



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 7, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the January 7, 2021 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. During the pandemic, the City's public meetings are being held online and live streamed on YouTube. Members of the public can access the live stream on the City's website and may submit questions or comments in the form provided under the streaming video. Those questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Jane Fox, Kristina Kennedy
Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Nicole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge
Other attendees: Greg Dale, consultant, McBride Dale Clarion; Kathy Bryan, chair, Architectural Review Board

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of December 10, 2020 as submitted.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

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. One of the cases scheduled for discussion tonight has been postponed to the January 21, 2020 meeting: Case 5: 20-184PDP for Germain Honda. There are two cases eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening:

Case 2: 20-169CU for Brazilianology, and

Case 3: 20-178MSP for the Dublin Plaza

Ms. Call inquired if anyone wished to move either of the cases to the Consent Agenda for discussion.

Ms. Fox responded that she had a question related to Case 3; that case was moved to the regular agenda.

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

CONSENT CASE

2. Brazilianology, 6065 Frantz Road, 20-169CU, Conditional Use

A request for a personal service use for an existing ±1,150-square-foot tenant space in the Millennium Office Complex zoned Planned Unit Development District, on a 7.84-acre site located west of Frantz Road, ±900 feet north of the intersection with Blazer Parkway.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

NEW CASES

1. All R Friends, PID: 273-012214, 20-195INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback for a ±8,100-square-foot building zoned Planned Commerce District (ThomasKohler, Subarea B1) on a 3.32-acre located west of Emerald Parkway, ±450 feet northwest of the intersection with Parkwood Place.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for an ±8,100-square-foot building on a 3.32-acre site located within the Thomas-Kohler Planned Commerce District. The Preliminary Development Plan for this Planned Commerce District was approved in 1996 without a preliminary site plan. The Thomas-Kohler Planned District encompasses approximately 120 acres, and the subject site is at the northern boundary of the district. The Planning and Zoning Commission approved the Final Development Plan for the Gardner School daycare facility immediately to the east of this site in May 2007 and an expansion in April 2010. A Final Development Plan for a banking and office operations center, BMI Federal Credit Union, on the parcel to the south was approved in February 2006. The Camden Professional Office Complex, approved in two phases in 2004 and 2006, is located farther to the south on the west side of Emerald. The land to the north is zoned SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District and includes the Trinity Green development, which was approved for three one-story office buildings, one of which has been built and occupied. The remaining acreage is vacant. The land to the west is zoned PLR, Planned Low-Density Residential District as part of Heather Glen Subdivision and Heather Glen Park. This particular parcel includes the access drive off Emerald Parkway for the daycare and the credit union and has 60 feet of frontage along Emerald Parkway. The land is undeveloped and flat with a partial tree row along the northern boundary. The site includes a consolidated stormwater management pond shared with the daycare. To the rear of the site, a 75-foot wide landscape buffer has been established as required by the development text. It includes a multi-use path. [Images shown of the surrounding architecture.] This is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for a new building to provide service to train adults with disabilities. The Code does not specifically address this service, but staff has determined that either adult day care (permitted) or vocational school (conditional use) are appropriate use categories for this proposal. The 8,000-square-foot building would be located toward the western portion of the site, and 60 parking spaces would be located east of the building. The Code requires one parking space per six students and one space per teacher for daycare facilities. Currently, no connection to the existing path to the rear is indicated on the site plan. In addition, the applicant has noted that a split rail fence, which is required by the development text along the boundary with Heather Glen, has not been installed in the 10 years that development has occurred in the Thomas-Kohler Planned District. Staff is not aware of any issues or complains due to the lack of this fence and is supportive of the deletion of the requirement; however, that would require a Minor Text Modification. While no details are provided at this informal stage, should the applicant pursue a ground sign, the placement would be challenging due to the limited frontage and the fact that, currently, both BMI and The Gardner School have ground signs near the entry drive. Daycare uses are limited to wall signs that are eight feet in height and ground signs that

are 6 feet in height. The development text requires a four-sided, high quality architectural design that maintains an overall coordinated architectural style for the district. Roof pitches are required to be 6/12, and stucco is not permitted as a primary building material. Buildings approved along Emerald Parkway use a dry stacked stone, painted wood panels, and details that portray a warm tone. The proposed architecture for this building lacks certain elements, so does not meet the text requirements. The applicant should consider the surrounding buildings to ensure that the text requirements are met and the architectural detailing is consistent along this important business corridor of the City. [images of elevations shown.] The development text also requires high-pressure sodium lighting for parking lots; therefore, the Commission would need to approve a Minor Text Modification with the Final Development Plan to allow modern lighting. The following questions are provided to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed adult daycare within Subarea B1 of the ThomasKohler Planned District?
- 2) Is the Commission inclined to allow the applicant to deviate from the lighting requirements as long as Code is met for lighting levels?
- 3) Does the Commission support eliminating the fencing requirements along the rear of the site and allowing access to the walking path?
- 4) What architectural elements should the applicant include to create consistency with the existing character on the west side of Emerald Parkway?

