



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 4, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**1. Heartland Bank
20-207FDP**

**6500 Frantz Road
Final Development Plan**

Proposal: Reconsideration of a determination for a Final Development Plan for exterior modifications and associated site improvements for an existing bank on a .82-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Post Road.

Request: Review and approval of a Reconsideration Request for a previously disapproved application for a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Section X of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission Rules and Regulations.

Applicant: Ashley Trout, Heartland Bank

Planning Contacts: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I, AICP Candidate; and Jennifer M. Rauch, Planning Director

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us; and 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-207

MOTION 1: Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve the Reconsideration of an earlier determination for a Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Reconsideration was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to table the Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The request for the Final Development Plan to be tabled was approved.



**1. Heartland Bank
20-207FDP**

**6500 Frantz Road
Final Development Plan**

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Chase J. Ridge

Chase J. Ridge, Planner I, AICP Candidate



~~Commission members expressed appreciation for the report, noting that this community values its Historic District and is very supportive of its preservation and development in a respectful manner. With that level of support, they are confident the recommendations will be advanced.~~

CASE RECONSIDERATION

1. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-207FDP, Final Development Plan

Request to reconsider a determination for the Final Development Plan made by the Planning and Zoning Commission at the January 7, 2021 meeting for exterior modifications and associated site improvements for an existing bank on a .82-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial, located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Post Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for reconsideration of a previously disapproved Final Development Plan (FDP). The .82-acre site is located at the southeast corner of US33 and Frantz Road and serves as an outparcel to the shopping center immediately to the south.

Case History

At their July 9, 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed and provided feedback on a Concept Plan for this site. Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) members were generally in favor of the modernization and of the proposed updates, but had concerns about the proposed aluminum exterior material selection. At the October 15, 2020 PZC meeting, the Commission reviewed a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for the site, which was largely unchanged from the Concept Plan. The PZC approved three waivers, as well as the PDP, with four conditions. Most recently at their January 7, 2021 PZC meeting, the Commission reviewed a FDP and an associated Master Sign Plan (MSP) for the site. Staff recommended approval of both the FDP and MSP, as well as an associated Parking Plan. The Commission approved the Parking Plan and MSP with the three conditions but did not approve the FDP, due to concerns regarding the proposed exterior synthetic cladding material (Trespa).

Request

The applicant is requesting that the PZC move to reconsider the determination made at the January 7, 2021 PZC meeting. The Commission's Rules and Regulations permit an action to reconsider a disapproval based on the expectation that the applicant will be providing new or updated information for that reconsideration. The applicant has provided a formal letter outlining the information that would be updated. The applicant desires to provide additional information on the proposed material, as well as other materials discussed at the January 7 meeting, and has committed to providing mock-ups of the proposed Trespa material, as well as alternatives for review by the PZC. A new rendering will be provided for each material for reference and scale. Should the request to reconsider be approved, then the formal reconsideration would occur at a future meeting date. Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission move to reconsider this application for a Final Development Plan (Case 20-170FDP) based on the new information provided.

Legal Presentation

Mr. Boggs stated that a request for reconsideration is authorized by the PZC Rules and Regulations, which govern the conduct of the Commission's affairs. Rule 10 states that a motion to reconsider an item can be brought by any member who voted on the prevailing side of the motion, and any member can second the motion. In this instance, the prevailing side voted not to approve the FDP. A motion to reconsider can only be brought up at either of the first two regular meetings following that vote to disapprove. If the motion to reconsider is approved, a second motion would be made to table the case for future consideration of the updated materials by this body.

Applicant Presentation

Ashley Trout, Heartland Bank Representative, 5600 Frantz Road, Dublin, Ohio stated that after their FDP

application failed to be approved, the bank's executive team and board met and discussed how to proceed. They were supportive of gathering the necessary information, including material samples, and the creation of mockups for consideration of the Planning and Zoning Commission. That process will take some time. If the Commission would agree to reconsider their project, they would like to request further clarification of color and tone of the material. The anticipated mock-up would be large, as the intent is to provide edges, corners and the reveal, which would enable Commission members to see all those details.

Ms. Call requested that staff clarify the primary and secondary material Code requirements for this District. Mr. Ridge responded that Code requires the minimum of 80% of each façade on a public right-of-way or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors, to be constructed of permitted primary materials. Those materials are natural stone, capstone, brick and glass. Secondary materials are permitted to be up to 20% of those facades; those materials include glass, reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal and exterior architectural panels and cladding.

Ms. Call inquired if Trespa and ProdeMa would be classified as primary or secondary materials. Mr. Ridge responded that Trespa would be classified as an other synthetic material. The Code gives PZC the latitude to approve new synthetic materials to accommodate new products and technology.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that in the applicant's statement, they indicate that one of the materials they would be submitting in the future would be Nichiha; however, in their previous presentation, they indicated that their architects stated that Nichiha would not provide the desired aesthetic, nor was it as durable as Trespa. If they believed that to be the case, that would not be a product the Commission would want to see.

Ms. Trout responded that they have studied it and do not consider it a viable option, but they would provide it in order to give the Commission all the options. They do not anticipate moving forward with the Nichiha; they prefer the Trespa material, but after studying the ProdeMa, they have recognized that as a viable option. They are open to any other suggestions, as well.

Ms. Fox stated that their intention is to have a wood-like skin. On the AC Marriott's façade and on the outdoor bar at Vasso's, an attractive, wood-like ceramic plank has been utilized. It has a very attractive, authentic wood appearance. It concerns her that the applicant would suggest bringing back a product that they do not think is appropriate in order to make Trespa look better, when there are other product options available, such as ceramic. Another product, Rainscreen, is described as having an authentic wood appearance. She would prefer that they bring back viable options.

