the path issue. Those paths are owned and maintained by the neighborhood homeowner association. The City has limited authority, and it would seem to be a regulatory overreach to attempt to exert influence there. Other than his concerns about the acrylic canopy, he likes the plan.

Mr. Call inquired if there are any plans regarding the path.

Mr. Toddy responded that at this time, there are no plans related to the area in question.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes there is some confusion. It appears a suggestion is being made to connect the neighborhood's private path into a public path. Private paths are kept separate from the public paths for the purpose of avoiding liability issues. Along that road, there are two parallel paths; one is the private path, the other is the public path. It would be an overreach to ask Muirfield to connect their path to the City's public path.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the plan; however, she shares the concerns about the translucent roof over the pool area. While this plan is not about the storage lot, the Commission could request the Club to take care of that unattractive area, which is near their beautiful facility. She likes the proposed plan, but would encourage them to consider a different roof material.

Ms. Call stated that she echoes fellow Commissioners' comments. The plan is attractive. However, the Commission considers an application and overall area holistically to ensure that we will be proud of the resulting project. The Commission appreciates the applicant's willingness to look at options for the roof, although that has not been made a condition of approval. Historically, the Muirfield Village homeowners' association has maintained its amenities beautifully, so, although there are concerns about the roof, there is assurance with the 20-year warranty that the association will ensure that the roof is well maintained or replaced. The pickleball courts will be fun, but she shares the Commissioners' concerns about shielding the view from the court of the vacant, unattractive lot.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the applicant would be receptive to committing to shielding the view from Muirfield Drive of the storage lot. They intend to do this on their side for the pickleball courts; it would seem fair to shield the view of the storage lot on the other two sides, as well, perhaps by adding a few trees.

Mt. Toddy responded that they would be willing to do so; it is in alignment with the requested condition. They will work with staff to ensure the buffer is adequate along Muirfield Drive.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize landscaping details with the pickleball courts addition, subject to staff approval.

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

6. Ayreshire Farms, PID: 272-000166, 20-092INF, INFORMAL REVIEW

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review of a potential future development proposal to rezone an 11.4-acre site from Rural District to Planned Unit Development District to develop lots for 34, single-family homes. The site is southeast of the intersection of Shier-Rings Road with Cosgray Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated this is a request for Informal Review and feedback regarding a proposal to rezone 11.37 acres from R, Rural District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District for the potential future development of 34 single-family homes at the southeast intersection of Shier-Rings and Cosgray Roads. The site was annexed from Washington Township into the City of Dublin on March 11, 2020 (Ordinance 02-20). Upon annexation, the site was automatically zoned R, Rural District, pursuant to the Zoning Code. Because that is the least intensively developable zoning, a rezoning would be required with any development. The applicant filed an application for rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan for a PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and also for a Preliminary Plat for the PUD. Based on the Commission's review and discussions of several recent developments, staff recommended that the applicant request an Informal Review prior to submitting the development proposal. The next time this application would come before the Commission, it will be to request a recommendation to City Council.

This L-shaped site is located at the southeast intersection of Shier-Rings and Cosgray Roads. The Ballantrae community is located south of the site, and there are single-family lots along Trafalgar Lane immediately adjacent to the site. The western portion of the site is being farmed and contains no natural features except for fence rows of trees along the southern and eastern boundaries. The eastern portion of the site is comprised of the rear portion of two rural, residential parcels that were not annexed to the City. Both parcels include trees and other vegetation. To the north is a site within the West Innovation District, which is currently zoned ID-4, which would allow for research and multi-family uses. Lots on the east side of Cosgray Road are within Washington Township. They have been for sale for some time, and staff has received numerous inquiries about their development potential. The 11-acre site is currently vacant farmland.

