



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 21, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the January 21, 2021 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that 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, Zachary Hounshell

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

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.

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

Ms. Call stated that three cases are available for the Consent Agenda:

Case 1: Tim Hortons, 6850 Hospital Drive, 20-183AFDP

Case 2: Tim Hortons, 7493 Sawmill Road, 20-182AFDP

Case 3: Country Club at Muirfield Village, 8715 Muirfield Drive, 21-002AFDP

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

Mr. Fishman responded that regarding Case 3 -- at the previous meeting discussion, direction was given that the landscaping along Muirfield Drive in front of the pickle ball court be opaque. Can staff confirm that will occur?

Mr. Hounshell confirmed that opaque landscaping is the expectation.

Mr. Fishman stated that with that assurance, he has no request to move the Consent Item to the regular agenda.

Mr. Boggs requested separate motions and votes on the Consent Cases.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the Consent Cases.

CONSENT CASES

1. Tim Hortons, 6850 Hospital Drive, 20-183AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

A request to remove and replace existing menu board signs with digital menu board signs for an existing drive-thru restaurant on a site located northwest of the intersection of Hospital Drive with Avery-Muirfield Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development – Avery Square Shopping Center/Kroger.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Minor Text Modification as follows:

In the Development Standards for Avery-Muirfield Drive Outparcels, Signage and Graphics, Subsection M, the Avery-Muirfield Drive Outparcels shall be permitted one digital menu board per tenant in accordance with the following:

- (1) The sign is located on the property to which it refers;
- (2) The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way;
- (3) The sign does not exceed 32 square feet in size;
- (4) The sign does not contain continuous movement, flashing, scrolling, video, or animation, except for the customer order image which shall not exceed more than 20% of the menu board sign area;
- (5) The sign is turned off during non-operational business hours;
- (6) The sign does not contain any additional speakers or sound; and,
- (7) The sign changes no more than three times per day.

Vote: 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]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant eliminate the pre-browse digital menu board from the proposal.

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]

2. Tim Hortons, 7493 Sawmill Road, 20-182AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

A request to remove and replace existing menu board signs with digital menu board signs for an existing drive-thru restaurant on a site located 550 feet northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Hard Road and zoned Planned Unit Development – Northeast Quad, Subarea 5A.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Minor Text Modification as follows:

In the Development Text, Subarea 5A: Retail Center Area, Signage Subsection: (4)(f) The multi-tenant retail outbuilding along Sawmill Road containing a drive-thru shall be permitted one digital menu board in accordance with the following:

- 1) The sign is located on the property to which it refers;
- 2) The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way;
- 3) The sign does not exceed 32 square feet in size;

- 4) The sign does not contain continuous movement, flashing, scrolling, video, or animation, except for the customer order image which shall not exceed more than 20% of the menu board sign area;
- 5) The sign is turned off during non-operational business hours;
- 6) The sign does not contain any additional speakers or sound; and,
- 7) The sign changes no more than three times per day.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant eliminate the pre-browse digital menu board from the proposal.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

3. Country Club at Muirfield Village, 8715 Muirfield Drive, 21-002AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

A request for modifications to a previously approved Amended Final Development Plan to allow for the relocation of four pickleball courts, as well as modifications of an adjacent patio, on a 79.66-acre site located west of the intersection of Muirfield Drive with Whittingham Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development – Muirfield Village.

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

- 1) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize landscaping details around the patio and pickleball courts.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

NEW CASES

4. Germain Honda, Phase IV, 6715 Sawmill Road, 20-184PDP, Preliminary Development Plan

A request for exterior building modifications and associated site improvements for an existing car dealership on a 12.70-acre site located southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Dublin Center Drive and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for Germain Honda, Phase IV, an existing car dealership. The 12.70-acre site is located within the Bridge Street District, which calls for a three-step review process: a Concept Plan, a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan. The Commission reviewed the Concept Plan in 2020, and this is the second step in that process. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Dublin Center Drive. The site was originally comprised of several parcels, which have been combined. The applicant's intent is to create consistency and efficiency across the site with these improvements.

Background

This is Phase IV of a multi-phased project. 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 0.64-acre portion of the campus. In 2019, the ART reviewed and approved Phase II of the campus improvements, specifically modifications to parking, landscaping, and lighting for the remainder of the site excluding the Sawmill Road frontage. Phase III provided interior improvements only, primarily for the new car store and service drive. Future improvements will be made to the used car store. In 2020, The PZC reviewed and conditionally approved a Concept Plan for the Phase IV building modifications and site improvements including a proposed sign plan. The Commission emphasized a need to prioritize landscaping and connectivity along the perimeter of the site and recommended the used car store display pad be eliminated. The Commission also expressed a desire to limit large signs along Sawmill Road noting that tree preservation and visibility must be balanced. A Master Sign Plan will be presented with the Final Development Plan (FDP). Since the Concept Plan review, the following updates have been made:

- Eliminated used car vehicle display pad to preserve four additional trees
- Modification to the Sawmill Road sidewalk alignment
- Addition of shared use path along a portion of Dublin Center Drive
- 56 new hedges to screen northwest portion of the site replacing existing Junipers
- Eliminated duplicative Service Center signs and blue stripe accent