Ms. Trout responded that they studied a ceramic product; however, using it in the diagonal pattern does not produce a natural look. Perhaps they did not find the right ceramic product. They have not explored the product used at the Marriott, as they believed it was lacking in grain and texture. Their intent is to get feedback on the products they would like to see. They would like to find viable options that they are willing to use, and that the Commission likes and will approve.

Ms. Fox inquired if they have any concerns about a local contractor being able to apply Trespa correctly, since it has not been used locally.

Ms. Trout responded that the architects have used the product on other projects in the nation, but not in the Columbus market. Ruscilli has found a contractor who has used the product previously. Constructing a mock-up wall will show the quality of the installation.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Trespa product provides a warranty.

Ms. Trout responded that Trespa and ProdeMa have 10-year warranties.

Ms. Fox inquired how that warranty compares to a hardi plank or a cementitious product.

Ms. Trout responded that she does that have those specifications with her.

Ms. Fox stated that it would be important, as the argument they are making is that of durability. Although the Bridge Street Code permits the Commission to permit some new materials, there has to be justification, other than aesthetics, for doing so; particularly, when there are primary materials available with which the Commission is familiar. She would encourage the applicant to provide warranty comparisons on any proposed

materials. In the previous presentations, the applicant has suggested very light colors. Were other color variations considered for this cladding?

Ms. Trout stated that they have discussed using other colors, especially since the Prodema product does not have a similar light color. As a result, they have been considering both products in a warmer tone and have produced renderings in those colors.

Ms. Fox requested that if the FDP is reconsidered, she would ask that they bring back any other color options within the Trespa family. In context, the surrounding buildings have warmer tones, in which case, this building would stand out as too light -- not as a complement to the surrounding warmer color tones.

Ms. Trout responded that the intent was to provide two color variations of the Trespa product. They would also be providing a sample of the Prodema product in a warm tone. Prodema is a wood veneer, so it has natural variations.

Mr. Supelak stated that although the delay in timing was not desired, he believes proceeding in this manner is correct. From the City's perspective, the applicant is requesting a material as an exception to the approved primary and secondary materials. The Commission does not object to the concept of the project; however, it has no confidence in a product that is an exception. Perhaps the mock-up of the Trespa will provide more confidence. However, should it ultimately not be approved, they are now "hedging their bet" with an alternative product that the Commission may consider preferable.

Mr. Fishman stated he would encourage them to consider the Commission's direction, and that of their architect, for a color that will not become dated in a few years. He is supportive of approving the opportunity to reconsider.

Ms. Call stated that there is a risk in requesting a product with which the Commission is unfamiliar. With regard to warranties, buildings last longer than 10 years and should have products that will endure with the building. We are looking for 30-50-year buildings and sites that endure much longer. She would prefer to consider a new material as a secondary material, so, if possible, she would encourage them to reduce the amount of the material to allow it to be considered as a secondary material. It is quite difficult for the Commission to make a decision to permit an untested product to be used as a primary material on a high-visibility site. Those are three critical considerations. She is not opposed to allowing them the opportunity for a reconsideration, but she would caution them that there is risk in doing so. They could expend funds on the same application, and the Commission continue to have just as much concern about use of an untested synthetic material as a primary building material on a high-visibility corner.

Ms. Fox stated that in case the Trespa product is not approved, she would like them to have more than one other option when they return.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees and, and therefore, requests that they also submit an approved primary material for use on this building.

Ms. Trout responded that they looked at several other materials. Their goal was to have a natural wood look, and many of the other products had a colder fabricated appearance. Their hope is to find a product that achieves the look they want. They understand they are taking a risk, and if they cannot get this type of product approved, they will go back to the design stage. They had previously discussed the hardi plank material, and she would take that option back to the architect for re-consideration. She will compile the warranty information to share with the Commission, as well.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on this application.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Fox seconded to reconsider the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to table the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

INFORMAL CASE

2. ~~Tuller Road Townhomes, 6851 Village Parkway, 21-004INF, Informal Review~~

~~Request for informal review and feedback on architecture for an attached, single-family residential development on an 11.61-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and non-binding feedback on architecture for an attached, single-family residential development on an 11.61-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway, with Tuller Road providing a boundary to the north and Tuller Flats located immediately to the west. In December 2020, the Commission reviewed and approved a Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for 155 attached single-family townhomes, 0.7-acres of open space, and three public streets. The Commission also approved two Administrative Departures, a Parking Plan and several Waivers including reduced front property line coverage, deviation from buildings occupying the corner, reduced roof pitch, and to allow thin brick material as a primary permitted material. The Commission disapproved two Waivers: one, to permit uninterrupted ridge lines, and two, to allow for non-compliant open space proportions. Images of the surrounding development character have been provided, including Tuller Flats, Bridge Park Block H and Greystone Mews. The Commission is asked to provide feedback on the integration of the proposed architecture in context with the surrounding area.~~

History

~~In March 2020, the Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for the development of 168 attached single-family townhomes, 0.9-acres of open space, and three public streets. At the time, two architectural options were shown. The Commission preferred a pitched roof option versus a flat roof, and encouraged a variable building form. At its December 20, 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed the architectural concept, which included a greater number of primary materials, specifically brick, and a warmer color palette. The Commission encouraged the applicant to provide usable front stoops, emphasized a desire to engage the streets, and requested the application of more primary materials and a variable roof line. This evening, the applicant is requesting feedback on a revised architectural concept prior to submission of a FDP application. Within the Bridge Street District, the numeric requirements associated with each building type require a significant level of detail.~~

