



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 4, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Kennedy, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted that she would be standing in for Chair Rebecca Call, who is absent. She provided the following opening remarks: "Welcome to a virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. We are currently holding our meetings online and live streaming to YouTube until further notice. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. We welcome your comments on cases. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Your questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. Please provide a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and refrain from making any inappropriate comments. We want to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Kennedy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Jane Fox, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Kristina Kennedy
Commission members absent: Rebecca Call [excused]
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Tammy Noble

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of February 4, 2021 as submitted.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

Ms. Kennedy stated that 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. Kennedy stated that one case, Case 2, is eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening and inquired if any member wished to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion; no request was made to move the case to the regular agenda.

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

CONSENT CASE

2. Bridge Street District - Amended Final Development Plan, 20-177ADMC, Administrative Request - Code Amendment

Request for review and recommendation to City Council to amend Zoning Code Section 153.066 to add an Amended Final Development Plan review process for the Bridge Street District in alignment with other review processes.

Public Comments

No public comments were received for this case.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council for the addition of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) review process for the Bridge Street District.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

NEW CASES

1. Historic Design Guidelines, 18-037ADMC, Administrative Request - Code Amendment

Request for review and recommendation to City Council for new Historic Design Guidelines applicable to properties located within the Architectural Review District and its outlying historic properties.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is an administrative request for a recommendation of approval to City Council. The Historic District Code amendment, Historic District area rezoning and revised Historic Design Guidelines are the result of the work of a stakeholder committee, public engagement, and Board and Commission review process. In 2018, the Historic Dublin Stakeholder Committee met four times (June 14, July 12, August 2, and August 30, 2018) to identify potential revisions to the Historic District Zoning Code and Guidelines. Opportunities for public input were provided at two public meetings held on October 9, 2018 and August 15, 2019, as well as two-hour office hours on each Wednesday in August 2019 (August 7, 14, 21 and 28). The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed draft revisions on July 11 and September 5, 2019. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) conducted six reviews of draft documents on July 10, July 24 and November 20, 2019, and on June 17, July 29, and November 18, 2020. On February 24, 2021, the ARB approved a recommendation to the Planning Commission for its subsequent recommendation of approval to City Council.

Overview

The Historic Design Guidelines is a companion document that has been updated in alignment with a recent Code amendment approved by City Council on February 22, 2021. Ordinance 03-21 approved an amendment to the Architectural Review Board Development Requirements and Procedures and a revision to the Historic District boundaries. The boundaries of Historic Dublin would be the area of applicability for the proposed Design Guidelines, as well as any historic properties listed in Appendix G of the Zoning Code. Council also approved Ordinance 04-21, an area rezoning removing Historic Dublin from the Bridge Street District. The intent was to differentiate the regulations in the two districts. The purpose of the legislation related to the Historic District was to ensure that current community values were reflected. The primary difference between Code and Guidelines is that the Code provides regulations regarding what "shall" be applied; the Guidelines provide recommendations and best practices, which "should" be applied in conjunction with the Code. Chapters 1-3 provide an introduction, set the context and character for the District, and identify building types and predominant architectural styles in Historic Dublin. Chapters 4-7 address rehabilitation, new construction, site design, and sign design recommendations. When the Code and Guidelines are administered in unison, it is anticipated that the review process within the Architectural Review District will be more user-friendly. Staff

and the ARB recommend that the Commission review and subsequently recommend City Council approval of the updated Historic Design Guidelines at their March 22, 2021 meeting.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Mr. Schneier pointed out the following items of concern:

1. On p. 46, the statement is made that, "New construction should be differentiated from existing buildings but should be compatible with the established character of the District." Unfortunately, that statement could be interpreted in various ways; therefore, it should either be amended or eliminated.
2. On p. 48, Item 5.6d, "Doors and Windows," indicates the "window to wall ratio should be similar to other buildings within the District." However, on p. 49, Item 5.11a states that, "buildings should maximize window design to provide daylight." Those two items would seem to be incompatible.
3. On p. 52, "Site Design - Applicability," the language, which concerns landscaping, states that the Guidelines "are applicable to both residential and commercial properties..." but Section 6.3 indicates that City Code Section 153.173-C3 states that the ARB has no jurisdiction over residential landscaping.

He would recommend the above language be tightened/clarified.

