



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 4, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 4, 2021 virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. She noted 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

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the January 7, 2021 minutes.

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.

PRESENTATION – HISTORIC DISTRICT TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Noble presented a brief overview of the Task Force. City Council established the Task Force on October 21, 2019 for the purpose of updating the Historic District Area Plan that was originally adopted in 2007 and subsequently incorporated into the Bridge Street District in 2013. The Task Force was asked to review all the Area Plan elements, including character, historic preservation, housing, economic vitality, streetscape, wayfinding, and all other considerations. The body was also asked to provide any other recommendations that would aid in the vitality and well-being of the Historic District. The Task Force met from January 2020 to November 2020 and presented their final recommendations to City Council at their January 4, 2021 meeting, at which time it was referred to the Community Development Committee for task prioritization and implementation considerations.

Kim Way, Chair, Historic District Task Force, stated that he would be sharing the recommendations that the Task Force has compiled and presented to City Council for their consideration. Task Force members studied the Historic District comprehensively and all the components of the Area Plan. They also engaged with Heritage Ohio to understand best practices in planning the design and management of Historic Districts. City staff provided them with the background information needed in forming their recommendations. They have presented these recommendations to the ARB and obtained their input. The Task Force recommendations have been separated into three primary categories, and each of those has a list of suggested implementation tasks. The three main recommendation are as follows:

- Creating an Updated Historic District Area Plan.
- Consider Management Options for the District.
- Support Existing Efforts that will lead to short-term successes.

The tasks associated with those three primary recommendations are as follows:

Creating an Updated Historic District Area Plan

1. Gateways: Consider gateway features at the transition points into the Historic District that differentiate the District from other parts of the City.
2. Streetscape: Focus on a streetscape design that is pedestrian friendly and fits the character of the Historic District.
3. Parking: Rely on existing parking lots and on-street parking instead of creating new parking areas/lots, unless required.
4. Open Space and Parks: Strongly encourage the preservation of our natural open space and greenways connections.
5. Indian Run Corridor: Provide recommendations to ensure the preservation of the Indian Run and adjacent greenways corridor.
6. South High Street Vitality: Encourage vitality focused in the south side of the District.
7. Diversity of Uses: Encourage mixed-use development that promotes pedestrian movement with a focus on retail and the lack of reliance on vehicular travel.
8. Preservation: Highlight the importance of historic preservation as development pressures continue within the District.
9. Proper Scale of Development: Ensure the proper height, scale and massing of buildings within the Historic District to ensure the quaint nature of the area.
10. Connecting the District: Ensuring adequate transition from the east to the west side of the river and embracing amenities that each has to offer to the District.
11. Wayfinding: Ensuring that both pedestrian and vehicular movement is easily accessible throughout the District through appropriate signage and landmarking.
12. Arts and Culture: Embrace opportunities to provide art and cultural artifacts that represent the history and vitality of the District.

Consider Management Options for the Historic District.

Management of the District: Consider a management program that oversees the goals and objectives of the Historic District and collaborates with the existing organizations in the District including the Dublin Convention and Visitors Bureau, Dublin Chamber of Commerce, Dublin Historical Society, Downtown Alliance, Architectural Review Board, and the Historic District Business Association.

Support Existing Efforts That Will Lead to Short-Term Successes.

1. Educational Effort: Provide learning opportunities to the District including historic perspective, cultural diversity and background and significant people and places in the District.
2. Processes and Regulations: Ensure updates to the Historic District Code and Guidelines are compatible with the vision for the District and the development review process is streamlined, clear and fair. Planning staff should finalize and forward these amendments in a timely manner.

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

CASE RECONSIDERATION

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

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

Staff Presentation

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

Case History

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

Request

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

Legal Presentation

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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

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

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

Commission Questions/Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Comment

No public comments were received on this application.

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

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

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

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

INFORMAL CASE

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

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

Staff Presentation

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

History

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

Architecture

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

are required to be provided with the FDP. The following questions have been provided for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed traditional architectural character?
- 2) Is the architectural character compatible with surrounding development?
- 3) Are the proposed design details harmonious across the various unit types?

Ms. Call requested that Ms. Martin summarize the previous Commission's direction regarding the differentiation between the private and public spaces.