Architecture

~~The applicant has provided an image of a seven-unit building example for the Commission's consideration; however, not every building in this development may express the level of variety demonstrated by the sample elevation. A building may incorporate two or three of the unit styles, and the remaining unit styles could provide differentiation building to building, not unit to unit. The proposed buildings remain 3.5-stories in height, and incorporate a historic American architectural style in a contemporary manner. The elevation varies the ridge line of the roof, and incorporates dormers and front gables to individualize each unit. Units are further differentiated by entry design, window details, and cladding materials. There are a variety of window designs, as well as box bay windows and juliete balconies. The design is differentiated by the application of primary brick materials, a diverse color palette and a variety in front entrances and front stoops. Rooftop decks are still optional on both the street facing and rear facing sides of the building, although are not depicted here. All final architectural details for the stoops, porches, juliet balconies, windows, and exterior building materials~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 7, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

4. Heartland Bank 20-207FDP

6500 Frantz Road Final Development Plan

Proposal: Exterior modifications and associated site improvements for an existing bank zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Frantz Road.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Rex Hagerling, Moody Nolan; and Ashley Trout, Heartland

Planning Contact: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I, AICP Candidate

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-207

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Parking Plan.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan without conditions.

VOTE: 3 – 4.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	No
Warren Fishman	No
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	No
Rebecca Call	No
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Chase J. Ridge

9A45F751698D466...

Chase J. Ridge, Planner I, AICP Candidate



Public Comment

Kevin O'Connor, 48 Corbins Mill Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"I am an adjacent property owner. When is this property going to address the trash that is generated by the property, which flows into my and other adjacent property owners' properties? The goal of Planning and Zoning is good neighbors. This property is not living up to that goal. I am happy to provide photos if you need them."

Ms. Call requested that staff provide the contact information for this neighbor to Mr. Fraas.

Mr. Fraas stated that he would have his property management company reach out to the neighbor.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

4. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-207FDP, Final Development Plan

6. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-208MSP, Master Sign Plan

A request for review and approval of exterior modifications and associated site improvements along with a Master Sign Plan for an existing bank zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial on a 0.82-acre site located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for exterior modifications and an associated Master Sign Plan for an existing bank on a 0.82-acre site located southeast of the intersection of US33/SR161 and Frantz Road. The site, which is zoned BSD-C, Bridge Street District – Commercial District, serves as an outparcel to the Dublin Plaza Shopping Center. At their July 9, 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for this site, and on October 15, 2020, the Commission reviewed a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for the site, which was largely unchanged from the Concept Plan. The PZC approved three waivers, as well as the PDP with four conditions. The three waivers were to allow a parapet taller than Code permits, to allow a lower percentage of primary materials on each façade than Code requires, and to allow a lower percentage of transparency than is required per Code on each façade. The four conditions of approval addressed drainage and grade concerns, excess parking on the site, transparency calculations, and selection of an exterior cladding material. Although not necessarily opposed to the exterior cladding material, the Commission directed the applicant to research other cladding materials to ensure that the most appropriate material was used. The site will remain largely as it is with a few changes. The existing four-sided pylon sign on the northwest corner of the site will be replaced with a monument ground sign. The existing parking on the north side of the site the dumpster and enclosure will be removed. The landscaping will be increased in the northwest and southwest portions of the site, and around the utility structure at the rear of the building. A brick paver patio is proposed in the entryway with stone seat walls, benches and landscaping. The applicant is proposing a modernization and remodel to the entire exterior of the existing building while retaining the structure within. The renovation replaces the combination of flat and hipped roofs with a simplified flat roof system. The proposal includes the replacement of the existing overhang with a new overhang and screening system clad in a Trespa Meteon High-Pressure Compact Laminate (HPL) material in a contemporary wood finish. The existing white columns that support the overhang are proposed to be replaced with steel I-beams to complement the contemporary wood aesthetic. Per the BSD Code, permitted primary materials include, but are not limited to, stone, manufactured stone, full-depth brick and glass. Permitted secondary materials include fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding. Code also requires that each façade visible from a street or adjacent property be comprised of a minimum of 80-percent primary material. The applicant is not meeting this requirement on any façade. However, the PZC approved a waiver to this requirement at the PDP stage of review. The applicant is proposing that at least 59 percent of each façade be clad in a secondary material

(metal panel) or the Trespa Meteon HPL material. Per Code, high-quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the Commission. At the PZC meeting on October 15, 2020, PZC members were supportive of the recommended condition of approval that the applicant continue to work with staff to select an appropriate exterior cladding material. The PZC members were not opposed to the applicant using the Trespa material proposed by the applicant, but wanted further research to be conducted to ensure the most appropriate material was used. The applicant considered other materials including Nichiha, which has been used elsewhere in the City. In their research, none of the alternative materials would allow for the quality installation and design that the Trespa material provides, given the unique design and installation pattern of the product on this building. The applicant has provided product samples for review and information on the product's durability in comparison to similar products, as well as a written statement describing Trespa's superior installation and design quality. The Trespa material will be installed in a combination of two wood finishes, Milano Sabbia and Elegant Oak. In addition to the new overhang and screening, the applicant is proposing to install a new aluminum storefront system which ultimately increases transparency from its current state. The remaining brick will be painted dark gray to complement the modern aesthetic. The elevations are largely unchanged from the PDP stage of review.