Ms. Martin responded that re. the third item (above), it was the intent that Section 6.3, "Landscaping," would be recommendations for both residential and commercial properties, specifically in regard to tree preservation. Although ARB has no jurisdiction to require that trees be preserved on residential properties, it is the Board's desire to encourage residential property owners to preserve trees to the extent possible in order to preserve the established cultural landscaping in the District.

Ms. Fox suggested that the language be modified also to clarify that the applicant is not required to submit a Landscape Design for Board review. These are simply landscape recommendations for the District.

Ms. Martin referred to item two (above). The intent of Item 5.11 was to allow some flexibility, recognizing that new construction would want to employ energy-efficient and sustainable building methods, while also attempting to be sensitive to the established character of the neighborhood. Her recommendation would be to retain the Items in 5.6, Doors and Windows, and modify or eliminate Item 5.11.

Ms. Fox inquired about window replacements in historic homes.

Ms. Martin noted that this topic is covered in the "Rehabilitation" section, p. 40, which states, "replacement windows should match the appearance of historic originals in number of panes, dimension....." The implication is that replacement should simulate the operating characteristics of the originals, but would not need to be original.

Ms. Martin requested clarification of the concern in item one (above) re. new construction windows, in regard to sustainability versus character.

Mr. Schneier stated that the issue is not point of view as much as it is the language/verbiage.

Ms. Martin stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Schneier's comment regarding p. 46, Section 5.1a. That phrase is not necessary, as the subject is addressed more directly in items b and c.

Ms. Fox stated that the Lancaster, Ohio Historic Design Guidelines provide more definition on the items Mr. Schneier mentioned.

Mr. Schneier responded that the language should not be arbitrary. If helpful language has been crafted by another entity, that could be considered.

Ms. Fox read the Lancaster language related to new construction that complements the Historic District.

[Discussion continued regarding new construction that complements but does not copy historic architecture.]

Mr. Fishman indicated the need to discourage the use of existing architecture that was not done well as a justification for doing something similar. The language referring to "other houses" should be tightened.

Mr. Boggs suggested that the application of precedence be narrowed to require that context not be related to buildings two blocks away, but to those within the immediate vicinity.

Ms. Fox suggested the following language, "New structures should look new but also take design cues from surrounding existing buildings so as to relate to historic setting. One should not attempt to replicate or mimic the historic building but work to achieve compatibility."

Mr. Schneier stated that he liked that language without the last sentence.

Ms. Rauch stated that per ARB direction, the language was revised from "adjacent" to "surrounding." Perhaps "surrounding" could be clarified. If the Board should experience difficulty with the language proposed in the Guidelines, the document can be revised again later.

Mr. Supelak stated that he was supportive of the modifications suggested by Mr. Boggs and Ms. Fox.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

Mr. Fishman noted that it is important to revise the language so that new construction does not result in another 1950s ranch.

Ms. Fox stated that there is a variety of architecture on S. Riverview Street, some are considered contributing and some non-contributing, including 3 or 4 ranches. If the non-contributing structures were to be demolished, do we want to change the character of the street? The question should be if the eclectic nature of the District that has evolved is preferred, or if a certain period of history, such as 1860 to 1910, is preferred. She believes ARB is interested in leniency in their ability to allow new construction to complement without being prohibited. Mr. Fishman stated the 1950s ranches should not be demolished if they are in good shape, as they are part of the eclectic character. However, putting a 1950s ranch in the middle of S. High Street or other areas might not be appropriate.

Ms. Martin noted that Franklin Street is part of Historic Dublin, and it is important to encourage preservation, not redevelopment with a mid-19th century aesthetic. The District is eclectic, non-homogenous. Preserving that character, particularly south of Bridge Street, would be important.

Mr. Fishman stated that his intent is not to encourage removal of the 1950s ranches, but to ensure that new construction blends with the surrounding character and is harmonious to the Historic District.

Ms. Martin responded that staff would take another look at the document and attempt to ensure that the reference to "surrounding" is capturing the Commission's guidance.

Ms. Fox referred to Site Design - Landscaping, p. 62. She is concerned about protecting the cultural landscape. Topography is considered a protected asset. Because the Historic District is on the riverfront, there is a severe grade change from High Street to the river. The landscape along the riverfront is considered a historic asset. That area once held two stone quarries, contains historic stonewalls along the edges, and [along its northern boundary] the Indian Run Ravine with beautiful waterfalls. The National Parks Service considers old cemeteries, ponds, lakes, rivers, waterways, particular contours, and archaeological land masses, such as Indian mounds, to be cultural landscape assets. A significant amount of land mass within the Historic District falls within this category. The Guidelines provide no applications to protect this asset. She would like to see this historic element added to the Historic Guidelines. There is existing verbiage that could be used.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if, at any point, this particular item was discussed as part of the review process.