With Phase II, removal of the northern most access point on Sawmill Road was approved in exchange for a new access point along Dublin Center Drive in the southwest portion of the site. That access modification will be implemented with the Phase IV improvements. Parking lot modifications are proposed forward of the used car building. The modifications to the used car building include the demolition of the existing metal structure and the retention of the existing masonry building. Demolition of that structure along Sawmill Road provides an opportunity for additional parking to be added. A curvilinear sidewalk along the Sawmill Road frontage is proposed, along with landscape improvements and a new car store vehicle display pad. Consistent with the Commission's previous direction, a shared use path will be provided along Dublin Center Drive. Staff has added a condition that the shared use path be modified to be a sidewalk connection, as it is in alignment with the surrounding pedestrian connectivity, and that an additional sidewalk extension turn the corner from Sawmill Road to Dublin Center Drive and be extended westward to the first access point. The used car vehicle display area has been eliminated, permitting the preservation of four healthy trees. The landscape will include dry-laid limestone walls, as well as shrubs and seasonal plantings. The new car display pad will be at grade with the showroom but higher than the street and sidewalk level. New lighting fixtures will be added with this phase. No updates have been made to the exterior architecture since the Concept Plan with the exception of the removal of blue accent stripes above the service drive. With the new car store on Sawmill Road, the Honda prototype will not be used. A cylindrical entry finished in a silver metal panel with glass sides is proposed to establish a presence along Sawmill Road. The existing EIFS panels are proposed to be repainted white consistent with the Honda brand, and a silver accent is proposed along the top edge of the building as well as the southeast corner where there is an existing architectural protrusion. The architectural character of the used car building will be updated to be consistent with the new car store including materials and colors. The size of the proposed storefront windows will match the new car store.

Master Sign Plan

The Master Sign Plan proposes a total of 16 signs, including:

- 1 Ground Sign
- 6 Wall Signs
- 5 Perimeter Directional Signs,
- 4 Interior Directional Signs

All wall and ground signs are proposed to be blue in color [individual sign types described].

The applications have been reviewed against the applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with five (5) conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance (Archall), 49 E 3rd Ave, Columbus, OH 43201, stated that this site is an amalgamation of multiple sites that has occurred over the years. Through this four-phased project, they are attempting to make one cohesive campus. Per the Commission's previous feedback at the Concept Plan, several changes have been made to the plan, including the removal of the vehicle display pad in front of the preowned building, reworking the sidewalk on Sawmill Road to save numerous trees on both the north and south ends of the site, and the removal of the Service sign. They appreciate staff's recommendation regarding the north sidewalk, which avoids the potential issues with trees and mounding on the corner of Dublin Center Drive. They have reviewed staff's recommendations and have no objections. With him tonight are Tom Hart, Isaac Wiles; Curtis Echelberry, Advanced Civil Design; and Greg Krobat, Landscape Architecture.

Commission Questions

Ms. Call requested clarification of the signs permitted for this project.

Ms. Martin responded that given there are two buildings on the site that have frontage on two public streets, per the Code, this site would be eligible for either wall signs or ground signs. If the applicant chose to have wall signs, this site would be permitted to have a total of three walls signs comprising a total of 240 square feet, no single sign exceeding 80 square feet in size. If the applicant elected to have ground signs, they would be permitted one sign per frontage, any one sign not permitted to be greater than 50 square feet, and all ground signs comprising no more than a total of 60 square feet.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that he appreciates the adjustments that have been made to the front of the site. The site has some challenges, as it is an accumulation of earlier renovations and adjustments. He appreciates the addition of the sidewalk, even though it will cost a few trees to do so. He has very few issues with the proposed Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is pleased with the changes that have been made since the Concept Plan review, specifically the tree preservation near the pre-owned vehicle building. The front of this property maintains the green character of Dublin. This is a massive property, and from the road, the signs do not seem to be overwhelming to a customer entering the site. The interior wayfinding signs are insulated to passing traffic. Therefore, she has no issues with the proposed signs.

Mr. Schneier stated that the applicant should be commended for taking disparate buildings and creating a campus environment. He is impressed with the changes made in response to the Commission's requests. Presently, the sidewalk issue is essentially "creating a bridge to nowhere." Achieving eventual pedestrian continuity is not a burden that can be placed exclusively on this applicant. The hope is that as Sawmill Road is redeveloped, there will be additional sidewalk connections. Where previously the site had a "hodge podge" of buildings, the cohesiveness achieved is impressive. He is pleased with the proposed plan.

Mr. Grimes responded that he, too, is pleased with the proposed project. He recognizes the efforts occurring along Sawmill Road. Although it may not yet have the desired connectivity, it does provide visual appeal and indicates the City's long-term vision for the area. In regard to the proposed signage, this is a large property; therefore, wayfinding signs are necessary. This dealership always has a large amount of inventory, which makes it necessary for those unfamiliar with the site to have interior wayfinding signage. Unifying all the structures under a common theme is very important for the City, the owner and the customers. He likes the plan.

Mr. Fishman stated that in regard to the sidewalk and landscaping, individual projects are considered with an eye to anticipated future projects. Although this section of sidewalk may be a "bridge to nowhere," eventually the connections will occur. Presently, Sawmill Road lacks pedestrian walkways. It is important to save as many

of the trees as possible, especially the perimeter trees. Sawmill Road is becoming increasingly commercial with more blacktop; therefore, with each project developing in this area, it is important to ensure as much landscaping as possible is achieved. While the efforts with this site have been good, the Germain site is losing a significant amount of tree caliper; therefore, we need to ensure as much perimeter caliper as possible. He agrees with his colleagues on the remainder of the project components.