Master Sign Plan

A Master Sign Plan is intended to permit a greater degree of flexibility in sign design and display. Because this building was constructed in the 1980s, before the implementation of the Bridge Street District Code, this site defaults to the standard sign code regulations. The applicant is proposing a total of three signs: one ground sign and two wall signs, which is one sign in excess of what Code would permit. Per Code, this site is permitted either two wall signs or two ground signs, given that the site has at least 100 feet of frontage on two public right-of-ways. The proposal calls for a 32.5-square-foot sign, mounted onto a stone monument. The sign, containing only the name "Heartland Bank" without a logo, is constructed using a routed HDU (High Density Urethane) material, painted white. The sign will be halo-illuminated using white LEDs. The letters are proposed to be 20 inches in height and centered on the stone monument. Given the ground sign's location near the intersection and the ground, staff is concerned that a wood product like HDU may not be the most appropriate material, and is recommending that the applicant utilize a metal or similarly durable and high-quality material for the fabrication and construction of the sign. The stone monument is clad in a Connecticut Whiteline Granite and would be installed behind the required eight-foot setback from the right-of-way. The applicant also is proposing two wall signs. The first sign is located on the north elevation of the building, facing S.R.161/U.S. 33, a white channel letter sign constructed of an HDU material. The sign will be halo-illuminated using white LEDs, and would be 41.5 square feet in size, where Code permits a sign of approximately 54.5 square feet for this elevation. Given the design of the overhang, the sign is proposed at 18 feet in height, centering it on the upper band of the bank's drive-thru overhang. Code permits wall signs to be installed at a height of 15 feet. The applicant provided renderings with the sign at 15 feet in height and 17.5 feet in height for reference. The sign, at 17.5 feet in height, does not appear centered on the upper band and crowds the bottom of the band. At 15 feet in height, the sign, as designed, would not be able to be located on this elevation. The applicant is also proposing to install a wall sign on the west elevation of the building, facing Frantz Road. The sign is a white channel letter sign constructed using an HDU material. It is halo-illuminated using white LEDs, and is proposed to be 74.4 square feet in size, where Code would permit a sign of 80 square feet for this elevation. The sign is proposed at 15 feet in height, meeting the Code requirement for height. This sign is proposed to include the company logo at approximately 16 square feet in size, which meets Code. Finally, the applicant is proposing an ATM sign on the south elevation. This sign is proposed at less than one-square-foot in size which, per Code, does not require a permit. A minimum of 12 parking spaces are required and a maximum of 15 are permitted for this site, based on the use. Because the request is to permit a total of 21 parking spaces for the site, approval of a parking plan is necessary. The requests were reviewed against the applicable criteria and staff recommends approval of the parking plan with no conditions, approval of the FDP with no conditions, and approval of the Master Sign Plan with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Ashley Trout, Heartland Bank, 430 N. Hamilton Rd. Whitehall, OH 43213, stated that they worked extensively with staff and studied many different materials and methods of installation. In order to get the natural wood

application desired, they have to use a material that can be turned into a plank. Trespa was the only material they could find that would be both durable and look the way they wanted. This building was built in the 1960s, and they began occupying it in 1996. For the last decade, however, they have been dealing with antiquated mechanical, electrical and HVAC issues. Two years ago, they determined to renovate it. They could renovate the interior only, or the exterior, as well. They determined to go with the complete renovation with the intent of making this an attractive building within that gateway area. They have already vacated the space and are operating out of a temporary location in Bridge Park. That is challenging, as they have no drive-through and are lacking the amenities they need to operate. Their goal is to have a decision that will allow them to expedite the project, complete the renovations and move back into their space. They are excited to get the project underway.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kennedy inquired the reason, from staff's perspective, that there has been a pushback regarding this material – is it a durability or cost issue, or because they want to ensure the wood-like appearance.

Mr. Ridge responded that this material typically is used in a different fashion, not as a wood aesthetic. After research, it has been determined to be a durable material, and the color lasts longer than similar materials, such as Nichiha. At the PDP stage, more information was needed to gain that confidence.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the applicant was able to provide that needed level of detail regarding both durability and color.

Mr. Ridge responded that they have, and a chart with that comparative information was provided in the Commission's meeting packet, as well as a sample of the Trespa product.

Ms. Fox stated that within the Bridge Street area, a primary material is required. What is proposed is a synthetic material. At the PDP review, the Commission had requested that a primary material be identified that looked more like wood and less synthetic. What other primary material options were considered?

Rex Hagerling, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce St, Suite 300, Columbus, OH 43215 responded that they considered several other materials that have a wood look; however, the proposed material was the closest to the look they preferred. Nichiha, while appropriate for some uses, was less durable; it is essentially a fibrous board with an applied finish. The finish on the Trespa material is baked onto the product. There are buildings where this material was applied over 20 years ago and remains today without issues. What they have proposed is a more expensive, higher-end product.

Ms. Trout stated that they also looked at cementitious tile, and natural wood was not desirable from a visual or maintenance standpoint. Other products considered lacked the warmth desired. Staff indicated that they liked the warmth of the Trespa material but needed to be certain of the durability. The applicant has worked with the vendor extensively to ensure the durability of this project, which will not require the maintenance that natural wood would require.

Ms. Fox stated that her concern is that this is a synthetic material that has not been used in the area. The Code requires a primary material that complements the surrounding structures. The Commission was willing to look at options; in Bridge Park, the Commission allowed a wood-like material that had both the depth and character of real wood. However, the proposed material does not have the look of a primary material, of real wood. This is a much more modern material, and it may lack warmth, as well. She is not an architect, and does not have the opportunity to look at other options. That is the reason the Commission requested other options. Although durability may not be an issue, some members do not like the look of the Trespa product. She does not believe it meets the Code requirement for a primary material.

Mr. Grimes stated that with the sign, the amount of glass on the building, and the landscaping, the Trespa will not be the largest percent of what is seen. The color is not inconsistent with the colors reflected in the Dublin Plaza or the adjacent McDonald's building. The Trespa product looks durable. He likes the overall plan that was submitted. He has no objections to the siding or the plan.

Ms. Call noted that members should also provide comments on the proposed Master Sign.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would not be in favor of the 18-foot wall sign, which exceeds the 15-foot requirement. She would prefer that signs meet Code, if at all possible.

Ms. Fox stated that, typically, she agrees that signs should meet Code. However, if this sign size were reduced to 15 feet, she believes it would look awkward on that façade.