Ms. Martin responded that the topic of cultural landscapes and resources was raised previously. It was incorporated in a limited manner, within the Overview section, p. 16. There is an opportunity to make that section more robust in regard to meaning, and to include specific recommendations related to the treatment of Dublin's resources.

Ms. Fox stated that ARB struggles with the applications that provide one story at the street level and 4-5 stories at the rear due to the grade drop, instead of terracing the building down the side of the hill, which would provide a more attractive view from the rear. No site design guidance with respect to topography is

provided in the Guidelines. New construction has resulted in the removal of stonewalls and older landscape features along the riverfront. If the schools on Bridge Street were ever to be moved, there are inadequate protections in place for the Indian Run Ravine. No regulations exist that prohibit the construction of a condominium along the ravine. She would like staff to look for opportunities to provide ARB with some ability to protect the cultural landscape in the District.

Commission consensus was to include this ability within the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Fox suggested that in the Appendix G list of historic buildings located outside the District, bold text be used for those that are City-owned to provide differentiation.

Staff indicated that distinction would be made.

Ms. Fox stated that in regard to Historic Storefront Rehabilitation (p. 43), the word "avoid" is used in the subpoints. She has suggested language be used that would indicate what is expected, rather than what should be avoided.

Ms. Martin displayed revised language, consistent with Ms. Fox's requests related to Storefront Rehabilitation, and in Site Design, the siting of new development related to the topography. The intent is that it refer to the surrounding buildings within the Architectural Review District.

Ms. Kennedy noted that, due to the requested revisions, the document is not ready for approval at this time. Ms. Martin inquired if there would be two Commission members who would be willing to collaborate with staff and review proposed revisions prior to formal review. This approach was used successfully with the ARB review.

Mr. Schneier and Ms. Fox indicated their willingness to provide collaboration.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded a request to table the proposed Historic Design Guidelines amendment pending incorporation of the Commission's recommendations.

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

[Motion to table passed 6-0]

3. Dublin City Hall, 5555 Perimeter Drive, 21-015Z-PDP, Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan

Request for review and recommendation to City Council to rezone a ±5.03-acre site, located west of the intersection of Perimeter Drive and Emerald Parkway, from Suburban Office and Institutional District to Planned Unit Development District – Coffman Park.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and a recommendation of approval of a rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan for the new City Hall building, located at 5555 Perimeter Drive, from SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District – Coffman Park, to complete the Coffman Park municipal complex. The site is located west of Emerald Parkway, south of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. The site is surrounded by other municipal facilities, including: the Justice Center immediately to the west, and to the north -- Coffman Park, the Development Building, the Coffman Homestead, and the Recreation Center.

Background

The Coffman Park PUD was originally established in 1994 (Ordinance 18-94), which incorporated 28 acres of parkland zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District, with an additional 18 acres to facilitate development of municipal facilities including the Dublin Recreation Center while also enhancing active and passive parkland opportunities in the City. In 2007, Ordinance 91-07 rezoned four additional parcels, totaling

7.5 acres, along the north side of Post Road into the Coffman Park PUD from the R-1 District; this included the Nyrop home, which was subsequently demolished. In 2011, Ordinance 35-11 expanded the Coffman Park PUD to include approximately 42 acres south of (former) Post Road and north of U.S. 33. In conjunction with this rezoning, Post Road was terminated and realigned to provide a larger consolidated land area for parks and recreation, as well as surrounding municipal facilities. This rezoning was consistent with the 2007 Community Plan, which identified it as a municipal complex site. In 2019, the City purchased an existing building at the intersection of Emerald Parkway and Perimeter Drive. The building is located on a single parcel with an additional parcel located to the southwest, which contains a new addition for Council Chambers and offices. The site currently is zoned Suburban Office – Institutional. With this rezoning, the site will be incorporated into the Coffman Park PUD. Amendments are proposed to the Coffman Park PUD development text updating it to reflect the minimal revisions that have occurred over time, as well as incorporating the new City Hall properties. Subareas A, B, and C are established, and all land rezoned in 1994 and 2007 are located in Subarea A; the land rezoned in 2011 is located in Subarea B; and new City Hall properties are located in Subarea C. No modifications are proposed to the development standards for Subareas A and B, as none of the parcels within these subareas include City Hall properties. Development standards have been added for Subarea C regarding municipal administrative functions, civic uses, parks and open space, and SO uses. All development and design standards are in accordance with SO regulations. The development text also includes sign standards to facilitate building identification for City Hall. Two wall signs are proposed: one for the administrative office building and one for the Council Chambers addition. A placemaking art sign would also be permitted in the future. If affixed to the building, it would be limited to 65 square feet and no greater than 20 feet in height. The two existing ground signs would be retained. Staff recommends a recommendation of approval to City Council for the proposed rezoning and PUD.