Ms. Fox stated that the project has occurred in phases, and the cohesiveness achieved is nice. She believes the sidewalk is as important as keeping trees. Currently, no pedestrian walkways are provided along Sawmill Road. There is a bus stop, but no place to stand. Adding sidewalks along Sawmill Road is very important. She likes the curvature of this sidewalk, as it provides a friendlier feel than a straight sidewalk, and the landscape will make it inviting. She agrees that it needs to be extended along Dublin Center Drive, but she understands the difficulty with putting it on the curve. Because a sidewalk likely will be added when John Shields Parkway is extended, it is better that the applicant not extend it into that area. She has one suggestion, however, regarding the signs. Sawmill Road is a gateway from I-270. It would be preferable if the design of the ground sign better matched the intent of the Bridge Street District Master Sign Plan objectives – signs that are artistic, fun, whimsical and eye-catching. Although the applicant was unable to use the brand's "wave" on the building, perhaps it could be incorporated into the sign design, or perhaps the vintage Honda logo wing could add interest to the sign. An artistic element added to the name would be more interesting. At the stonewall located left of the new vehicle building, would it be possible to add a sitting area for the dealership's customers? In addition to providing a place to wait, it would add a social connection to the sidewalk and street. The site has a length of 866 feet along Sawmill Road, and providing a seating opportunity would add a "stop and stay" interest, which is consistent with the Bridge Street District's intent. Social connection elements added now would contribute to an eventual greater pedestrian walkway along Sawmill Road. The new Chase Bank site is adding pedestrian interest elements to their gateway corner. Her final question concerns the lighting, which is uniform from the front to the rear of the site. At some point, would a "front porch lighting" effect be added? That type of lighting is typical for front entrances versus inventory parking areas.

Mr. Todd responded that was the goal of the bollards around the display pads -- to create that type of atmosphere along the sidewalk.

Ms. Fox stated "porch lighting" creates a different effect than the lighting that is typical for inventory parking spaces.

Mr. Todd stated that he believes she is referring to accent lighting; they would look into that opportunity.

Ms. Fox stated that she would encourage them to make their site along Sawmill Road as inviting as possible to pedestrians and passing traffic.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the plans provide any outdoor customer space.

Mr. Todd responded that other than the display pads in front and with the pre-owned vehicle building, it does not.

Ms. Kennedy suggested that outdoor space be added for customers who might prefer to wait outside, if there is opportunity to do so.

Ms. Fox suggested adding a bench.

Ms. Call stated that the project is very nice. Tree preservation and sidewalk connectivity are important. She appreciates the applicant listening to the Commission's suggestions and bringing forth a product that will make the City proud.

Public Comment

No public comments on this case were received.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with five (5) conditions.

Following discussion, Commissioner consensus was to add a condition for provision of outdoor seating.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the conditions as stated.
Mr. Todd responded that he had no objection.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded amending the motion to incorporate an additional condition.

Vote on the amendment: 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]

Vote on approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following six (6) conditions.

- 1) Sidewalk to be installed along the Dublin Center Drive in lieu of a shared use path; and sidewalk to be installed along Dublin Center Drive, from Sawmill Road to the first access point to promote walkability for the area and site in alignment with the BSD Code.
- 2) Prior to Final Development Plan submittal, the applicant confirm that the holder of the utility easement will permit new trees to be planted within the easement and provide affirmative documentation to the City.
- 3) The applicant work with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector to refine the street wall height and plant selections prior to the Final Development Plan.
- 4) The applicant update the photometric plan to comply with BSD Lighting Uniformity requirements, and maximum permitted lumens per square feet.
- 5) The applicant provide all sign fabrication details and material with submission of the Master Sign Plan.
- 6) The applicant work with staff to identify seating locations and specifications.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

5. The Overlook at Tartan Ridge, Hyland-Croy and McKitrick Roads, 20-170FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for review and approval of final details for development of 24.5 acres with 56 single-family homes, 7.9 acres of open space, and five public streets on a site located northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road with McKitrick Road and zoned Planned Unit Development – Tartan Ridge, Subarea F.

6. The Overlook at Tartan Ridge, Hyland-Croy and McKitrick Roads, 20-171FP, Final Plat

A request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat to subdivide 24.5 acres to establish 56 single-family lots, 7.9 acres of open space, and five public rights-of-way.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that Case 5 is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the development of a residential community consisting of up to 56 single-family lots and 7.9 acres of open space on a 24.5-acre site. Case 6 is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for an associated Final Plat. A Concept Plan for this project was reviewed by the Commission in July 2019; in December 2019, the Commission reviewed and recommended Council approval of a Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat; and City Council approved the Preliminary Development Plan and Plat in February 2020. The Final Development Plan review assures the plan is in compliance with the Preliminary Development Plan and Development Text and provides an opportunity for the Commission to review and approve the final landscape and design details.

Site

The site is located northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and McKitrick Road, west of Tartan Ridge, north of Tartan West, south of Glacier Ridge Elementary School and east of Glacier Ridge Metro Park. It is currently undeveloped but contains a stormwater management pond in the northwest corner of the site, as well as a silo in the southwest corner of the site.

Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of 56 single-family lots with 7.9 acres of open space, and associated public streets, sidewalks and shared use paths. There are two lot sizes – Courtyard and Patio. Courtyard lots are a minimum of 60 feet wide at the building line and a minimum of 125 feet deep. These lots are primarily located on the perimeter of the site. Patio lots are a minimum of 52 feet wide at the building line with a minimum lot depth of 125 feet. Patio lots are primarily located in the interior of the site. The minimum setbacks for both Courtyard and Patio lots are 15-20 feet front yard setback; 25 feet rear yard setback; and 5-foot side yard setbacks. Lot coverage is limited to 60 percent. Per the Development Text, the architecture is European Country and Midwest vernacular styles. Key massing principles outlined in the Development Text include a prominent street presence, appropriate proportions, clean intersections and purity of form. Permitted exterior materials include stone, manufactured stone, stucco and wood or cementitious fiberboard. A map was provided that depicts the neighborhood connectivity. Sidewalks are proposed throughout the entirety of the site, including along all frontages and leading to a proposed overlook amenity in Reserve A (northwest portion of the site). An eight-foot-wide shared use path is proposed along McKitrick Road, turning north along the entire length of Hyland-Croy Road. The applicant is proposing a number of landscape improvements with this application, the most notable of which is proposed for the exterior of the site in Reserve A, along Hyland-Croy Road and McKitrick Road. The applicant is proposing a naturalized mix of deciduous, ornamental and evergreen trees within this reserve. Mounding is also proposed along Hyland-Croy and McKitrick roads. The dry basin in the southeast corner of the site has been removed and replaced with landscaping. The applicant has added street trees along the frontages of both Hyland-Croy and McKitrick roads, as required by Code. These trees will be staggered along the new paths and will be located within the reserve, which is maintained by the master HOA. Plant species for the hedges in front of the new homes have been narrowed to boxwood, gray juniper and vintage gold false cypress. Detail for the stone veneer pillars at the sidewalk entries to each home is also included in the landscape package. The pillars will incorporate a brick band at the top to match the driveway materials and be topped with a limestone or concrete cap. The proposed height of the pillars (5' 4") is taller than those in Tartan Ridge. Staff is recommending that the height of these pillars be reduced to match those in Tartan Ridge. The proposal includes one rectangular ground sign identifying the neighborhood at Brenham Way and McKitrick Road. The sign is an engraved cast stone sign, 25 square feet in size. The lettering is proposed to be black, and the sign sits atop a stone-clad monument. The monument is capped with a four-inch cast stone cap. The sign will be approximately five feet in height at its tallest point. The overlook amenity proposed for the northwest portion of the site provides a unique opportunity for the residents and general public to spend time, with several seating options and tables proposed on the patio and under a covered pavilion. A two-sided fireplace is proposed on the north side of the pavilion. The pavilion, 24 feet in width and 28 feet in length, is constructed primarily of cedar beams and columns, stone veneer, and is sheathed with a dimensioned asphalt shingle. Furniture for the overlook patios and pavilion include white plywood picnic tables and white Adirondack chair and table sets. The patio is a decorative aggregate material and the overlook amenity is clad in a ProVia Ohio Vintage Limestone veneer. All products associated with the overlook amenity are as proposed or are to be an "owner approved equal." Should the applicant desire to utilize an alternative material, staff recommends that the applicant provide the alternatives to staff prior to obtaining building permits to ensure a product of equal or greater quality, subject to staff approval.

Final Plat

The final plat is for the subdivision of an approximately 24-acre site into 56 single-family lots; 7.9 acres of open space; and five (5) public rights-of-way.

The applications were reviewed against all applicable criteria and staff recommends approval of the Final Development Plan with five (5) conditions and the Final Plat with one (1) condition.

Applicant Presentation

Gary Smith, G2 Planning & Design, 720 E. Broad Street Suite 200 Columbus, OH 43215, applicant's representative, stated that there have been many previous discussions with the Commission and Council, and they have received significant assistance from staff. They are in agreement with staff's recommended condition. The primary concern they have relates to the tree replacement requirements. They had always envisioned that all the additional plantings in the buffer would count toward the required tree replacement. However, staff is calculating it differently, and requiring that they provide an additional 200 caliper inches. They are already providing approximately 570 new trees on this site. What is shown on the plan is a total of 1,200 caliper inches. They believe that more than compensates for the 53 trees that are being removed to permit this development. Per the Planning Commission's previous request, they have added a considerable number of trees to the buffer line, resulting in a dense, heavily planted buffer. Staff has asked that they remove and relocate some of the trees around the pond. They would be willing to relocate those into the buffer area, but would like the Commission's consideration of the tree replacement issue. Penalizing the applicant by requiring another 100 trees is overkill, and likely exceeds the intent of the City's Tree Replacement requirements.

Ms. Call inquired if what is being required is 100 inches or 100 trees.

Mr. Smith responded that staff is indicating the total tree replacement is 1,421 inches. Based on their calculations, they are providing 1,202 inches. That is a difference of 200 inches, which equates to approximately 100 trees.

Ms. Call requested staff's clarification of the Code requirements and the related history.

Mr. Ridge stated that there are three requirements: the street tree requirement; the tree replacement requirement; and the buffer requirement. The 1,421-inch total is a compilation of the requirements of all three. The applicant's intent was to overplant the buffer to compensate for some of the required replacement inches. The issue is a result of differing interpretation of the requirements between staff and the application. Staff has recommended a condition that the applicant plant no more one-third of the required replacement trees in the buffer.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant could use one-third of the required replacement in the buffer.

Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Mr. Smith stated that for the buffer proposed in their rezoning application, their calculation began with the normal buffer requirements, but to that, they also added the anticipated tree replacements. The result was that the buffer included normal buffer trees, but also tree replacement trees. Unfortunately, it seems that distinction was not made clear in their Development Text. Now, staff is indicating that the replacement trees are still owed. In view of how the differing calculations occurred, they are requesting the Commission grant them leniency, as they are already planting a large number of trees on the site.

Ms. Martin stated that the Preliminary Development Plan, which includes the Development Text, has already been adopted by Council. Unfortunately, the Final Development Plan does not provide the flexibility to interpret the text differently than what was clearly identified in that text. Additionally, the requirement that no more than one-third of the replacement inches be double-counted in the buffer is consistent with staff's interpretation for recently approved developments.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on this application.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy inquired if staff has, or can suggest, recommendations for locations where the additional 200 inches could be planted beyond the buffer.

Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the request for removal of trees near the stormwater retention pond was for the purpose of improving walkability in that area, or for a different reason.

Mr. Ridge responded that the intent was to open up a vista to the pond and amenities.

Mr. Smith responded that they have no objection to moving those trees to other areas of the site. Their request relates only for leniency in the 200-inch replacement requirement. Due to the large number of trees already being added to the site, the additional amount would be punitive.

Mr. Schneier inquired where the access to the patio amenity was located.

Mr. Ridge responded that the access to the amenity is from the interior. A path is proposed from one of the public streets to that amenity area. There will be no access from the shared-use path on the exterior of the site.

Mr. Schneier stated that he asks because the staff report states, "it provides a unique opportunity for the residents and general public to spend time at the amenity." However, is it correct that the amenity is not intended for public use; it is an amenity only for the residents?

Mr. Smith responded that is correct.

Mr. Grimes inquired if there had been any consideration for including a connection from the interior of the site – perhaps between Lots #7 and #8, to the shared-use path along Hyland-Croy Road. It would provide a more convenient access to the school and the park.

Mr. Smith responded that such discussions did occur with the Preliminary Development Plan, but the developer did not wish to include that connection, particularly by the amenity area, which will be maintained by the HOA for the residents. The rezoning was approved without those connections, and they would prefer not to include such connections.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the paths would be maintained by the homeowner association (HOA).

Mr. Smith responded that the internal sidewalks and the path to the overlook amenity area would be maintained by the HOA. He does not recall the understanding regarding the paths along Hyland-Croy and McKittrick roads.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, 6689 Dublin Center Drive, Dublin, representative for Tartan Ridge LLC stated that he is unsure who is maintaining the perimeter pathway.

Mr. Fishman stated that if it is a public path, the public should have access to it.

Mr. McCauley responded that the public has access to any perimeter pathways, regardless of who is maintaining it. The required pathways were approved with the rezoning and not part of this application.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to compliment the applicant on the pond overlook amenity. It will set a wonderful standard for other developers. Because it is so attractive, she understands staff's desire to open up the view to it. She is attempting to see where 100 additional trees could be located; the site already seems dense. The goal is to create a lovely streetscape and view into the development. She is not supportive of forcing more trees onto the site, but rather, creating the desired aesthetic.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is supportive of using as many of the trees as possible. We can never have too many trees. The buffer can be made denser, or they can be placed in the area where the pond and open space intersect with the road.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is an attractive, well thought-out community, and the overlook amenity is very attractive. The biggest hurdle is the tree replacement. He agrees that, if possible, locations for the replacement trees should be found. If they cannot be placed in the buffer, there are ample places to add landscaping. He loves the development.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is in agreement with maintaining the tree replacement requirement to the extent possible. Staff has said that there are places to put the trees. She is impressed with the overlook amenity.

Ms. Fox stated that there does not appear to be much barrier between Lots #23 - #26, which back up to Glacier Ridge Elementary School. If there is any place where trees should be placed, it is on the boundary between the school and the homes on those rear lots. They would provide a valuable noise buffer.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's recommendation. As discussed previously, other evergreens could be replaced with deciduous trees. Between the school and the houses would be a perfect place to add evergreens. In addition, this is a dense development having only 6-foot side yards; surrounding the homes with trees would improve the look.

Mr. Schneier stated that he prefers quality over quantity and is not certain that he agrees that more trees are always best. He is curious if the issue is related to aesthetics or to the economics of the project. If the applicant is motivated by the economics, not the aesthetics, that should be clarified. He agrees with Ms. Fox that trees should be added where there is a reason to add them, versus attempting to get as many trees on the site as possible.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement.

Ms. Call stated that staff's recommendation is to decrease the height of the 5-foot, 4-inch pillars to match the other pillars in Tartan Ridge; how tall are the other pillars?

Mr. Ridge responded that the typical height of the pillars in Tartan Ridge is 48 inches.

Ms. Call requested clarification of the HOA open space maintenance requirement.

Mr. Ridge responded that the Master HOA is responsible for maintaining the majority of Reserve A, which is primarily the large exterior of the site. The sub association is responsible for maintenance of the overlook amenity, the path to that amenity, and the hedgerows and pillars.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Development Text requires a certain number of trees, or if there would be opportunity for further discussion of that topic by the Commission.

Mr. Boggs responded that the replacement inches must be provided on the site; however, the Commission can discuss whether those inches could be counted within the buffer area.

Ms. Fox stated that if the text requires a certain number of trees within the buffer, a certain number of replacement trees, and a certain number of street trees, it does not seem there is much flexibility in the numbers, only in the location of the trees.