Ms. Martin responded that the Commission's feedback emphasized the importance of the public and private spaces and recommended that greater separation be provided between the public and private areas to allow for a transition and to provide an amenity space that will activate the public street. That direction aligns with the principles of the Bridge Street District Area Plan.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, stated that the applicant is requesting the Commission's feedback on the sample elevation shown to determine if the design direction is correct. If correct, a more comprehensive architectural plan will be developed.

Keith Filipkowski, Director of Construction Operations, PulteGroup, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that this revised architectural design attempts to achieve the Commission's previous suggestions. He is hopeful that attempt has been successful. In this design, the rooflines undulate vertically in combination with the units being offset front to back. The variation shown in the sample elevation portrays a one-foot difference unit to unit. This design uses a variety of characteristics to provide an attractive streetscape and emphasize the individuality of the units, including a variety in brick courses, symmetry of window alignments, unique entryways.

Commission Questions and Comments

Ms. Fox inquired how and where would the rooftop terraces be incorporated. Also, is it correct that, although the sample façade incorporates seven different unit styles, only two or three of those styles would be used on any one building?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that not all of the buildings have seven units. A four-unit building would use only four of the styles, as appropriate for that building. The Commission expressed the need for individuality. His preference would be that no elevation would replicate the same unit style more than once in a given building. However, if the Commission believes that would be too individualized, they are open to suggestions. The rooftop terraces would be private spaces, separated by the rooflines. A railing system will be used to provide fall protection. In his view, the railing is appropriate with the traditional style of architecture; the Federal style uses balustrades. It would look elegant and draw on the widow-walk railing that will be incorporated into some of the entryways, as well as the Juliet balconies.

Mr. Schneier inquired if every seven-unit building would have seven different unit styles, or would some seven-unit buildings have only two or three styles represented. If so, how would the spread be accomplished? In regard to the stoops, are there any two-step stoops or porches?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the intent is that the variety of styles be as presented by the sample in the presentation. The articulation of the differences will be in alignment with the Code requirements. Beyond, that it can be a matter of preference. If individuality is the preference, any one building should not repeat the same style within that elevation. However, they have no objection to considering the opposite of that, i.e. two units within a four-unit building could be the same. They would work with staff to create a comprehensive plan for the FDP that is mutually desirable. In addition, due to the offsets of the units, different size stoops would be provided, with and without overhead coverings. The intent is a balanced individuality and variety.

Mr. Fishman stated that he appreciates the revision to a more traditional architecture; however, he believes the architecture still does not meet the architecture look and quality of the sample photographs provided by Ms. Fox and discussed at the December 2020 meeting. I believe the units represented in those photographs reflected a greater offset difference between the units than one foot. In addition, there was greater use of

the primary materials. The Commission is looking for architecture that will age well and look attractive 10-20 years in the future. Architecture similar to that reflected in the photographs provided by Ms. Fox was built 30-40 years ago and looks great today; that is what the Commission wants to see here. In regard to unit variety, referring again to the photographs -- in one community, each building elevation used only one unit style, but each building reflected a different unit style. How a variety is achieved may be determined by the uniqueness and quality of the architecture style. He liked those stoops better, as well. He assumes that the walks will be brick. No sample images were shown of the backs of the buildings. In the sample unit photographs, the rear of some of those buildings were as attractive as the front.

Mr. Filipkowski stated that the design is not fully advanced, and the detail required for the FDP should achieve what is desired. The details added could include more substantive columns, and additional embellishments could be added. At this juncture, they are interested in knowing if the proposed design is on track with the desired form, mass and style. Significant changes have been made in the conceptual architecture since the initial Concept Plan Review, and with those changes, different constructability factors had to be considered. Regarding the use of primary materials, this revised design uses significantly more primary materials – more than 80% -- than the previous concepts. At this point, most of their focus has been on achieving the right design for the front elevations, but due to the Code requirements regarding masonry corners, in all but two of the scenarios, the side elevations would be fully brick, as well. That brick would continue to wrap around to the rear of the buildings and terminate at an inside corner. At the previous discussion, there was no discussion of the rear elevations that warranted significant changes to those elevations. With respect to brick sidewalks, he would defer that question to Mr. Underhill; however, the last discussion reflected the idea of incorporating landscape as a buffer and to add unique character. The rendering provided does not show that, as at this point, their focus has been on the form, the mass and style of architecture.