Proposal

The proposal is for 34 single-family lots along three new public streets with 2.25 acres of open space with a density of 3.0 dwelling units (du) per acre. The Community Plan Future Land Use Map designates this site as "Mixed Residential - Low Density," defined as areas intended to provide a mix of housing options and transition from existing single-family neighborhoods at a typical density of 3.0 du/ac. The Mixed Residential land use is described as "larger sites expected to incorporate a mix of housing types and be designed to look, feel and function as a cohesive neighborhood. Smaller sites may include a single housing type, appropriately scaled to the surrounding development context." The adjacent Ballantrae community is approximately 2.0 du/acre. The applicant is proposing a single-entry street into the development from Shier-Rings Road, which terminates in cul-de-sac roads to the east and to the west of the north-south entry road. All roads are proposed to be public streets. Staff had concerns that lots #12 and #13 at the end of the entry drive could be impacted by vehicle headlights; however, the applicant has indicated that the

bedrooms in those homes would likely face the rear. Staff was also concerned that a few lots are smaller than other lots at the edges of the development, which could make vehicle maneuverability difficult for the garages on those lots. The proposed lots are located along the roads in the development with open space reserves in the southeast and northern portions of the site. The two largest reserves will accommodate stormwater management ponds. Images depict the ponds with fountains and natural stone outcroppings; some of the design elements are reminiscent of the landscaping in Ballantrae. A bikepath will be extended along the Shier-Rings Road frontage. The 50-foot landscape buffer along Cosgray Road, established and platted with Ballantrae, will be required to be extended with this proposal. The three open spaces in the proposed development would be dedicated to the City but maintained by a forced and funded homeowners association.

Architecture

The applicant has provided architectural reference images to illustrate the intended character of the development. The general style is a farmhouse character with board and batten siding, darker color window frames, decorative garage doors, and trim and beam accents. Homes are one or two stories and a majority have a three-car garage. The applicant has stated that the intended target market for this proposal is empty nesters.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions to assist the Commission in its discussion:

- 1) Are the proposed land use, density and development details appropriate?
- 2) Is the proposal appropriate to the character of the surrounding development pattern?
- 3) Does the Commission support the proposed architecture?
- 4) Does the common open space provide a functional and usable space for future residents?
- 5) Other considerations by the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Todd Foley, Principal, POD Design, 100 Northwoods Blvd. Suite A, Columbus, Ohio, 43235, stated that they have been working on this project the past couple of years. However, given the Commission's recent discussions about changing dynamics in the home market and changing perceptions on single-family homes, smaller lots, and smaller/narrower setbacks, it seemed advisable to pause their intent to proceed with this project to have a discussion with the Commission about their thoughts for the project. At first glance, it would appear that this area should have been developed as part of Ballantrae. However, the developer has a vision for a boutique neighborhood here comprised of high-quality, single-family homes. While there may be some empty nester buyers, this development would fit more of a transitional family, perhaps moving from a larger Ballantrae home. This type of buyer may still be interested in large, outdoor spaces. There will be focus on ensuring that the homes are architecturally different. Due to the adjacent roundabout, the site has some access challenges that limit the type of development that can occur on this site. This is a good transitional site to the West Innovation area to the north. The homes are intended to have three-car garages and cost \$450,000+. He was involved with the recently approved Hamlet project, and with this proposal, they have attempted to provide a deeper rear yard for the homes. Much of the open space on this site is within private open spaces, which will permit the homeowners to have fire pits and entertaining opportunities. There is a variety of lot sizes. Passive open space has also been provided with the retention ponds. With this plan, the focus has been placed on the lots, which permit larger homes with enjoyable private outdoor space to the rear rather than wasted side yards. They would like to obtain tangible feedback from the Commission on this proposal, which they believe will be a nice addition to this area.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated that, due to some missing numbers on the information provided, it is difficult to get a full sense of the lot coverage and intensity, topics that the Commission has recently discussed. Although the side yards are shown, dimensions are not provided.

Ms. Husak stated that the development text the applicant provided in the original submission stated that the minimum required side yard would be six feet, so a house could be built within six feet of the lot line, which would mean 12 feet between homes.

Mr. Supelak inquired what is the lot coverage.
Mr. Hounshell responded that it is 60 square feet.