Applicant Presentation

Ken Cook, applicant, 5950 Wilcox Place, Dublin, OH 43016, inquired if staff had been given the most recent layout for the parking lot, which would have reflected that the number of parking spaces was reduced.

Chris Jolley, Project Manager, 5925 Wilcox Place, Suite E, Dublin, OH 43016, [displayed site plan], stated that the revised configuration is similar to the first plan provided. However, the parking spaces in the center and a few other spaces were eliminated.

Mr. Cook stated that it is unlikely that the facility would ever need to accommodate more than 60 individuals. Most clients would arrive by shuttle buses and vans. Other than staff, very few clients would use the parking lot. [images shown of surrounding buildings and surrounding architecture for context.]

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Call inquired about the estimated number of staff at this facility.

Mr. Cook responded that there would be approximately 10 staff and 50 clients, a ratio of 1 to 5.

Mr. Fishman inquired if this would qualify as a Conditional Use, due to the limited number of people and parking spaces. If the use changes, there would need to be changes in the building and parking.

Ms. Martin responded that this use could be considered as an adult daycare or a vocational use. The designation of this use as a vocational school was based upon precedent; however, this use will provide some adult daycare services for their clients. Staff will resolve this with the applicant prior to their Final Development Plan (FDP). A conditional use with the FDP is anticipated.

Mr. Fishman stated that identifying this as a Conditional Use makes more sense, because if the use were to change in the future, there could be a need for many alterations.

Mr. Cook stated that their intent is to build another facility several miles to the south in the Arlingate Plaza area, and that site has been designated as a vocational training center. The Dublin facility will be the adult daycare center; it will not have a mixed use. The use here will be similar to their Wilcox Place facility. He does not foresee any possibility for change of use in the future. At the time of their initial discussion with Dublin, the specific use had not yet been determined.

Ms. Call inquired about the difference in parking requirements for the two potential uses.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code does not provide specific parking requirements for vocational schools. They do exist for trade schools, but they would be a little high for this site. The most accurate calculation would be the daycare parking calculation, which is one parking space per six students and one space per teacher.

Ms. Fox stated that when she visited the site, her initial impression was that the building was set so far back on the lot, so far away from any frontage in the approach, that the view of the site would be only of the parking. However, with the revised layout, the building has been moved forward and the parking reduced; that was important. She is concerned that the roof pitch is not consistent with neighboring buildings. She has no objection to the daycare use or newer lighting. Although no split rail fence exists in this area, there is a large site to the west that eventually could become a residential development. Her concern is that the split rail fence was required by the development text for the purpose of creating a boundary between residential and commercial uses. Therefore, some note should be made that if residential were ever to develop there, and the request of that development was to adhere to the development text requirement for construction of the split rail fence, that the burden would be on the commercial property owner to make sure that happens. There was a reason that requirement was included in the original development text, also a reason that it has not occurred to date, but she does not believe the protection should be removed permanently. In her review of the site, she noticed that more primary materials exist in the architecture of the adjacent buildings than are proposed in this building. The proposal is for split brick, which does not appear to have been used on the other buildings. In addition, there is more stucco in this proposal than is used on the other buildings. Her suggestion is to increase the articulation of the building elements. The architecture is so nondescript that she could identify no element of interest. When looking at the surrounding buildings, The Gardner School has a much more impressive front door. The front door on this building should be more impressive, particularly since it is set back from the roadway. She also would encourage the use of more natural materials and less manufactured products. Since the building has been moved forward, there is a large yard at the back, but a very small covered patio. As the Commission considers new developments, it is looking for central connection, mobility and connectivity. Although the clients of this facility may not use the walkways significantly, it is likely they would use a covered patio. Therefore, she would recommend that they improve or increase the amount of usable outdoor space. The primary materials, articulation, ensuring that the height does not exceed 35 feet, and adhering to the slope of the roof requirements are important.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no objection to the use of this property for this purpose and the parking. The split rail fence is a characteristic element in Dublin. She agrees that if it is not required at this time, that should there be a future need for it to provide a buffer between the commercial and a residential development occurring in the adjacent area, that it should be provided at that time. She agrees with Ms. Fox's comments regarding the proposed architecture. Although it is not a Code requirement, visually, she believes it is important to have colors that are consistent with the surrounding properties. She inquired about the sidewalk connection. Ms. Martin responded that the applicant is required by the Building Code to provide certain connections. Ms. Kennedy stated that the applicant's question was if it would be acceptable to have the sidewalk connection to the public way be placed within the parking setback. Ms. Martin responded that per Code, it would be permitted.