Ms. Martin stated that the applicant is requesting to double-count the trees, so, essentially, the replacement trees would be permitted to be counted in the buffer. Staff is recommending that no more than one-third of the replacement inches be permitted to be double-counted. That recommendation is based upon previous developments, including one also located on Hyland-Croy Road -- Autumn Rose Woods. However, this is ultimately the Commission's decision.

Mr. Fishman requested clarification of the term "double counting;" does that result in the same number of trees, or less?

Ms. Martin responded that fewer trees would be provided by using the calculation that one-third of the replacement trees may be used to fulfill the planting requirement in the buffer. It would not be substantially fewer, but it would allow the applicant some flexibility.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant is willing to accept staff's recommendation as a condition.

Mr. Smith inquired if staff's recommendation is that up to one-third of the trees that were required in the Development text could be used for buffer trees, or if the recommendation was that one-third of the trees planted in the buffer overall could count toward the tree replacement. They would be agreeable if staff is

willing to accept that one-third of the trees required in the Development Text are applicable as replacement trees, versus none of them being applicable. He agrees with Ms. Fox that it is the aesthetic that is important, not the number. They already are providing a large number of trees, a very dense buffer and a great aesthetic, and would be willing to plant additional trees at the rear of the lots bordering the school.

Ms. Call stated that Mr. Smith refers to trees that have already been provided in the buffer. Since the initial application, has the applicant already provided trees in the buffer?

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant must fulfill the requirements of their Development Text, including the buffer requirements.

Ms. Call inquired the number of trees that have already been provided in the buffer and the number of trees that remain to be added.

Mr. Boggs stated that the buffer requirement is specific in terms of the type of trees and the frequency of their planting within the buffer area: two evergreen trees per 30 linear feet; three ornamental trees per 90 linear feet; and one other deciduous tree per 45 linear foot, planted in a naturalized manner. That formula will produce a certain number of trees and a certain frequency within the border.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant is already meeting that requirement within the buffer zone.

Mr. Smith responded that in the buffer area, they currently have 67 deciduous shade trees, 116 evergreen trees, and 60 ornamental trees. They exceed the text's buffer requirement for deciduous trees by 95.5 inches in deciduous trees; exceed the requirement for evergreen trees by 22.5 inches; and exceed the requirement for ornamental trees by 42 inches. They have more trees in the buffer than is required by the Development Text.

Ms. Call inquired what is their tree replacement requirement.

Ms. Martin responded that, based on the applicant's description, they would be able to reduce the total number of buffer trees to those required by the Development Text. They are separately required to provide tree replacement inches. The condition recommended by staff is that one-third of those replacement inches could be provided in the buffer.

Ms. Call inquired how many replacement inches are required for this project.

Mr. Boggs responded that per staff's report, 626 inches are required.

Ms. Call stated that one-third of 626 inches is approximately 209 inches; the 160 inches in excess of what is required would cover most of that.

Ms. Martin stated that what makes the calculation difficult is that the buffer requires trees not inches, but the tree replacement requirement is in inches.

Ms. Call stated that the tree replacement requirement of 626 inches could be reduced by the 160 overage inches in the buffer.

Mr. Smith stated that staff indicated that they could not use any of trees required by the buffer to account for replacement trees, and no more than one-third of the replacement inches can be placed in the buffer. Therefore, other locations would need to be found for the remaining two-thirds. That is more of a limitation than a concession.

Ms. Martin responded that the difficulty is in lining up the trees and replacement inches. However, once the number of trees required in the buffer is known, that number could be multiplied by 2.5 inches (typical diameter of a new tree). That calculation would produce the total number of inches required in the buffer, and one-third of the replacement inches (209 inches) could be credited against that requirement.

Mr. McCauley stated that staff has indicated that we have 200 fewer inches than are required, which is approximately 100 trees.

Ms. Martin clarified that it would be 80 trees.

Mr. McCauley stated that of the 80 trees, staff has indicated that one-third can be placed in the buffer. That would reduce the number to 59-60 trees. We are already planting approximately 570 trees on this 24-acre site or 24 trees per acre; that is a large number of trees.

Mr. Fishman suggested that the applicant could place the 59 trees wherever they determine to be appropriate on the site.

Mr. McCauley stated that at the Preliminary Development Plan approval, Mr. Fishman stated that he wanted a denser buffer, and, accordingly, that is what was incorporated into the Development Text. The request was not for a denser buffer, plus street trees and replacement inches. When they submitted the Final Development Plan, they believed they were meeting all the requirements. There is no more space left for additional trees. After the FDP was submitted, staff indicated that we had not met the tree replacement requirement, but that was the first time it was mentioned. If they had been aware of the requirement earlier when Mr. Fishman requested a denser buffer, he would have inquired if the replacement inches would be counted in doing so. However, with the PUD review, there was no mention of the tree replacement requirement or fees in lieu of.

Mr. Fishman stated that the compromise would be to put the additional 60 trees in the buffer zone. Mr. McCauley responded that Mr. Romanelli already is spending \$300,000 in trees, and the Commission would like him to add an additional 60 trees, or another \$50,000-\$60,000. Yet a review of the earlier meeting minutes will verify that was not required. This is the first time the tree replacement requirement has been mentioned. We have already over-treed the site; now, the request is for more trees. Mr. McCauley inquired if they agree to the condition, would they be able to submit a tree replacement waiver request to City Council. Mr. Romanelli has done amazing things for this City, so he would like to ensure he has the legal opportunity to contest this requirement. If Mr. Romanelli would not be permitted to request a waiver, could a condition be added with this approval providing him the opportunity to make that request?