Ms. Call stated she assumes the floorplan selected by the homebuyer would impact the lot coverage.
Mr. Foley responded that the floorplan selected – a two-story or a ranch -- as well as whether the optional three-car garage were included, would impact the lot coverage.
Mr. Supelak noted that the different lot shapes and proportions will add variety to the neighborhood. What is at the rear of Lot #21?
Mr. Foley stated that lot is actually part of the leach field system for the home that is directly to the north. There is an easement there, and they have worked with staff on creating parameters to address that issue should that system cease to function or be eliminated. Unfortunately, it cannot be eliminated at this time.
Ms. Husak stated that is an item on which they are continuing to work; the engineer has not indicated that would be an acceptable lot configuration.

Mr. Grimes inquired if retention ponds of this size are required for the area, as it could allow additional usable space.
Mr. Foley responded that this is a linear site, and with the stormwater drainage patterns reflected here, they will be forced to direct the stormwater in two directions. It is also due to the outlets on the site. With the level of engineering that has occurred, the sizes are approximate based upon what is anticipated. Detailed engineering will occur to ensure there are the right easements and setbacks. In regard to usable space, this development will be connected to the Ballantrae trail system. This is an asset for residents looking for that type of activity. They will, as well, look for opportunities for passive park spaces with the retention ponds.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the area behind the houses has been annexed to the City.
Ms. Husak responded that it has been annexed.
Mr. Grimes stated that he assumes many layouts were considered. Was the possibility of an entrance/exit off the roundabout rather than from Shier-Rings Road explored? He asks because the lots at the proposed entrance are smaller than the remaining lots.
Ms. Husak responded that it was not. The applicant was required to have an extensive traffic study conducted, and the parameters have all been addressed with engineering staff. There are regulations regarding proximity of neighborhood entryways to roundabouts.

Mr. Foley stated that the proposed entrance is where it is required to be due to the geography and existing roundabout. Cosgray Road presents its own challenges, as well. Discussions have occurred with Washington Township Fire Department regarding their access requirements. There will be some lots that will be restricted in floorplan options in order to address driveway approaches.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the farmhouse style of architecture was being overdone in this development. This is a small development, so perhaps a more muted emphasis would be more compatible with Ballantrae and the adjoining area. Finally, it seems the common areas should be made more functional to provide walkable opportunities for the residents within the development.

Public Comment

There was no public comment regarding this case.

Commission Questions [continued]

Ms. Fox inquired the range in square footage of the proposed homes.

Mr. Foley responded that he does not have exact square footage, but the six types of home available average 3,000 square feet.

Ms. Fox stated that some of the lots are only .15 acres, so what is the smallest square footage offered?

Michael King, VP of Operations, Rockford Homes, 999 Polaris Pkwy, Suite 200, Columbus, OH 43240 stated that the largest would be a two-story home at 3,000 square feet. The ranch home will start at 2,000 square feet; so the range will be from 2,000 to a maximum of 3,000 square feet. They will be pre-programming the homes on the lots to ensure that they do not over-indulge house intensity on lots. The smaller lots, such as Lots #28 - #34 will be the smaller home types, and they may be limited to two-car garages, which would be a 40-foot wide product. With a three-car garage, it would become a 50-foot-wide product. The emphasis is on rear-yard living and bikepath connectivity to Ballantrae. They are residents of Ballantrae and recognize the importance of those features to the community. They would also like to incorporate a 10-foot tree preserve as a buffer for all the lots that abut adjacent housing.

Ms. Fox stated that she likes the fact that the lots are different sizes. However, to allow this level of high density, it is important to provide a mix of housing options that will create a cohesive neighborhood in exchange. However, this is a traditional suburban development layout. If the intent is that this will be a community for empty nesters, there should be physical and social amenities provided as a tradeoff for the proposed level of density. That could be a community garden, dog park or a central gathering area. She appreciates the value of the rear-yard living spaces, but empty-nester communities are interested in social connections. The open spaces here are not usable, only functional for water retention. This development is too small for a community center, but it is not too small for other features. She is concerned about the density, parking and proximity of the homes.