Mr. Grimes requested clarification of the lighting issue.

Ms. Martin responded that the development text was written in the late 1990s. At that time, sodium halide bulbs were the predominant choice. Due to advancements in technology, LED fixtures now are preferred, which would require Commission approval of a Minor Text Modification with the Final Development Plan. At this time, the applicant is inquiring if the Commission would be supportive of that request.

Mr. Grimes stated that he believes consistency with the surrounding buildings is necessary, as well. In regard to the fence -- when he visited the site, he observed many people on the path. Whether or not a residential development has occurred in the adjacent area, there are a large volume of people on the path. From the business's perspective, he would assume they would prefer an element that would discourage users of the path from entering their property. However, if the Commission were to require this development to install the fence, the same requirement would need to be made of the surrounding property owners. He believes this is a good location for the proposed type of business, although it may be a challenge to be tucked in at the back. While the clients of this facility would not have an issue with that, future uses might.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the proposed project and the location. It is an appropriate location for that development. He agrees that pedestrian connections are important. He is supportive of the proposed sidewalk that would provide a connection to Emerald Parkway. However, it could also connect to the trailway at the back. While this business may not need that connection, it would be beneficial for the community. He agrees that the proportion of primary materials is important. There is also a need for a front door that articulates the entry in a more natural and intuitive manner. He would recommend altering the front door placement to be more asymmetrical. Additionally, it will be important to add landscaping between the building and the sidewalk. It will be a challenge to get the signage to work well, but that can be worked out as the project proceeds. He has no issue with approving a Minor Text Modification regarding the lighting.

Mr. Fishman stated that the difference between regular and slim brick is distinguishable. He would encourage them to provide more real brick, less stucco and make the architecture more consistent with the surrounding buildings. In regard to the suggestion to add a sidewalk to the bikepath, perhaps a bikepath instead of a sidewalk could be extended to Emerald Parkway. A bikepath extension could be curved and landscaped and be less expensive than a sidewalk extension. He has concerns about the proposed building height being consistent with the other buildings. In regard to the fence, he does not understand the reason the fence was not installed with the other properties. If the adjacent land is developed residentially, it may be difficult to get that fence constructed. Perhaps it could be made a requirement with this development, and the City could require the other property owners to meet the fence requirement, as well.

Ms. Call stated that she would be supportive of requiring the fence with the initial application. It is more difficult to address later. She is supportive of the use and the location. In regard to the placement, it is important to make sure that there is visibility to the business. She would prefer the street view not be of parking. Perhaps there is a way to shift the parking to the rear and move the building forward or to provide berm around the parking and not around the building, thereby highlighting the positive features. Parking lots are not particularly attractive. She appreciates, however, that the number of parking spaces was reduced. She concurs with the need to meet the requirements regarding primary materials.

Ms. Fox expressed a similar concern regarding a street view of the parking lot. The view of the building should not be through vehicles and asphalt. The adjacent buildings have more architectural detail than is proposed here. It will be important to improve the details and front articulation on the building.

Ms. Call stated that most of the facility's patrons would be dropped off. Having a covered front entry would not only provide weather protection but also improve the articulation on the front of the building. She inquired if the applicant had any additional questions.

Mr. Cook responded that he believes there could be a point of confusion in regard to the split rail fence. No residential development can occur west of their building. That is a park, and the bikepath circumnavigates the park. Adding a fence would be cutting off access to that walkway. Additionally, he believes their back patio will be large, and tables for their patrons could be placed within their large greenspace. Erecting a fence between the building and that park walkway will be restricting the space for the developmentally disabled clients with whom they work. If the Commission is referring to development occurring to the north along Innovation Drive – there is a significant tree line providing separation between the sites.

Ms. Martin responded that the split rail fence would be required to provide separation between the commercial uses in the ThomasKohler PCD and potential surrounding residential uses. The area to the west is presently undeveloped. To the north, there likely will be commercial development.

