



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 7, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. All R Friends
20-195INF**

**PID: 273-012214
Informal Review**

Proposal: Informal review and feedback for a ±8,100-square-foot building zoned Planned Commerce District (Thomas-Kohler, Subarea B1).

Location: West of Emerald Parkway, ±450 feet northwest from the intersection with Parkwood Place

Request: Informal review with non-binding feedback of a future development application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Chris Jolley, Project Manager; and Darin Ranker Architect

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-195

RESULT: The Commission provided informal review and feedback on the proposal for an approximately 8,100-square-foot building. Commission members were generally supportive of the site layout, although they expressed a desire for increased connectivity through the extension of shared-use paths and sidewalks. Members discussed the required split-rail fence at the rear of the property and encouraged that it be included in plans for formal review, rather than wait for development to the west to occur. The Commission generally agreed that the architecture should be revised to better conform to the styles of surrounding structures, with more primary materials utilized throughout. The Commission also suggested revising the entry, indicating that it was not obvious where the entry was located. Members were supportive of the proposed use.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox Yes

Warren Fishman Yes

Kristina Kennedy Yes

Mark Supelak Yes

Rebecca Call Yes

Leo Grimes Yes

Lance Schneier Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



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.~~