Mr. Underhill stated that the focus has been on the vertical elements, but a full plan incorporating a high level of details will be provided with the FDP.

Mr. Fishman stated that quality must surround the entire building. The rear of the buildings should not be absent a similar level of quality. This project deserves a high level of quality due to its location within the Bridge Street District. This design is partially where it needs to be, but he anticipates the next step will reflect the level of quality that is needed.

Mr. Underhill stated that at the past discussion, it was noted that this site potentially could be located at the rear of an empty theater site. There is a difference between the locations of the buildings in the photographs and the location of the proposed buildings. At least one of the projects depicted in the photographs had the benefit of a tax abatement. They will continue to work on achieving the desired level of architecture, based on this location and the economics.

Mr. Fishman responded that if the theater were to abandon their present site, another great development would replace it. The intent is to make the entire Bridge Street Corridor a reflection of quality that will continue to exist 50 years in the future. He expects to see a development here that the community will be proud of.

Mr. Filipkowski stated that from an architect's perspective, they are continuing to look at the details as the design progresses, and the intent is for it to reflect a high quality. Special care and attention must be invested, not only on the comprehensive mass and scale of the building, but each element of the architecture of individual units. The proportions must be appropriate, however, as there is a point at which the embellishment can be too much.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Commission has been asked to comment on the traditional feel of the proposed buildings. In her opinion, what is proposed is consistent with a traditional design, a style she appreciates. Although the design leans to a traditional focus, it also has modern touches, which helps to achieve context within the surrounding development. She finds it reminiscent of the West Bridge Street streetscape, and as such, feels quaint and cozy, yet individual in appearance. She is in favor of the proposed approach.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the traditional feel, the variation and the inconsistent roofline. He would like to see the different unit styles used throughout the development, and no style replicated in close proximity on the same building. However, in addition to the seven different front entries shown, other variations could be possible. Although two units may be similar, they could be made distinctive. He likes the tones and colors and the direction of the proposed architecture.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the forward/backward meandering offsets of the units. Is there only a 12-inch difference?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the difference is two feet.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is pleased that it is two feet, as a one-foot difference ultimately can feel flat. As typical in these types of developments, there are a large number of units here. The danger is that they can appear as, what is sometimes described as, Soviet block housing. However, with these variations, despite the number of buildings, they have achieved a Cityscape fabric. Adjusting the roofline and the variations between the units has been an improvement; however, he remains concerned with the proposed "front doors," which he finds under-whelming. Although there are stoops, there are no front porches. Do all the front entrances have legitimate porch roofs? A couple of unit styles appear only to have pilasters against the building front.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that his observations are correct.

Mr. Supelak noted that it could be possible to extend a porch roof across the doorways of two adjacent units. That would achieve more legitimate porch roofs. Front doors can also be inset from the front façade, achieving a covering from the mass itself. Improving the front stoops and entryways, and including the details and landscaping that are not yet part of the design will have a positive impact. Historic row houses traditionally have narrow alleyways, so the side elevations typically are not significant. However, this development will have side elevations that are very exposed. Perhaps a couple of the buildings could have three dormers as opposed to just two. Could shed dormers versus gable dormers be a potential? In summary, the proposed direction is good, with some refinements.

Mr. Filipkowski expressed appreciation for the ideas, which he would consider.

Ms. Call stated that she appreciates the articulation made to the roofline, but, while they have met the "letter of the law," they have not taken full advantage of the potential. There is the concern that it still looks like one large building. Not much creativity went into breaking up the roofline; it moves up and down minimally. She likes the inspirational images provided by Ms. Fox; the Commission would like to see something similar. In Dublin, all applicants are held to a higher standard, so regardless of the Theater's future, other developments occurring around this property will elevate this property's value. She noted that one of the sample photographs showed units that had no difference in articulation, but chimneys provided separation of the units. Providing something "more" can be achieved in different ways. Regarding the earlier suggestion for three dormers – she has observed them used on a Pulte product in a different area, and due to the sizing, those units appeared congested.