Ms. Call stated that the applicant provided a drawing of what the 15-foot sign height would look like. Essentially, it would be mounted to nothing on the bottom.

Ms. Kennedy responded that she had missed that image in the packet, and is in agreement with Ms. Fox.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the ground sign size.

Mr. Ridge stated that site defaults to the standard sign code. Ground signs are permitted to be a maximum of 50 square feet in size and 15 feet in height. They also are required to be set back eight feet from the right-of-way or the property line. The sign is consistent with the Code requirements.

Ms. Fox inquired about Code requirements for wall signs.

Mr. Ridge responded that wall signs are permitted to be one square foot in size per linear foot of the elevation to which they are attached, with a total limit of 80 square feet. The applicant is permitted a wall sign on that elevation of 80 square feet.

Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Grimes stated that they have no objection to the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Supelak stated this is an attractive project. The only issue is the siding. Although Trespa is a good product and has a good rain screen, he has several concerns about it. If it were to be installed, there could be no second thoughts. He has been searching information regarding exterior wood products and looking at the finished images of the projects on the Trespa site. Most Commission members are hesitant about this product. Would it be possible to see a mockup of the structure with this product, rather than a small sample? Since installing the siding is one of the last steps in the project, potentially, there is time to review and approve that component of the project. Could this be made a condition of the FDP?

Ms. Martin responded that the Commission previously has requested applicants to provide full size samples, and the applicant could agree to do so. The Commission has also applied Conditions of Approval requiring a portion of the project come before the Commission for a second review prior to issuance of a final Building Permit for the exterior.

Mr. Boggs stated if the Commission wants to pursue that type of condition for approval, and if the applicant has no object to the condition, it will be essential for the specifics of the condition to be very clear.

Ms. Fox stated that the approval of the PDP approval required that options to the Trespa material be provided. The Commission has seen a variety of wood cladding materials on other buildings, which provide a much more realistic wood appearance. The intent is that the cladding should be a primary material. What is proposed is not a primary material; it is a product that the Commission is unfamiliar with and unsure of. With no real options to view tonight, she believes it will be essential to have an architect provide samples of other options for the Commission to consider. For the Commission to permit a product that has neither been seen or used before for a gateway corner in the City would be setting a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Supelak noted that the issue might be the detailing rather than the product itself. The Parker Community Boathouse product reflects different detailing that results in a more compelling quality.

Mr. Schneier inquired if hardiboard is permitted in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Ridge responded that hardiboard is a cementitious fiberboard.

Ms. Rauch stated that hardiboard is a secondary material. Primary materials are brick, stone and glass.

Mr. Schneier stated that, for him, the issue is not whether the material is synthetic or natural; it is the look of it. He would not object to the proposed product, but if fellow Commission members would prefer to see a mockup first, he would support that, as well. He has no objection to the Master Sign Proposal.

Mr. Fishman stated that he always prefers signs to meet Code, but he would not object to the sign proposal. He is concerned about the synthetic siding material. In addition, the proposed material would touch the ground, which can negatively impact the material. We would much prefer primary materials be used when the material will have contact with the ground. On the back of the material sample is the statement that "the sample is not representative of the size or thickness of the material." Will the material be thicker than the sample?

Mr. Hagerling responded that the actual material used will be 5/16 inch to 3/8 inch thick. He added that, although the material appears to touch the ground, it will not; it will be 0.5 inch to 1.0 inch off the ground.

Ms. Fox clarified that wood is a secondary, not primary material. She is not opposed to the use of a wood-like material, but it must have a realistic look.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is concerned about the Trespa product. If this material were to fail in a year, she is certain the property owner would address that in some manner. What options would be pursued?

Ms. Trout stated that they would be willing to provide a mockup using that product; however, she would request that it not be made a condition before approval. Their bank operations currently are displaced. Rather than working six months to a year in a temporary space, it would be better for them to proceed with the internal renovations only, and forego external renovations. If the mockup is not satisfactory, they would continue to look for the right product. Perhaps a re-design would be necessary. However, they have studied this product extensively, and they are confident in the product. Should there be an issue, however, in a year or so, they would pursue another facelift.

Mr. Hagerling stated that they considered the type of mockup that the Commission has suggested, but it was quite expensive. They did not want to spend money on the mockup until they had more confidence that the Commission would approve the material. They would prefer to have approval and be able to submit for the building permits. At the same time, they would have a mockup created, and if it were to be unsatisfactory, they would pursue a material change.

Ms. Trout stated that due to the costs, they did not want to do a mockup without having the Commission's approval. The Commission's approval would allow them to start the project. It has been almost three years since they started planning this project. Currently, the building is unoccupied, and they do not want it to sit vacant too long.

Ms. Call inquired what percentage of an elevation must be comprised of primary materials.

Ms. Martin responded that a primary material is required to cover 80% of an elevation.

Ms. Call stated that the Trespa material is not merely 20% of the building. This is an attractive building, and she has no objection to the sign proposal. If this building were in the Bridge Street District, the proposal would be consistent with the Bridge Street Sign Code. In addition to the look of the material, the edge used with the material also has a very different look, and a large amount of that edge would be visible.

[Discussion continued regarding the Trespa siding and edging.]

Mr. Boggs clarified that a Final Development Plan is not reviewed by City Council. Approval by the Commission permits the applicant to pursue building permits.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded approval of the Parking Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the plans to provide the dimensions of the monument structure (ground sign), subject to Planning approval, prior to submitting for permanent sign permits through Building Standards.
- 2) The applicant ensure that any additional directional or ATM signs meet Code.
- 3) The applicant utilize a metal or similarly durable and high-quality material for fabrication and construction of the ground sign, subject to Planning staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call clarified that the applicant has requested that a large-scale mockup not be a condition for approval. Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with no conditions.

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

[Motion failed 3-4.]