Mr. Boggs stated that, per the Rules of the Planning and Zoning Commission, when conditions for approval are applied, the Commission must request the agreement of the applicant. If the applicant does not agree, the condition would not be added. Then the question is if the Commission would approve the FDP without that condition.

Mr. McCauley inquired if those conditions are accepted, could an additional condition be added that the applicant may come back with a tree waiver request.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would prefer to reach a compromise that can be approved.

Ms. Martin stated that the tree waiver process is not under the purview of PZC. A condition would not be necessary; the applicant is entitled to that process, should he choose to pursue it. Tree waiver requests are considered by City Council. There are site considerations that make a site eligible, such as heavily wooded sites.

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Fishman had requested additional evergreens. Evergreen and ornamental trees are allowed to provide only a certain percent of the tree replacement requirement, and they are probably at that limit already. If the Commission desires additional evergreens, they have no objection, but they want to make sure that they would count toward the replacement requirement.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission's request relates to the distribution of the evergreens, not necessarily the count of those trees. The request was for the purpose of providing screening next to private residences, and not in view spaces; it is a request, not a requirement.

Mr. Smith responded that they would have no objection to providing additional evergreens behind the lots bordering the school; however, they would want those to count toward the required replacement inches. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that providing evergreens in that location would not necessitate removal of evergreens from the buffer in order to meet the percent requirement.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important to remember the intent of our Code. The percentages provided are for the purpose of ensuring screening where it is needed. We do not want to overscreen, resulting in a wall of evergreen trees and not an aesthetic streetscape. She would prefer leniency in regard to the kind of trees, working with the City's landscape architect to achieve the best aesthetic along Hyland-Croy Road.

Mr. Smith requested that the site plan with the trees be shown.

Ms. Martin suggested that the application be tabled. That would provide opportunity for staff and the applicant to bring the case back to the Commission, along with additional tree numbers and a Minor Text Modification, clarifying the Development Text.

Ms. Call requested the applicant's preference.

Mr. Smith requested clarification of the reference to a Minor Text Modification.

Ms. Martin responded that a Minor Text modification must be minor in nature. It cannot provide a tree waiver within the Development Text. It would resolve only the issue at hand tonight, providing clarity of the text meaning and raw numbers in terms of inches, trees and dollars.

Mr. Smith responded that it appears that the outcome would not be changed, the outcome would just be made more clear. It would be beneficial to provide clarification in the text that one-third of the trees in the buffer could count toward the tree replacement requirement, as was their original intent. However, if there is no opportunity to make a modification that accomplishes that, he does not see the value of tabling the application.

Mr. Boggs stated that once the absolute number of trees in the buffer had been determined and the number of caliper inches calculated, a Minor Text Modification could be written and approved that would eliminate the need to go before City Council.

Mr. Smith responded that they have already done the math and provided it to staff. They know the number of inches required in the buffer and the number of caliper inches they are providing in the buffer. That is how they arrived at the 200-inch deficit between staff's interpretation and their interpretation. If tabling the application cannot impact that number, he cannot ask his client to delay, based on an uncertain result.

Mr. McCauley confirmed that due to the construction season, they would not want to delay the start of the project.

[Site plan with trees shown.]

[Discussion continued regarding revising the percentage of replacement trees permitted to fulfill buffer requirements and the percent of evergreens permitted.]

Ms. Martin noted that the percent of evergreens is based on the historic implementation of the tree replacement requirements; no finite number is identified. All of the developments recently approved have no more than 50% evergreens, strategically placed to provide screening.

Commission consensus was to amend Condition #3 from one-third to one-half and to add Condition #6 to address the tree replacement issue.

The applicant indicated they had no objections to the six (6) conditions.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the height of the proposed pillars to match the existing pillars in Tartan Ridge, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant continue to work with staff to fulfill each of the tree replacement requirements, or that the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu for the remaining inches.
- 3) The applicant plant no more than 1/2 of the required tree replacement inches to fulfill buffer requirements.
- 4) The applicant shift a portion of the trees surrounding the stormwater facility in the northwest portion of the site to allow for a more open vista from the west, subject to Staff approval.
- 5) The applicant provide staff with any alternative materials or furniture selections pertaining to the overlook amenity area prior to obtaining building permits to ensure materials of equal or greater quality are utilized, subject to staff approval.
- 6) The applicant work with staff to increase the percentage of evergreens adjacent to or interior to lots #23 - #26, and that these additional trees apply toward the tree replacement requirement.

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]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation for City Council approval of the Final Plat with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments prior to submittal to City Council.

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

[Motion passed 7-0]

- **PRESENTATION: MOBILITY STUDY UPDATE**

Presentation on the Dublin Mobility Study, a multi-phase strategic plan, to support the community's evolving mobility needs.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Rayburn presented an update on the City's Mobility Study, noting that the presentation would provide guidance on how development applications could be considered through a mobility lens. The Dublin Mobility Study was undertaken in 2017 with the goal of planning innovative transportation improvements to support the needs of the community. Initially, a large public workshop gathered public opinion, which led to the visioning and establishment of key objectives for Phase I of the study. Phase II prioritized the objectives more specifically, and Phase III crafted that information into pilot projects. Those projects resulted in better information and secured grant and funding opportunities. The mobility effort is currently at the end of Phase IV, wherein a few of the pilots have moved into permanent mobility programs and consideration of long-term funding. Phase V will look more deeply into specific focus areas.