Ms. Fox stated that to her, the quality will dictate how these buildings will aesthetically and practically perform in the Bridge Street District. In the Sawmill Center District, the primary intent of any building construction is that the neighborhood will have a strong, pedestrian-friendly streetscape. With the proposed buildings, the first floor level must engage with the street. She found the seven unit styles with all the elements shown a little "busy." In the photographs she provided, some of examples had more continuity of style, but the vertical facades were "broken" up, so that there was not a one-dimensional face on the street. Additionally, the use of horizontal elements, such as heavy lentils under the windows, broke up the front façade, along with use of a variation in materials. She believes more than a stoop is needed; that area should be functional, where a person could sit for awhile. Integrating it with the landscape would provide a nice transition to the sidewalk. The photographs she provided show a legacy quality; that element is missing in what is proposed. It does not meet the timelessness criteria and does not integrate in a desirable manner with the street. She likes the traditional architecture, but it is too predictable. More variation is needed between the buildings, and the front stoops need to be larger, more inviting, more usable and more interactive with the public realm. She has no objection to rooftop terraces, but cannot see from the renderings, how they could be harmonious.

Mr. Schneier stated that to him, the impression is that of "Main Street – Disneyland," there are too many details. He is concerned that if all those details are incorporated, to stay within their desired price point, the quality of the materials would be sacrificed. In such cases, the result is materials that do not look real and lack the substantiveness that will stand the test of time.

Mr. Fishman stated that the Commission is looking for quality architecture and is having difficulty describing it; however, he knows quality when he sees it. He will defer to the architect to determine how to provide that on this project, but these buildings must be something the City can be proud of. The quality must be much closer to that reflected in the sample photographs provided.

Ms. Call summarized the Commission's feedback. The Commission is generally in favor of the traditional architecture, and the articulation front to back. The Commission has requested that more quality and substantiveness be incorporated into the front entryways – doors, stoops and porches -- and that they provide more engagement with the streetscape.

Ms. Fox stated that the Commission is requesting a quality style. This street allows the architect the flexibility to be creative, not necessarily attempting to "check all the boxes" regarding size, form and window shape. Sometimes a form-based Code can lock in the design too much. The Commission is encouraging them to come up with an appealing design with a legacy quality.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would like any additional clarification.

The applicant requested no additional clarification.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

NEW CASES

Cases 3 and 4 were heard together.

3. Turkey Hill, 6201-6233 Avery Road, 20-161CU, Conditional Use, Drive-Thru Restaurant

Request for a Conditional Use for construction of a new drive-thru restaurant designated as an auto-oriented commercial facility, on a 5.48-acre site zoned Community Commercial District.

4. Turkey Hill, 6201-6233 Avery Road, 20-162CU, Conditional Use, Fueling Station & Car Wash

Request for a Conditional Use for construction of a new fueling station and a car wash also designated as an auto-oriented commercial facility.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of two Conditional Use applications to allow for construction of a new drive-thru restaurant (Case 20-161) in conjunction with a convenient store, and for a gas station with car wash (Case 20-162), which are all designated auto-oriented commercial facilities, on a site located southwest of the intersection of Avery Road and Shier-Rings Road. The site is zoned CC, Community Commercial District, is 5.48 acres in size, and presently contains three structures and three access points, one on Shier-Rings Road and two on Avery Road. Formerly the site operated as an office and commercial facility for Dublin Building Systems. With this redevelopment, the existing structures would be demolished and the access modified. There is a stream corridor protection zone along the southern side of the site. None of the proposed improvements would be within the bounds of that protection zone and all natural features of that corridor would be preserved.

Proposal

The CC, Community Commercial District allows a variety of permitted and conditional uses. The proposal calls for two auto-oriented commercial facilities, which are conditionally permitted uses. The uses can range from gas stations, carwashes, and drive-through restaurants. Restaurants and retail stores without drive-thrus are also permitted in this District. Conditional Use reviews are intended to provide the Commission an opportunity to independently review uses that "although often desirable, will more intensely affect the surrounding area in which they are located."

Conditional Use - Gas Station with Car Wash

A ten-pump gas station is proposed with 20 fueling positions, protected by a 14-foot-4-inch tall canopy. The proposed stacking meets the Code requirement of five spaces per pump. The fuel service is proposed to operate 7 days per week, 24 hours per day. The anticipated staffing level for all the uses on the site is 50-55 employees. The car wash is approximately 3,100 square feet in size, which the applicant has indicated is a standard size. The self-serve car wash accommodates one lane of thru traffic. Two pay stations are provided in two lanes immediately south of the car wash. The lanes accommodate 12 stacking spaces each, which meets the Code requirement. The car wash is proposed to operate daily from 7:00AM - 9:00PM.