Mr. Supelak stated that on occasion, the Commission has received applications for these types of communities looking for an exception, and we have accommodated a few, as we recognize that there is appetite for some clustered developments in our city. He believes that the proposal for 30+ lots is the appropriate kind of boutique development. With an Informal Review, some information is not available, so more design would be required. Until more detail is provided, the Commission is uncomfortable accommodating exceptions for a denser empty-nester neighborhood. He likes the proposed architecture, which appears to be good quality, and the Farmhouse style is popular. While the consistency in the palette is nice in some regards, at the same time, having 30 homes of the same color palette can become milquetoast. He would probably encourage a little more of the stacked-stone element be added. He appreciates the variety in the lots, which will lend some diversity to development. He is concerned that the area is overbuilt to the point that the lots on the cul-de-sacs are very pinched at their front entries. Screening the eastern approach into the neighborhood will be important. He agrees that the retention pond areas should offer some usable amenity for the residents. Overall, he appreciates the layout and the architecture; only refinement is needed.

Mr. Fishman stated that at the recent joint meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board, there was discussion concerning this type of development. We agreed that we were looking for greenspaces where people could walk and meet. In his opinion, the proposed plan is too dense. The staff report indicates that Lots #1, #2, 18, #19 and #20 were problematic lots. Perhaps those lots could be eliminated. The recommended number of lots was 28-29, but there are 34. If the five problematic lots were eliminated, there would be usable space next to the retention ponds, which would significantly improve the development. He could not support the proposed plan. He has observed that families with children bought the homes in neighborhoods that were anticipated to be empty-nester developments. Families look for affordable homes within the Dublin School District, so he anticipates the same thing will occur here, particularly with two-story homes. This will not be an empty-nester community; there will be children living here. He realizes this in an infill development, but he believes it must be less

dense with more walkable greenspace. That is what Dublin is recognized for and one of the reasons people come here. He agrees with staff on their recommendation to eliminate some of the lots, as it would provide more greenspace within the development. It is preferable not to rely on the adjacent Ballantrae community to provide the greenspace. Finally, the architecture appears to be the latest trend using an inexpensive product – hardiplank. The only distinguishing architectural element is the garage door, which, in time, will be replaced, so the architecture should be fine-tuned. However, his primary concerns are the lack of usable greenspace and the need to reduce the density by eliminating the aforementioned lots.

Ms. Call stated that she is not in favor of the six-foot minimum setbacks. If they are permitted, the combined minimum space between the homes needs to exceed 12 feet – for instance, a six-foot plus an 8-foot sideyard. If 3,000-square foot homes are proposed, it is essential to see the sizes of the individual home models. The report indicates that the minimum lot size would be 0.15 acres and the maximum would be 0.4 acres, but those will be the corner lots that have some unbuildable space. Hopefully, we learned our lesson with Oak Park, where a variety of houses were offered, including single-story and two-story models, but most people chose the larger home. The cost difference between a small or a large home on the same size lot is incremental. The result was that the minimum setback occurred everywhere. In this proposal, Lots #9 through #17 are very small and all look the same. She agrees that some lots need to be eliminated. She would challenge staff to look at the City's open space requirements. In her previous experience in another city, open space was designed to be usable. She shares concerns about the headlight intrusion into Lots #11 and #12. When this proposal returns, it should reflect a maximum of 60% lot coverage and the distribution on the lots with designated home models. This proposal is a great "first step," and she is confident that, working together, the result will be an attractive development. This site is located in the applicants' backyard, so they also want a pleasing development next to their community.