Mr. Cook stated that is correct, but the area to the west is a park, which is unlikely ever to be developed as a residential property.

Ms. Fox stated that she was under the impression that it was zoned Low Density Residential.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. It is zoned as part of that neighborhood. While the intent is to preserve the trees long-term, the requirement for a split rail fence is in the development text. If there is not a consensus

among PZC members to approve a waiver of that requirement, the FDP would include the requirement to construct the fence.

Ms. Call requested that staff provide any information regarding long-term development plans on this site with the future application.

Mr. Cook stated that currently they are renting two 3,000-square foot buildings one half mile distant from this location. When this site is built, it will be 80-85% populated from the beginning. They anticipate being at capacity within a short period of time and, if there is sufficient need, they would build an additional facility in the Dublin area. In regard to the street view of this building, there would be only a couple of seconds to view the property when passing by. However, their intent is not to attract walk-up traffic to their building. Their business comes through the Department of Developmental Disabilities. In view of the health and safety issues of their clients, the setback position of the building is a benefit.

Ms. Fox recommended providing a front portico and the addition of landscaping within the area where the parking spaces have been eliminated.

Mr. Cook responded that their intent was to add landscaping. He thanked the Commission for their input.

NEW CASES

3. Dublin Plaza, 225 W. Bridge Street, 20-178MSP, Master Sign Plan

A request for revisions to a previously approved Master Sign Plan for an existing shopping center zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial. The 9.17-acre site is southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

No staff presentation required.

Board Questions

Ms. Fox stated that the sign criteria addresses lighting, and the existing gooseneck lights should be maintained, including a coat of paint. At present, half of the fixtures are painted; on the other half, the paint is worn off. Additionally, the fixtures have differing types of light bulbs; some are LED and some are incandescent, which results in inconsistent lighting. She would recommend the landlord be asked to provide both the paint coating and consistent lighting. In addition, signage exists at the cart corral that is not part of the sign package. A commitment is needed that the signage in that location be removed at some point in the future.

Charles Fraas, Casto, Property Owner/Applicant representative, 250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 500, Columbus, Ohio 43215, stated that they would commit to painting the sign fixtures, informing Kroger of the need to remove their signs on the cart corrals, and formulating a plan for consistent lighting in the shopping plaza. He would provide a report to Ms. Martin on how that would be achieved.

Mr. Supelak stated that the plaza is a vibrant location within the City with two important anchor stores, Kroger and Roush Hardware. He is curious as to when an overall update to the plaza might occur.

Mr. Fraas responded that Casto does update their properties. A "facelift" for the Dublin Plaza occurred approximately 10 years ago. The current economic model is working, and their tenants have certain rights that they must honor. He has had conversations with City staff about the subject, however, and will share the Commission's comments with the owner.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission is interested in advocating for that.

Ms. Call stated that this site receives significant traffic at certain times, such as City parades, that is unrelated to the business activity. The Commission appreciates the excellent partnership they have enjoyed with Casto.

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 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:

Historic District Rezoning

- Properties remaining within the Historic District boundary and previously zoned as a Bridge Street District zoning will be rezoned into new Historic Zoning Districts: HR, Historic Residential, HC, Historic Core, HS, Historic South, and HP, Historic Public.
- The parcels that contain the development of Bridge Park West Buildings Z1 and Z2, West Plaza, CML Dublin Branch and Downtown Dublin Parking were proposed to be rezoned from Bridge Street District - Historic Transition Neighborhood (BSD-HTN) to Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood (BSD-SRN). The ARB members recommended these properties retain the Historic Transition Neighborhood District zoning classification, and any future modifications be under the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission.
- The six residential parcels, along N. Riverview Street, were proposed to be rezoned from Bridge Street District - Historic Core (BSD-HC) to Historic District – Historic Core (HD-HC). The ARB recommended these properties be rezoned to Historic District – Historic Residential (HD-HR) to retain the neighborhood character.
- The Dublin City Schools property, Dublin Cemetery, Indian Run greenway, Indian Run Cemetery, Riverside Crossing Park West, Dublin Spring Park, and the Karrer Barn property are proposed to be included in a new HD-Public District.
- An updated zoning map has been created for review, and an area rezoning of the properties is included with the Zoning Code amendment, which aligns with the new zoning districts.