Mr. Rayburn reviewed the key objectives of the study:

- 1) Support economic development
- 2) Promote equitable access to mobility
- 3) Expand multimodal options
- 4) Improve public health
- 5) Preserve our environs by focusing on future growth

To accomplish those objectives, the following items were prioritized:

- 1) Micro-transit, including shuttles and circulators, providing shorter trips through the COTA service and augmenting those services.
- 2) Shared micro-mobility, including bike shares and scooters
- 3) Concepts for mobility hubs
- 4) Wayfinding on the City's shared-use paths
- 5) Complete and smart streets.

Micro-transit – Dublin Connector:

The Dublin Connector provides mobility independence for those aging in place and those with disabilities. It also provides first and last mile connections for the workforce. Bus commuters to Dublin have often needed to utilize Uber and Lyft to complete their trips, at a cost of \$200-\$400/month. As part of the Covid-19 response, the City discontinued the regular shuttle services to senior/disabled shuttle services in March through September 30, 2020, in order to limit the exposure for City's most vulnerable citizens. Instead, the City pivoted to a delivery service to provide food and essential goods to senior citizens in the community. Staff has tracked key performance indicators to be able to further evaluate and improve mobility services. The indicators showed that the Dublin Connector effort had diverted over 10,000 miles for vehicle commuters, reducing the congestion on Dublin's roadways and resulting in cleaner air in the community. Approximately 7,700 rides have been provided for Dublin citizens since 2018. The following top destinations for those using the micro-transit shuttles are: AC Marriott, Walmart, Kroger, Friendship Village of Dublin, COTA 21 Stop J/Tuttle Mall, Tuttle Mall, Sawmill Meijer, Dublin Food Pantry, Giant Eagle, and Heartland of Dublin. From those destinations,

three cluster sites can be seen: Historic Dublin, Sawmill Road, and Tuttle Mall. Next steps for the Dublin Connector Micro-Transit include:

- 1) Consider utilizing City vehicles to maximize branding opportunities and lower operating costs.
- 2) Pursue regional coordination of Northwest corridor mobility improvements.
- 3) Continue to advocate for increased COTA services.
- 4) Balance funding resources with level of subsidy provided.
- 5) Expand partnerships with employers and senior care facilities.
- 6) Diversify support in view of vulnerable funding sources.
- 7) Adopt progressive parking and demand management policies.
- 8) Refine Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and continue tracking measures of program success.
- 9) Consider a regular solicitation period for mobility services.
- 10) Consider adopting truly on-demand service.

Shared Micro-Mobility – Bike shares:

Residents have expressed an interest in Bike Share, so they have been looking at opportunities. The Bike Share Program will coordinate the launch of TRIP Bike Share and Bird Scooters in 2021. Additionally, the public input phase for the CoGo expansion in Dublin is anticipated in spring 2021. The City will be partnering with Upper Arlington, Hilliard and the Metro Parks systems for submission of a joint application for federal and state funding. Ohio State will be assisting with outreach efforts for the City and producing a report that can be used with the grant submission. They will be contemplating Code revisions as the City considers more micro-mobility options.

Mobility Hubs:

Mobility Hubs will play an essential role to connect and leverage the different modes of transportation. Mobility Hubs provide a space to co-locate at least two modes of transportation and serve as transfer points. They will be drafting site-specific designs for each tier of mobility hubs and engaging COTA and regional partners in discussions regarding future opportunities. Initially, three hubs are being considered at the Dublin Community Recreation Center, at the Columbus Metropolitan Library – Dublin Branch, and a connection site at Frantz Road and Metro Place North.

Wayfinding on Shared-Use Paths:

Wayfinding is a form of information system to guide people through the physical environment and enhance their understanding and experience. Visual cues, such as maps, directional information, symbols, etc., will guide path users. Wayfinding also highlights local/regional points of interest and opportunities for exploration. Initially, a vinyl sticker application to the pathway is contemplated, but eventually, a more long-term solution could utilize stencils and glow-in-the dark paint. Next steps would be to finalize curated bike loops and implement the wayfinding pilot, from which feedback and rider input would be gathered. Staff would continue to identify additional opportunities for bike loops.

Complete and Smart Streets:

In June 2018, City Council passed a Complete Streets Resolution, and in October 2019. Council passed a resolution in support of MORPC's Smart Streets policy. City departments have been directed to consider and incorporate Smart Street technologies whenever feasible, including projects such as Smart Intersections. A long-term policy consideration is a Vision Zero policy, which looks at street designs and policies such as speed limits. The overall goal is to build and expand the Dublin mobility eco-system, incorporating the micro-transit, COTA opportunities, shared micro-transit and options, mobility hubs, wayfinding and Complete and Smart Streets.

Commissioners expressed appreciation for the Dublin Mobility Study update, and for the planning and direct action items advanced by Planning staff for an effort that will have a significant opportunity for the City. Members expressed a desire for continuing to receive updates on the effort, so that the mobility goals are included in the City's overall development planning.

Mr. Rayburn responded that staff would be launching a quarterly mobility newsletter. Commissioners will be included in that mailing.

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 2021.

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

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Assistant Clerk of Council