Commission Questions/Discussion

Mr. Supelak inquired who owns the crop field between Perimeter Drive and the highway.
Ms. Martin responded that it belongs to a private property owner.

Mr. Schneier inquired what determines the maximum size of the placemaking sign.
Ms. Martin responded that the proposed areas are based on a design concept, which was included in the meeting packet. The development text provides that the sign be at the discretion of the City Manager. Therefore, City Council in collaboration with the City Manager's office, would be able to choose the imagery. The 65-square-foot provision is approximately 8 feet by 8 feet.

The Commission had no questions or concerns.

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded a recommendation of City Council approval of the 5555 Perimeter Drive (Dublin City Hall), Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan.

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

[Motion passed 6-0]

GOAL SETTING

Ms. Rauch stated that discussion regarding Commission Goal Setting began last year. The intent is to further develop training and educational direction for 2021, which could include educational topics such as sustainability, mobility, housing needs, Council goals and Citywide visioning. The following questions were considered:

- 1) What training and educational topics would the Commission like to participate and learn more about in 2021?
- 2) What format should these trainings take (self-paced, group discussion, presentations, virtual conference sessions, articles, combination)?

- 3) What planning projects would the Commission like more information about? What is the preferred format for staff to provide updates to the Commission?
- 4) What information or assistance can staff provide the Commission members in preparation for the meeting?
- 5) What recommendations does the Commission have about the information and organization of staff reports, materials, presentations, etc.?
- 6) What other topics or items should be considered as we move forward in 2021?

Commission Discussion

Commission members recommended the following training and educational topics for 2021 and formats for such training:

- Micro-training sessions related to City initiatives and priorities expanding the Commission's understanding of the City's vision and goals. Examples of previous education include sustainability and transportation. This would provide greater context to the projects the Commission considers.
- Expressed a preference for group discussions, as members benefit from learning their colleagues' views.
- Inclusion of a presentation/discussion with an expert in architecture to provide the Commission guidance on evaluation/recognition of good architecture, with the possible creation of a checklist of pertinent criteria.
- More information on quality and material choices.
- Incorporation of the Community Plan into the Commission's reviews; understanding how Planning staff incorporates that document into their reviews. [Development of the 2035 Framework Plan is in process, to be followed by an update of the Community Plan.]
- Refresher course regarding conflict of interest, ex-parte requirements, Sunshine Law, and running an effective meeting.
- Discussions concerning density and housing needs; learning the community's desires/needs versus developers' preferences. This could include types of housing; demographic needs; and ratio of residential versus commercial development.
- Update regarding residential design standards/policies, including regional survey results.
- Macro view of housing industry trends, including demographics, density and mobility, and their potential impact on the Commission's review of future applications.
- Presentations from regional partners on development issues they are experiencing. Such overviews would encourage a seamless transition between Dublin and surrounding areas.
- Revitalization of conversations related to Conservation Design and WOW (scenic road setbacks) – earlier initiatives incorporated into the Community Plan, which appear to have languished. The overall goal is achieving greater density without sacrificing greenspace.
- Presentations regarding pocket neighborhoods and other housing trends [Examples: City of Savannah, Ga.; Seaside, Fla.; Hilton Head, S.C.] to consider in developing future planning ideas/objectives.
- Discussions regarding how to incorporate placemaking into development plans, using both references and good examples.
- Tours of neighborhoods in other communities (for example, the NPA conference tour; virtual in the interim).
- Provide regular updates regarding Planning projects and pending cases, and City projects, including CIP and Engineering projects.
- Provide earlier design collaboration (pre-application) for new development proposals, perhaps via work sessions, clearly communicating City expectations, while ensuring the property owner's rights and ability to design their own project. Suggestion to use an "issue - rule – conclusion" framework to address issues in a logical progression.

Pursuant to the recommendations provided by the Commission, staff will develop a training program to be implemented in 2021.

COMMUNICATIONS

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council