Drive-thru Restaurant

The drive-thru restaurant will be an integrated use within a 7,600-square-foot convenient store, which is located along Shier Rings Road. The convenient store contains a second restaurant that will not operate a drive-thru. All drive-thru sales are to be done electronically through an online application. There will not be any human order-takers or an interactive order speaker, although a menu board is proposed. Indoor sales will be completed via order kiosks. The pick-up window is located on the west side of the building, with the drive-thru lane circulating counter clockwise around the convenient store. There will be one drive-thru lane and one pickup window for the drive-thru. The drive-thru provides 15 stacking spaces, where Code requires 11. A bypass lane also is provided to allow vehicles to exit the drive-thru lane and to allow emergency vehicle access. The drive-thru will operate 7 days per week – 24 hours per day, as will the convenient store. The second restaurant does not require a Conditional Use and will be open daily from 6:00AM-10:00PM. The applicant estimates there will be 50-55 employees at opening, with that number decreasing to 35-40 after a two to three month period. These estimates are for the entire site, not solely for the drive-thru component. A total of 60 parking spaces are provided on site along with the required vehicle stacking for each auto-oriented commercial facility. Without the Conditional Use requests, this project would be eligible to go directly to Building Permitting. The request, typically, would not be under the purview of the Commission, as it is in a Standard Zoning District, not a PUD. All associated landscaping for vehicular use areas as well as screening, tree preservation and tree replacement are required to be met and will be reviewed in detail with the Building Permit. All signs are required to meet the Sign Code and will be reviewed with the Sign Permit. The intent of the architecture is to apply traditional materials that align with those found throughout Dublin, while incorporating contemporary influences of the adjacent West Innovation District. The buildings are proposed to be clad in brick and stone, which will mimic the aesthetic of the OSU Wexner medical facility. Staff has reviewed both applications against the application criteria and recommends approval of the Conditional Use – Gas Station and Carwash with four conditions and approval of the Conditional Use – Drive-Thru Restaurant with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Christopher Cline, applicant representative, Haynes, Kessler, Myers & Postalakis, Worthington, Ohio 43085 stated that his client would provide information regarding EG America, which is new to Dublin.

Steve Fuller, Vice President-Real Estate Development and Acquisitions, EG America, 165 Flanders Road, Westborough, MA 01581, stated that there are 17 Turkey Hill locations in and around Columbus, and he was involved in the acquisition and development of all. This is the first potential site within Dublin. He provided history of EG America's initial involvement with the 762 Turkey Hill convenient stores, which have now transitioned to 1,700 stores in 31 states. They are headquartered in Westborough, Mass., and they work with many municipalities in the location of Turkey Hill sites.

Mr. Cline stated that this site is approximately 5.5 acres, and in terms of the amount of intensity that they would anticipate in Dublin for office or retail would be approximately 5,500 square feet of buildings. Of course, development is constrained by development standards, including setbacks, landscaping and parking, which results in approximately 10,000 square feet per acre. They have proposed approximately 10,700 square feet in structure, exclusive of the fuel dispensing area. The site plan demonstrates that the development standards required by the City Code can be met on the site. However, that is not entirely correct, as many of the users of this site will be partaking of more than one of the services. The traffic access study treats all the uses as separate, reflecting different customers for each accessing the site. Approximately 60 plan sheets have been submitted, providing a significant level of detail, although that level of detail is not required for a Conditional Use. However, that level of detail would be required for the Building Permit, and they decided to demonstrate with this proposal the ability to meet all the development standards. The development that surrounds this site is some of the oldest legacy zoning development in Dublin. In 1970, the Village of Dublin rezoned everything from Post Road south to the Shier Rings Road/Avery Road to the Industrial zoning category. The northwest quadrant of Shier Rings and Avery Road to the north was zoned General Industrial, which is the most intensive industrial zoning category available. Therefore, the area around site reflects that industrial character. The purpose for that zoning was that I-270 was being extended and the community leaders at that point in time thought it was important to set aside the future bread basket of the future Dublin. The new development occurring in the area, such as the OSU Medical Facility, will have need of the type of services this site will provide. An infrastructure agreement would be involved. Currently, the site is served by an 8-inch sanitary sewer line from a larger line to the south. That 8-inch line ends in the southern portion of this site, and the City desires to have it extended to the north, as that northern area does not have sanitary sewer. Extending the sewer line across this site would be opening up the site to the north for development.