Historic District Boundary Changes & Outlying Properties Updates

- The parcels that contain the development of Bridge Park West Buildings Z1 and Z2, West Plaza, CML Dublin Branch and the Downtown Dublin Parking Garage have been removed from the Historic District, but remain within the Bridge Street District. As part of their review, some members of the Architectural Review Board expressed concern about the boundary change and the removal of these properties from the Historic District. Based on Council's direction the proposed boundary changes remain in the draft map.
- The eastern boundary of the Historic District has been moved to the west side of the Scioto River, with the exception of the Scioto River Bridge, which remains under the Architectural Review Board's purview.
- Appendix F in the proposed Code has been updated to reflect the proposed boundary changes.
- City-owned historic properties have been added to Appendix G, the list of outlying historic properties.

Architectural Review Board Zoning Code Update

Greg Dale, Consultant, McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way #300, Cincinnati, OH 45227, stated that Ms. Bryan, ARB Chair, is also present for this discussion. The ARB review process included six meetings and a page-by-page review of the proposed amendments, which resulted in a number of proposed changes. ARB has been equally involved in a thorough review of the Historic District Design Guidelines, which are being finalized for an anticipated recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Essentially, the Guidelines provide policy guidance for the ARB in applying the Code. The proposed HD Zoning Code changes address: Permitted Uses; Use Specific Standards; Site Standards (calibrating the standards to address residential compatibility); Development Standards (most of which were carried over from the current regulations; Design Standards; Procedures; Demolition regulations; and Definitions. The draft Code documents reflect the ARB's final recommendations.

Ms. Bryan, ARB Chair, stated that the ARB invested a significant amount of time in their review, and they have presented a clean final draft for the Commission's consideration and recommendation.

Public Comments

Kathleen Bryan, 84 S. Riverview Street, Dublin Ohio 43017:

"Thank you for taking the time to consider the changes recommended by the Architectural Review Board to the Code for Dublin. Great time and care has been given to the changes before you tonight. The ARB held several meetings throughout the past year, inviting and encouraging public input. We feel the changes recommended will help preserve and protect Historic Dublin while providing opportunities for home owners to upgrade and enhance their properties. Sincerely, Kathleen Bryan, Chair "

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Call stated that the Commission appreciates the time and effort spent in this process. The public comment was demonstrative of the amount of attention to detail and public engagement that went into this effort.

Mr. Grimes requested clarification of the dividing line that separates the school property.

Ms. Rauch responded that the line through the middle of the property reflects the current boundary, which aligns with the historic 1919 school building. Staff has discussed with Dublin Schools the possibility of moving the boundary further west. The School's desire was to keep it in the same location; therefore, the proposal adheres to the School's request to keep it as it currently exists, maintaining the 1919 Building under ARB's purview.

Mr. Grimes stated that previously, the Commission discussed the issue of overbuilding on an existing lot. Has that issue been addressed in this draft?

Ms. Rauch responded that there was a significant amount of study and in-depth discussion among staff on this topic. This draft looks at overall lot coverage, appropriate setbacks, and maximum building coverage. The intent is that a proposed building may not cover a lot end-to-end. Their review considered and attempted to balance the needs of the historic properties and the need to permit development.

Mr. Dale noted that topic probably received more discussion than any others.

Ms. Bryan noted that staff members actually went out and measured houses on different streets to define the peak height. The desire is to preserve the historic quality in the District. For those who want to build bigger, there are many other places in which to do this; Historic Dublin may not be one of those.

Ms. Fox stated that one of the issues was that the Code did not address the authority of the ARB in the event of a conflict with BZA. When such conflict occurs, ARB should have the authority to make the final decision within the Historic District. Does this amendment provide the Board with that authority?

Mr. Dale responded that he believes it does. There is now a balance between the Code, the Design Guidelines and discretion by the Board.

Ms. Rauch stated that this concern was discussed and was addressed in a clear manner.

Ms. Fox stated that the intent is not to make the process more difficult but more clear. In regard to the boundaries, she does not believe the Library, Buildings Z1 and Z2, and the Downtown Parking Garage should be under the Commission's review. They should be under the ARB's review as a Transition District. If we want ARB to control the Historic District, ARB should be able to control the heart of it. In addition, she believes the entire School site should be included in the Historic District. The Indian Run Ravine runs along the entire perimeter of the School site. It is a cultural amenity that should be protected. She believes the entire ravine should be included in the Historic District. In regard to the properties on N. Riverview, which the City recently purchased, its intent was to preserve those properties as residential to the extent possible. However, it may not be possible with every property. One or two at the end may need to be developed commercially.

Ms. Bryan stated that ARB would like to see those preserved as residential. We are quickly losing our Historic footprint. We need to keep that in mind with the decisions that are being made.