7. Architectural Review Board Zoning Code Update, 19-007ADMC, Administrative Request – Code Amendment

~~A request for an amendment to the Zoning Code sections including definitions, architectural review, Bridge Street District districts, and appendixes F & G to address the Historic Dublin Boundary and Architectural Review Board development standards and procedures.~~

8. Historic District Rezoning, 20-188Z, Zoning Review

~~A request for area rezoning from the Bridge Street District (BSD) to Historic District (HD) designations in conjunction with the Architectural Review Board Zoning Code amendments.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Rauch stated that Greg Dale, consultant, McBride Dale Clarion, and Kathleen Bryan, Architectural Review Board chair, are present to assist in the presentation and answer questions. In 2018, Council directed staff to look at the Historic District and remove it from the Bridge Street District. The intent was to also draft development standards, parameters and guidelines that would preserve the character of the Historic District. It was believed that having the Historic District included in the greater Bridge Street District was eroding the Historic District, and development was not consistent with the desired character and context. That effort included amending the boundaries to remove the Library, Parking Garage and the Bridge Park West Z1 and Z2 Buildings and the plaza between them from the Historic District. The development within those areas is not consistent with the character and context of the Historic District. Changing the Districts also required amending the Zoning Code to ensure the Code requirements were consistent. The supplemental Guideline documents are nearing completion, and those will be provided for the Commission's consideration at an upcoming meeting. The draft Code, Rezoning, and Guideline documents are the result of a multi-year stakeholder committee, public engagement, and Board and Commission review process. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed and recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) for the proposed Historic District Zoning Code amendments and the rezoning at their November 18, 2020 meeting. The rezoning component is primarily administrative, essentially changing the nomenclature of the Districts. Ms. Rauch summarized the rezoning and boundary changes, as follow:~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 15, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. Heartland Bank 20-139PDP 6500 Frantz Road Preliminary Development Plan

Proposal: Facade improvements and associated site improvements for an existing bank.
Location: Southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Post Road and zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.
Request: Review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant: Rex Hagerling, Moody Nolan; and Ashley Trout, Heartland
Planning Contact: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us; or
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-139

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the following three Waivers:

1. §153.062 — Building Types (E)(1) - Façade Materials. **Requirement:** A minimum of 80% of each façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors, shall be constructed of permitted primary materials. **Request:** A minimum of 59% of each façade be permitted to be clad in a combination of materials not permitted as a primary materials.
2. §153.062 — Building Types (O)(7)(d) – Façade Transparency. **Requirement:** A minimum of 65% storefront transparency is required on street facing facades of the building and a minimum of 50% storefront transparency is required on non-street facing facades. **Request:** A minimum of transparency on each façade that does not meet the minimum required per Code.
3. §153.062 — Building Types (D)(1) – Parapet Height. **Requirement:** Parapets shall be no less than two feet in height and no more than 6 feet in height. **Request:** A parapet height of approximately 12 feet, 2 inches.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: All three Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox Yes
Warren Fishman Yes
Kristina Kennedy Yes
Mark Supelak Yes
Rebecca Call Yes
Leo Grimes Yes
Lance Schneier Yes



**Heartland Bank
20-139PDP**

**6500 Frantz Road
Preliminary Development Plan**

MOTION 2: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve the Preliminary Development Plan with 4 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on finalizing grading and drainage details with the Final Development Plan;
- 2) That the applicant provide a parking plan to address the issue of excess parking on the site with the Final Development Plan;
- 3) That the applicant correct the transparency calculations for the elevations prior to submitting for a Final Development Plan; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff on selecting an appropriate exterior cladding material prior to the Final Development Plan submission.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Chase J. Ridge

9A45F751698D466...

Chase J. Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner



Ms. Call stated that she agrees with Mr. Supelak regarding the suggestion Ms. Newell made during the previous review for adding "more" to the layout. She agrees with Mr. Fishman regarding the parking. In retrospect, parking probably should not be based on the number of bedrooms, but because of the number of one-bedroom units proposed, the numbers probably would not be much different if calculated in the standard manner. She also agrees with other Commissioners concerning the need to improve the .39-acre dog park -- the size as well as the turf material. Consistent with the expectation for this area, the architectural character has an urban character. Ms. Fox offered good points about providing more open space within the block. Previously, Mr. Hunter indicated that the open space design would provide an urban environment with a backyard quality; that is not present with this design. Finally, the density and intensity in a development like this is important. She was disappointed to see that the previous 42-unit proposal had been replaced with 100 units, 77 of which are 445-square foot, one-bedroom units, which is a preponderance of intensity and density! Although this area is the right place for higher density, it must be a "platinum" package. That is not what is proposed.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant needed any additional clarification of the Commission's positions. Mr. Hunter responded that no clarification is needed. He believes the development of the blocks within Bridge Park has gradually improved, and the same will occur with Block G.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to see Bridge Park become a timeless place that people want to visit. Along Longshore Street, there are some fun entrances, such as Cap City, but on every street there should be places that cause people to stop and take another look. She urges them to pay attention to the first level. Every 50-60 feet, there should be something that captures the public's interest. If that does not occur, this will be a place that people want to avoid at night, rather than linger. Outdoor spaces are needed more than ever, and it is essential to create a timelessness in this area.

Ms. Supelak stated that what she is referring to is the "destination" quality of the design. Some of that will occur with the tenants. As long as the design provides the ability for the tenants to add their unique flair at the street level, that layer will come in time.