Manny Paiva, Senior Project Manager, Planning Department – Real Estate Group, EG America, 165 Flanders Road, Westborough, MA 01581, stated that the site currently has three access points, which, with the FDP, will be reduced to two. The two accesses will be located as far as possible from the Shier Rings and Avery Road intersections. The Shier Rings Road curbcut will be controlled as a right in/out only, and the Avery Road curbcut will be relocated as far south as possible to align with the curbcut on the adjacent property. Southbound traffic on Avery Road will have a safe right turn pocket into the site; for northbound traffic on Avery Road, the existing median will be extended to provide a safe left turn pocket. With the convenient store, two restaurants will be provided. The I-Hop drive-thru restaurant will operate by a phone order service from the car or from an inside kiosk. Inside the convenient store will be a SBarro Pizza counter order restaurant. With the gas pump service, they have met all Code-required aisle spaces and the pavement was minimized to the extent possible to maximize the surrounding greenspace. The carwash service will be manned.

Mr. Cline stated that with the Conditional Use request, they must demonstrate that any additional intensity resulting from the Conditional Uses has been dealt with adequately. In this case, it is easier than typical with a traditional Conditional Use consideration, because of the ordinances the City has enacted. The stacking requirements for the drive-thru lanes are already defined by the Code, and they meet the requirements. There are 10 conditions, and Item #8 has been addressed successfully. A detailed traffic access study was prepared, which City traffic engineers reviewed and determined that all of the accesses in and out of the site meets the appropriate warrants. Access from Shier Rings Road is only eastbound; westbound traffic on Shier Rings Road is prohibited from turning into the site by a median. In summary, these services will be welcomed by individuals working south of the main interchange.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kennedy inquired if there is bikepath or sidewalk connectivity around the full perimeter.

Ms. Martin responded that there is existing connectivity. There may be some slight modification needed immediately adjacent to the entry.

Ms. Kennedy stated that convenient stores within the community receive a significant level of bicycle traffic and inquired if bicycle parking would be provided on the site.

Mr. Paiva responded that it is not in the plans, but it could be added easily. A connection from the perimeter sidewalk is proposed, and a bike rack could be added at the convenient store.

Mr. Schneier stated that the project is appropriate in this area, particularly with the addition of the hospital. He appreciates the applicant's expertise and the thoroughness of the plans provided.

Mr. Grimes stated that the expertise in development of the site plan is apparent, and he appreciates the detail provided. He appreciates the applicant's working with the City on the provision of sewer line.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a nice project in a very appropriate location. It will be a welcome addition on that side of the highway. He agrees with Ms. Kennedy that the convenient stores in Dublin receive significant bicycle traffic, so bicycle racks would be appreciated. He gives the applicant credit for thinking through the site logistics. His only concern is the north façade of the building. Currently, it is a large, empty billboard, but if the landscaping is robust, it could improve its appearance.

Mr. Fishman stated that this a good location for the project; however, the surrounding uses will not be Industrial, although it is zoned as such. He encourages the incorporation of attractive landscaping.

Ms. Fox stated that she also agrees that the location is suitable and she is impressed by the materials used, the layout of the building, and the integration of the fuel pumps on the interior so that they are not highly visible from the roadway. She anticipates this will be a very successful location for Turkey Hill. This is a significant corner of the West Innovation District. The vision of that District is for a live-work-play area, and it focuses on walkability. The City is attempting to retrofit suburbia in the area, creating more density and providing more pedestrian and bicycle access to services. She would encourage them to consider extending safe pedestrian and bicycle access from Shier Rings Road into the property. Traffic from the Ballantrae development will be from Shier Rings. This will be a very active area for that type of traffic. She agrees that the north façade of the building, although landscaped, does need more aesthetic appeal. The Turkey Hill in Clintonville has added some details that softens a similar façade. Due to the anticipated level of pedestrian traffic, she would encourage them to consider adding something on the north façade that provides a "warmer" feel. The only other question she would have is if the development would be harmonious with existing and intended character. Gas stations typically are lit very brightly. This site will be lit 24 hours, what will the lighting effect be like on this corner? Are there any special attempts with the lighting?