Ms. Fox stated that with informal reviews, it is important to give some helpful, construction input regarding the proposal's future direction. Tonight, we have mentioned items we do not like. In this potentially empty-nester community, it would be helpful to be mindful that empty nesters are looking for homes they can "lock and leave," a low-maintenance lifestyle, and proximity of social connections. As proposed, this development will draw other types of buyers. If their intent is for this to be an empty-nester community with this level of density, perhaps they should consider reducing the square footage of the homes. There is a new trend for "pocket neighborhoods with small, potentially 1,200-square-foot cottages, suitable for a single adult. Such cottages could be arranged to look onto a greenspace that would attract social interaction. With a variety of lot sizes, there can be more variety of home sizes, as well, so some larger homes could provide the rear-yard living spaces for families. She would urge them to move toward a more cohesive neighborhood, rather than anticipating most activity to occur in backyards or outside this development. The hope is to create empty-nester living the homeowners can enjoy without leaving the community. She would like them to mix up the home styles and sizes so the community has an intimacy different from the typical suburban development. A different product is necessary for denser, empty-nester developments that offer a lifestyle within.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had received sufficient input to proceed.

Mr. Foley responded that they have received great feedback from a variety of perspectives. Initially, they did not anticipate having an Informal Review, so the development is substantially designed around this site plan. However, they will attempt to incorporate some of the Commission's input in the details they will be bringing back. He appreciates the Commission's feedback.

Mr. King clarified that the intent is not that this development will be an empty-nester product; it will be a transitional product next to the larger 4,000-5,000 square-foot homes in the Ballantrae community. This development offers mid-sized homes for those who really do not want to live in condominiums, which are subject to condominium association rule. This transitional product will enable a more independent living. They understand the need for open spaces; however, there is a significant amount in Ballantrae, and very little of it is used. With the current need for social distancing, the idea of having a common area for social gatherings is becoming a thing of the past. He believes that it is important that this transitional product

offer walkability, along with some common area. He appreciates the Commission's input as they proceed with the future plan that will be shared with the Commission.

Communications

- Public Comments

Ms. Husak stated that the following two public comments were received, which were not related to a specific case.

Dr. Reeve Brenner, 303 Bradley Avenue, Rockville, Maryland:

"We ask that you look into Bankshot.com for play courts servicing the needs of the differently abled. See Bankshot.com in connection with a distancing participation so important at a time of the virus. Our satellite offices are in Cleveland and our fabrication also is in Cleveland. You might wish to check out the national association for recreational equality. The underserved special communities will be the beneficiaries of 301 309 0260. There are hundreds of Bankshot facilities all over the country. One of the parks, playgrounds or sports recreation centers could provide a Bankshot facility for the community."

Joseph Raccuia, 5507 Classic Ct., Dublin, OH:

"I have raised my family in Dublin at the same residence for a total of 35 years. I just listened to the Commission's August 20, 2020 meeting and felt compelled to write this letter particularly concerning the segment on "Residential Development Patterns". It is alarming to me that the Dublin PZC would seriously utilizing demographic trends for guidance in future development approvals. Some of the members suggested talking with "experts" like university professors who, for the majority, live in urban settings, or with associations funded by developers that put on seminars taught by "volunteers." Please do not misunderstand me, I think what Claudia Husak's presentation was very timely. It points out a lack of vision and leadership that has prompted me to write this letter. Ms. Husak is asking for your guidance and she is pointing out an alarming trend of forgetting Dublin's quality of life and following what home developers are saying. They are commission-based sales people convincing homebuyers to buy into the high-density trend, so they must be right. They are even using demographics as a sales pitch. Higher and higher lot coverage means more profits! I recall in the late 70's and early 80's, the demographics pointed to a shortage in hotel space, so developers built more and more hotels, which led to a glut of poor quality hotels. Following Ms. Husak's presentation, your commission should have discussed how these recent approvals -- Oak Park, Tartan Ridge, Autumn Rose and Hamlet on Jerome -- affect our quality of life in Dublin. How do they affect our schools, existing property values, law enforcement, living in concert with natural environs, green views, access to health services and food services? Then following that discussion, you should be asking how to improve the quality of life in Dublin. Ms. Husak mentioned side-loaded garages with the Webb development. She stated how fast the Pulte development was sold out, without high density. She also commented on empty nesters (which my wife and I are) wanting an HOA to take care of their yard. She did not say that empty nesters do not want to give up their quality of life, especially in concert with nature and green views, at a time in their life when they have the free time to enjoy it. In closing, I am not against high density, but its place is in an urban setting where people can walk or access mass transit, and automobile ownership is almost non-existent. Mixing high density with the automobile will not keep Dublin green! Please look for ways that guidance can improve the Dublin quality of life."