Ms. Fox stated that perhaps the live-work option could be applicable here.

Ms. Bryan responded that would be historically accurate; so the ARB would have no objection.

Ms. Call requested clarification regarding the maximum building footprint within the Historic South District.

Ms. Rauch stated that under Historic Residential, live-work is not a Permitted Use. However, that issue can be discussed and a recommendation could be considered. In regard to the maximum building footprint in the HS District, that limitation was taken from the current Bridge Street District Building Type requirements. At the southern end of the District, Historic South transitions to Residential. It is beneficial to limit the size of the buildings there, and discourage large commercial buildings.

Ms. Call stated that she was attempting to understand the differential between 1,800 square feet in any one building but a total of 3,000 square feet. That would permit a secondary building that was nearly the size of the primary building.

Ms. Rauch stated that is not in the Historic Residential District. The Historic South District would permit a live-work unit.

Ms. Fox requested clarification about the bed and breakfast use. The text states that the property owner shall reside on the property or manage the facility. There is a small historical, bed and breakfast property in the Historic-Commercial Core District. The owner lives in California, but he has the property managed by local professional management. It is a nice tourist amenity, offering visitors an opportunity to stay in a historic structure. Would that facility be compliant or not?

Ms. Rauch stated that it was not the intent for there to be a conflict with short-term rentals.

Mr. Boggs stated that before this case comes before Council, he and Ms. Rauch would clarify that situation. There is a need to ensure there is no conflict between these regulations and the short-term rental regulations, which are new.

Ms. Fox referred to the language regarding General Retail Uses in the Historic Core, which states they should be limited to no more than 10,000 square feet of gross floor area. The largest building she is aware of in the Historic South District is 5,000 square feet. Where would there be 10,000 square feet for Retail – General use?

Ms. Rauch stated that there was a previous discussion on this topic, and the intent was to revise that.

Ms. Call inquired what it was changed to.

Ms. Rauch stated that she does not recall at this time.

Ms. Fox stated that the language indicates that food trucks may not operate more than six hours per calendar month. Would food trucks, such as that behind Magnolia's, be permitted to remain permanently?

Ms. Rauch responded that they would not. Regulations were added to address that issue more clearly.

Ms. Fox stated that the Intent (page 12) is important. The language reads, "The standards promote design of a comparable size, scale and mass to the existing development character." She would like the word "promote" to be replaced with a stronger word.

Ms. Fox requested clarification of a cultural assessment.

Ms. Rauch responded that it is required with a request for Demolition of contributing structures. It is an inventory of items that could be impacted by the demolition.

Ms. Fox stated that with a Demolition, there appears to be no requirement to document the interior. If an applicant provides a reason of economic burden, what proof is required.

Mr. Dale stated that review criteria is provided on pp. 76-77. The primary criteria for buildings that are contributing is a demonstration that there is no economically viable use of the property. Tools were added to assist the Board in making that determination.

[Discussion continued regarding proposed amendments.]

Public Comments

Denise King, 170 S. Riverview Street, Dublin Ohio 43017:

"As a resident of the Historic District and active member of the community, I want the P & Z Commission members to know that the process for considering, negotiating and finalizing the Code updates and zoning for the HD has been fulsome. From 2018 to now there have been about 18 meetings, some large, some small,

on these issues and the HD Guidelines. Anyone from anywhere in Dublin, residents and business owners have had ample opportunities for input. The issues most important to the HD and Franklin residents are maintaining the character, scale, height, lot coverage, setbacks and sightlines that make the HD what it is. There was a lot of give and take and a lot of buy-in to bring the code and zoning to what is presented to you today. Please build on this comprehensive effort by adding your blessing and forwarding them to City Council for adoption. We've talked and talked. It's time to act. Thank you."

The Commission provided direction to staff to make the minor changes to the language of the proposed Amendment as was noted in the discussion.

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Grimes seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the Historic District Code Amendment and Appendixes F & G.

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call clarified that the Commission is not in favor of dividing the school site, and the recommendation is that the entire School site would be included in the Historic District and under the ARB's purview.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council of the area rezoning from the Bridge Street District to the Historic District designations, as clarified.

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.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- Planning Director Rauch reported that Senior Planner Claudia Husak had accepted the Planning Director position in Powell, Ohio. Her last day with the City will be Tuesday, January 6.
- Ms. Call recommended to staff that prompts be provided in the staff reports, alerting the Commission of any Code associated with the application on which future revisions are anticipated.
- The next regular meeting will be on Thursday, January 21, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council