Mr. Paiva responded that they are working with a Cincinnati lighting company. They use a computer-generated program to compile a comprehensive lighting plan that complies with the local municipality's Code. This plan has the minimum number of fixtures and degree of brightness permitted by the City's Code. All the lights are LED and are concealed within the fixture canopy.

Ms. Fox inquired about the possibility of improving the aesthetics of the north façade of the store building.

Mr. Cline responded that several options have been suggested, including faux windows and incorporating a variety in depth of the different architectural materials. They will be considering possible ways of improving the appearance of that façade. In regard to the lighting issue -- the detailed lighting plan provided shows the degree of candle power cast every two feet on the ground, as well as the fixtures that will be used.

Ms. Fox stated that in Dublin, pedestrian use of pathways is increasing and planning the site with the pedestrian traffic in mind likely will increase the future level of business.

Mr. Cline stated that there is a bikepath that meanders around the east and north sides of the site. It will be within the City's purview to extend the bikepath across Avery Road, as part of the University Blvd. improvements. He assumes that connectivity may be established by the City.

Ms. Fox clarified that she was referring to the sidewalks near the entrances, so that kids do not have to bike within the access drives.

Mr. Supelak stated that they can anticipate a high level of bike traffic from Shier Rings Road. As the plan exists, bicycle traffic would have to come all the way around the site before being able to enter it. The question is if there could sidewalk access connected to the bikepath on Shier Rings Road to the north.

Mr. Cline stated that as they designed the site, the bikepath extended diagonally from the corner down to the southeast corner of the building, but Engineering requested that it be removed. Perhaps they could re-visit it with City staff and determine if they would permit it to be included in the site plan.

Mr. Paiva stated that originally it was extended diagonally, but Engineering was concerned about a sewer connection in that area. Another option would be to, where the drive lane enters, add a row of hedges, then add a sidewalk connection that runs at a 90-degree angle to Shier Rings Road. Along the sidewalk, they would place downward-facing ballard lights to provide lighting after dusk.

Ms. Fox expressed appreciation for that suggestion and would anticipate staff working with them on that connection.

Ms. Martin noted that they would do.

Ms. Call stated that they provided above and beyond the level of documentation required, and the Commission recognizes the level of detail and commitment. The details allow the Commission to see the future vision for the property.

Public Comment

Chad Harris, 6151 Avery Road, Dublin, Ohio:

"I have been listening to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. I own the property to the south, which is south of Cosgray Ditch. My concerns remain about the erosion of the Ditch. This is a conversation for the City of Dublin, as well. There has been no maintenance or upkeep in recent years. In the document for the project, it states, "Stormwater retention will be accomplished through underground storage structures, which discharge to Cosgray Ditch." I would like to see this addressed. Thank you."

Ms. Call inquired if staff would be able to respond to Mr. Harris with the information requested about how the issue regarding potential Ditch erosion would be addressed.

Michael Hendershot, City Engineer, stated that he would reach out to Mr. Harris to address his concerns.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Conditional Use, 20-162CU, Fueling Station & Car Wash, with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff to demonstrate compliance with all landscape requirements, prior to submittal of building permits.
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.
- 3) That the applicant reimburse the City of Dublin via an infrastructure agreement, to be considered by City Council, for the actual cost of the public sanitary sewer extension along the Avery Road frontage, presently estimated at \$32,000.00, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building occupancy.
- 4) That the applicant construct the turn lanes at the same time as the development, which shall be conditionally accepted by the City of Dublin, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building occupancy.

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Conditional Use, 20-161CU, Drive-Thru Restaurant,

- 1) All conditions of approval associated with 20-162CU, (Conditional Use - Fueling Station & Car Wash), be fulfilled.

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

5. Temporary Signs, Administrative Request - Code Amendment, 20-098ADMC

Proposal for Amendments to the City of Dublin Sign Code to comply with all requirements of the U.S. and Ohio constitutional, statutory, and case law decisions requiring that temporary sign regulations remain content neutral.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and provided feedback on these draft regulations at their October 1, 2020 meeting. The Commission supported the draft language and requested minor amendments and additional information regarding the recommended approach to address other temporary signs. The revised draft includes these revisions. [reviewed minor changes made.]