Mr. Hunter responded that is the number one lesson they learned as they developed Bridge Park. With the beginning blocks, the storefront was included upfront. What that meant, however, was that the tenants would be unlikely to replace them, as they would incur additional cost. With the exception of a few, including Cap City, the businesses did not do so. They no longer provide the storefronts in the beginning. Instead, opportunity is provided for the tenants to differentiate their space, and that will occur here.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Suite 500, Dublin, OH 43017, stated that after the previous review, their team studied the Commission's input and attempted to provide the requested unique greenspaces. That effort resulted in the flat open space between the Office and Garage buildings, where turf and an opportunity for an outdoor meeting space now is provided. They also are considering the possibility of including a water feature at the corner of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. Adding the dog park will meet or potentially exceed the open space requirement. With four-sided architecture buildings, the service/loading area typically occurs at the back door, which in this case opens into the public realm. They considered that situation for some time and came up with the unique solution of providing an underground access beneath the open space via an interior service corridor. This type of evolution within Bridge Park achieves the "next level" in details, a platinum experience. Finally, the 445-square-foot one-bedroom units offer WiFi-control opportunities. They appreciate the Commission's input, and look forward to meeting again soon.

The Commission thanked the applicants for their presentation.

2. Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, 20-139PDP, Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for facade improvements and associated site improvements for an existing bank. The site is southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Post Road and zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for exterior modifications and associated site improvements for an existing bank on a 0.82-acre site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). The Heartland Bank site is located southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Frantz Road. The site is an outparcel to the Kroger shopping plaza immediately to the south. At their July 2020 meeting, PZC members reviewed and provided feedback on a Concept Plan for this site, and subsequently, the applicant has submitted an application for a Preliminary Development Plan for exterior modifications and associated site improvements.

Site

The bank is centrally located on the site, with a right-in/right-out vehicular access point on Frantz Road. There is also vehicular access from the south through the Dublin Plaza parking area. The bank site contains 27 parking spaces; six will be removed, reducing the total spaces to 21. Given the size of this building, the site is required to have a minimum of 12 parking spaces or a maximum of 15 spaces. With the Final Development Plan (FDP), the applicant will be required to provide a parking plan to account for the excess parking. The current parking along W. Bridge Street and the dumpster enclosure in the northeast corner of the site will be removed; the drive-through will remain unchanged. Improved landscaping will be installed in the northwest and southwest corners of the site.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a modernization and remodel to the entire exterior of the existing structure. This includes increased glazing on all facades with a new aluminum storefront system. This includes a Trespa Meteon High-Pressure Compact Laminate (HPL) cladding material in a contemporary wood finish on all four elevations, and a metal panel screening. The existing white columns that support the overhang will be replaced with steel I-beams to complement the contemporary wood aesthetic. The remaining brick will be painted a dark gray color. Although the increased glazing will increase transparency, the Code transparency requirement will not be met; therefore, the applicant will be requesting a waiver to this requirement. A second waiver will be required to allow a larger percentage of each façade to be clad in a secondary material, and a third waiver is also required to permit a parapet taller than the two to six feet permitted by Code. A 12-foot, 2-inch high parapet is proposed to provide screening of the mechanicals and the existing gabled roof. Staff is supportive of the waivers but is concerned about the proposed Trespa HPL cladding material; therefore, it is recommended that the applicant continue to work with staff on identifying an appropriate material. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the three waivers and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with four conditions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox requested clarification of Engineering's recommendation regarding a driveway.

Mr. Ridge responded that Engineering recommended that the access point off Frantz Road be narrowed to make it more pedestrian friendly, but it is not a requirement.

Ms. Fox inquired if any amenities would be added to improve the walk for pedestrians within the plaza and the outparcels.

Mr. Ridge responded that, other than what is depicted in the plan, no other improvements are proposed.

Ms. Husak stated that no additional improvements are required of the applicant. However, the City is studying potential enhancements within the Frantz Road Corridor, including addition of more pedestrian-friendly amenities and landscaping. Discussions have occurred with the CASTO Realty Group, owner of the Kroger plaza, regarding potential enhancements of that site.

Ms. Fox stated that there appear to be new landscape islands on the southeast corner of the parcel. Mr. Ridge responded that enhancements have been made to the southwest landscape islands, and that may be occurring on the southeast side, as well.

Applicant Proposal

Ashley Trout, Heartland Bank, 6500 Frantz Road, Dublin, OH, stated that they have no additional presentation, but would be happy to answer questions. They would like to discuss the exterior cladding and landscaping with the Commission. For comparison purposes, they included the renderings from the Conceptual review in the packet. In addition to the changes shown in the new renderings, the color of the planters has been addressed, as requested.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Grimes stated that he appreciates the changes that have been made in the cladding, including the increased transparency. In regard to the concerns raised about the plaza, the applicant has an opportunity to take the lead and "set a tone" for further enhancements that will occur within the plaza. In regard to the amount of parking for the bank, perhaps there is a reason they would like to retain more than is required; if not, there could be an opportunity to use some of the spaces to make additional landscaping improvements.

Mr. Fishman stated that walkability in the shopping plaza is important. He concurs with Mr. Grimes's comments about landscaping versus parking spaces, as the bank site looks like an island in a sea of blacktop. Walking from Kroger or Roush Hardware through the parking lot to the bank is risky. He would encourage any landscape enhancements that could be made that would benefit the pedestrian traffic. He likes the improved cladding with a contemporary wood finish, as seen with the sample provided.

Ms. Trout noted that the sample is slightly thinner than the actual material that will be used.

Ms. Fox stated that the cladding material has a wood appearance that transitions to the more contemporary character of the Bridge Street Corridor. Because more natural materials are desired within this area, she is concerned that a material as contemporary and sleek as this, minus any warm wood feel, might appear out of place when more development occurs. This material is most often used on very contemporary buildings. She would prefer a more natural-looking material, something that appears to be wood although it may not be. She is concerned about the height of the parapet. The reason for the proposed height is to hide the view of the existing roof, but if in the future, there are two-story buildings around the bank, would they have a view down to the old roof? She is concerned that the view will be hidden only at ground level, but have an exposed, unfinished look from above. Is there another screening option for the roof?