Ms. Call stated that the first public comment is a good reminder of the needs of a differently abled body of people; however, the second comment relates to the last case discussed this evening. Commissioners share the writer's concern. We believe there is a place for density, but we try to be aware of how any of the developments affect the quality of life in Dublin.

- Virtual Meeting Format

Mr. Grimes stated that with the use of the Webex meeting format tonight, there were issues with the audio. It was difficult to hear others. If this is the typical Webex experience, he prefers the Zoom meeting format.

Ms. Husak stated that Planning staff is working with I.T. staff to identify the best meeting process. I.T. is attempting to support these meetings to the best of their ability, and we are attempting to reciprocate. Ms. Call stated that it is important to make sure the names of meeting participants shown are correct to avoid an incorrect meeting record.

- Future Meeting Topics

Mr. Supelak requested a future meeting provide a refresher on the private versus public paths issue, so that Commissioners have a better understanding. For example, the OSU hospital site's private paths were to be connected to the City's public pathway system, but the Muirfield Village private path is not. There are some stipulations of which the members need better understanding.

Ms. Call stated that along the City's public roadways, there should be an adjacent public path. However, in the Muirfield Village area, there is no public path adjacent to the roadway. There is no public path to walk from her home to Glick Road.

Mr. Fishman stated that the paths within Muirfield Village are private paths that are privately maintained. The City does not maintain that community's paths. However, the path on the perimeter of Muirfield Village along the roadway is a public path. The path within the community deliberately does not join the public path, although there is usually a way for the residents to reach the public path. The paths intentionally are kept separate for liability purposes. It is similar to a gated community, whose paths are also private. Muirfield Village's roads are public, but its paths are private. Its common area is also private, maintained exclusively by the HOA.

Ms. Call stated that Muirfield Village extends from Brand Road to Glick Road, so that is a lengthy area for there to be no public path.

Mr. Fishman responded that the path along the perimeter of Muirfield Village is a public path as is the path along Glick Road. All of the paths that are not within the neighborhood itself are public paths. The only private paths are internal to the neighborhood.

Ms. Call stated that if an individual wished to walk from Brand Road to Donegal Cliffs, they would need to walk up Muirfield Road to Glick Road and then down Dublin Road to Donegal Cliffs. Because of the size of Muirfield Village, a walk around its perimeter is 6 miles.

Mr. Fishman stated that the streets in Muirfield are public, so one could walk along those. Another reason the paths within Muirfield Village are private is that many of them are not adjacent to the street; they extend through homeowners' back yards. The paths must be posted as private per insurance requirements. If a person had an accident on a Muirfield Village private path, there would be a liability issue for Muirfield Village. The commercial areas in Muirfield Village are accessible by the public path, however, including the Morgan House. That would be consistent with making the OSU Hospital accessible to the public.

- Continued Discussion of Higher Density Development

Ms. Fox stated that she believes Council would like to know where and when the Commission believes higher density could be permitted, and what the tradeoffs or conditions for that density must be. She would like the Commission to continue that conversation and develop guidelines for future Planning and Zoning Commissioners.

Ms. Husak responded that not much land remains in the community for residential infill purposes.

Mr. Supelak noted that although he thought the number of units in the proposed development tonight were too much, 30+ units would be small in comparison to some other developments. Therefore, it is a little more agreeable than with a large neighborhood. The Commission is cautious of requests for higher-density developments, so there would be value in having stipulations or conditions when considering.

Ms. Husak stated that staff would schedule the topics mentioned tonight for some upcoming meeting discussions.

Ms. Rauch reported that the next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 1 at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council