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that in Item B, under "Prohibited Sign Locations," it is stated that they are prohibited in any utility easement. Do property owners typically know where their utility easements are?

Ms. Rauch responded that they are shown on the property's plat or plat plan, which are provided to a buyer at the home purchase closing.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she does not know where hers are located, and she assumes other residents may have a similar issue.

Ms. Rauch stated that in residential communities, the easements typically are located to the side and rear of the property, where signs are not placed. If any issue should arise, City Code Enforcement staff would discuss the issue with the property owner and help them understand where the signs could be placed.

Ms. Call referred to Item I-3, and inquired if eliminating the frontage restriction regarding lots with less than 100 square feet of frontage could ultimately result in an increase in sign clutter.

Mr. Boggs responded that because the restriction is one sign per parcel (Item I-2), all sites, large or small, are permitted only one sign of the smaller sign. The proposed language will result in a reduction in clutter based on the permitted size of the signs, if not in number of signs.

Ms. Call inquired about the enforcement of these regulations, when passed, for existing signs on these parcels.

Mr. Boggs responded that these restrictions would apply to temporary signs, and the signs that prompted the concern about visual clutter are also temporary signs. The duration limits would be applied, along with an educational component for the property owners regarding the revised Code. Ultimately, if there was not compliance with the new Code, the enforcement process would be initiated.

Ms. Call inquired when would the new Duration period begin for existing signs.

Mr. Boggs responded that it would begin on the effective date of the ordinance. The reason is that the first enforcement mechanism is a citation to the Mayor's court, which is a criminal filing. Criminal law cannot be applied retroactively.

Mr. Supelak referred to Item I-5 and noted that the language regarding duration needs clarification.

Ms. Rauch responded that the clarification would be made before referral to City Council.

Ms. Call inquired if a front and back sign is counted as one sign, are two sign fronts on a corner with two frontages on a sign post counted as two signs?

Ms. Rauch responded that the Code indicates that "where a sign has two or more display faces, the area of all signs shall be included in determining the area, unless the two faces are joined back to back and parallel to each other and not more than 24 inches part." The Code clarifies that situation.

Mr. Supelak stated that the 24 inches apart would be either side of a wall. The Commission previously reviewed such a case, wherein the distance between the signs on either side of a fin wall was greater than 24 inches. Is there merit to considering a greater distance?

Ms. Call responded that she believes there is less concern about the distance between two signs on each side of a wall than about two, parallel signs.

Mr. Supelak responded that 24 inches would likely be applicable to a large monument sign.
Ms. Call stated that she would have no objection to 24 inches, as the applicant also has the option of submitting a Master Sign Plan application for signage that exceeds Code requirements.
[Consensus of the Commission was to retain the 24-inch stipulation.]

Ms. Fox inquired if the proposed Code would address drive-thru menu boards.
Mr. Boggs responded that the proposed changes focus only on temporary signs. The signs to which she is referring are permanent sign fixtures.
Ms. Fox stated that she understands that issue was not addressed in this revision. It is unfortunate, however, that property owners must apply for an Amended Development Agreement, when we recognize that technology has advanced to the point that most sites now have menu boards incorporating higher technology. When could that issue be addressed?
Ms. Rauch stated that this question warrants greater discussion, as in many cases, those are Development Text requirements, not just a Code requirement. We can schedule that topic for a future discussion.
Mr. Boggs pointed out that Development Text issues could be handled as Minor Text Modifications, and be administratively approved.

Ms. Kennedy referred to Item M-4 and inquired if simple birthday celebration signs would exceed the size limitations.
Mr. Supelak stated that because such signs are placed for approximately 24 hours, they would be gone before enforcement could transpire.
Mr. Boggs concurred. From a practical enforcement perspective, the City's resources are finite, and must be marshalled toward priority issues. In addition, the type of sign to which she refers is truly temporary. If it were in place for a period of time and drew Code Enforcement's attention, the Code Enforcement Officer first would make an attempt to contact the property owner and advise them of the issue. There are multiple opportunities to voluntarily comply before enforcement ensues.

Ms. Call stated that for clarity purposes, regardless of the content of the sign, the issue is that of a sign being placed on a residential property for a short time duration.

Public Comments

No comments were received on the case.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Kennedy seconded a recommendation for City Council approval of the Code Amendment regarding Temporary Signs.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, February 18, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council