Robert Minshall, Executive Director of Preconstruction Services, Ruscilli Construction, 5815 Wall Street, Dublin, OH 43017, responded that the parapet section of the wall is 12 feet, but the visible portion of the parapet is closer to 5 feet. Currently, there is only one building across the street that could have a view of this roof. The expansive flat roof of the nearby Casto strip mall building contains a large amount of equipment, and the McDonald's building next to the bank has a parapet screening for rooftop mechanicals. Roofs typically have a significant amount of mechanicals, some of which can be seen from the ground. With the proposed project, nothing will be seen from the ground. At this point, significant additional expense would be necessary to revise the roof, which would not improve the view from more than a few hotel rooms.

Ms. Fox stated that she appreciates that explanation. Her primary concern is the cladding material, which she believes should have a more natural wood feel. She does not particularly care for the appearance of the proposed product, and would like the applicant to work with staff and attempt to identify another option.

Ms. Kennedy stated she likes the increased landscaping. This is a long overdue renovation project. The reduction in number of parking spaces is justified. Is the proposed cladding material used on any of the adjacent structures, such as the hotel across the street or the new McDonald's renovation, which Commissioners could use as a reference?

Mr. Ridge responded that this particular material has not been used within the immediate vicinity.

Ms. Husak stated that the hotel and McDonald's buildings used only hardiplank or some type of cementitious siding.

Ms. Kennedy stated that due to the amount of surface that will be clad with the material, she would agree that it should have a more natural look and quality feel. She is looking forward to seeing this building "refreshed."

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the design is great and has no negative comments. Commissioners are aware of the risky route between the shops and the bank, but it is not the applicant's responsibility to address. Of course, if there were anything the applicant could do to make that route a little more pedestrian friendly, it would be appreciated. The proposed renovation will greatly improve the bank's appearance.

Mr. Supelak stated that using parapets for screening purposes is common. The view of the roof from the hotel rooms would not be changed significantly if the roof were to be rebuilt; therefore, he is supportive of the 12-foot parapets. His concern about the cladding material is not its durability, but its appearance. The grain of the material will appear monolithic. The previous renderings showed a variegated wood look, which this material will not achieve. If this is the material used, there will be a need to compensate with detailing to make the material appear to be real wood rather than a panelized rain-screen system. It would be preferable to identify a material that allows the more variegated wood quality shown in the renderings, but should they decide to work with the proposed material, this still will be an attractive building.

Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of fellow Commissioners' suggestions in regard to the landscaping and the proposed reduction in parking spaces. She appreciates that the color of the planters will be addressed. Will a sign package be provided with the Final Development Plan (FDP)?

Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Ms. Call stated that after a discussion with staff earlier this week, she took the samples and attempted to damage them; she found that the material is durable. She is supportive of the proposed material, but is also supportive of the applicant and staff working together to identify another material.

Ms. Fox stated that she is not in favor of approving this particular cladding material, unless staff and the applicant have first worked together to identify a possible alternative.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would have any objection to that suggestion.

Ms. Trout responded that they have no objection to other options, but in their review to date, they have been unable to find an option with the desired wood look. They did not consider real wood, because the wood product on the Penzone building has not worn well. They have no objection to continuing to look for another product, however.

Ms. Husak stated that the Commission could approve the Preliminary Development Plan tonight, and the applicant would bring back the identified cladding material with the FDP for the Commission's consideration, or the application could be tabled, in which case, the applicant would bring back an alternative material for the Commission's consideration.

Ms. Call inquired the applicant's preference.

Ms. Trout stated that they would prefer to keep the project moving and work with staff on the material selection.

Commission consensus was to proceed with a vote on the application, with the condition that the proposed material be submitted with the FDP.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the following three waivers:

1. Section 153.062, Building Types (E)(1) - Façade Materials.
2. Section 153.062, Building Types (O)(7)(d) – Façade Transparency.
3. Section 153.062, Building Types (D)(1) – Parapet Height.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to approve the Preliminary Development Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with Engineering on finalizing grading and drainage details with the Final Development Plan.
- 2) The applicant provide a parking plan to address the issue of excess parking on the site with the Final Development Plan.
- 3) The applicant correct the transparency calculations for the elevations prior to submitting for a Final Development Plan.
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff on selecting an appropriate exterior cladding material prior to the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Joint Council/PZC/ARB Work Session

~~Ms. Fox reported that a joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB will be scheduled in December to provide an update regarding policies, challenges and issues. The goal is to create a better line of communication between Council and its boards and commission with the goal of improving the project review process. She requested that Commissioners provide desired discussion topics for the meeting. Commission members will forward desired work session topics to the Chair.~~

Future Commissioner Training

~~Suggestions were made for future Commissioner education, including the following opportunities:~~

- ~~• Architect presentation regarding their review process;~~
- ~~• Shadowing a development project through staff review process.~~
- ~~• Attendance of OSU student presentations for critique/review of project designs.~~
- ~~• Tour of examples of development projects within the City, along with helpful commentary; video tours could be utilized, as well.~~

~~The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 5 at 6:30 p.m.~~

ADJOURNMENT

~~The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.~~

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 9, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

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

Proposal: Facade improvements, new signage, and associated site improvements for an existing bank that needs modernization and remodeling.
Location: Southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Post Road and zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.
Request: Review and approval of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
Applicant: Rex Hagerling, Moody Nolan
Planning Contact: Chase J. Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-096

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

- 1) That the applicant submit a landscape plan with the Preliminary Development Plan, ensuring Code compliance;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to choose an appropriate exterior cladding material;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with Staff on creating an appropriate sign plan for the site; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to address the location of the existing dumpster and dumpster enclosure.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Concept Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Chase J. Ridge, AICP Candidate, Planner I



~~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