



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 20, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted that due to the pandemic, the City of Dublin is currently holding public meetings online and live streaming to YouTube. The meeting live-stream can be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present:	Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier, Rebecca Call, Lee Grimes, Kim Way, Mark Supelak, Jane Fox
Staff members present:	Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Megan O'Callaghan, Michael Hendershot, Colleen Gilger, Rachel Ray

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the April 15, 2021 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call 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. Call swore in individuals intending to address the Commission on tonight's cases.

Ms. Call stated that there are no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening.

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

1. Hyland Glen at 7270 Hyland-Croy Road, 21-058INF, Informal Review

A request for the development of a residential Planned Unit Development neighborhood consisting of 102 single-family lots with 12.8 acres of open space. The 42.2-acre site is zoned Rural District and is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road with Post Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for an Informal Review, an optional step in the Planned Unit Development process. This site currently is zoned Rural. The anticipated request will be for a rezoning of the site to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The site is located northeast of the intersection of Post Road and Hyland-Croy Road and is approximately 42 acres in size. The site has 3,000 feet of frontage along Hyland-Croy Road and presently contains two residences with access from Hyland-Croy Road, and a historic farmstead located along Post Road. The remainder of the site is farmed. The Community Plan is a guiding document that is referred to when rezoning of property is being considered. The Future Land Use for this site has two designations – one is Suburban Residential, Low Density; the other is Mixed Residential, Low Density. The Mixed Residential Low Density recommends up to 3 dwelling units (du)/per acre; Suburban Residential recommends 1 – 2 du/acre. The Community Plan also includes Special Area Plan, where special attention is given to unique site characteristics, as well as corridors. The Northwest Glacier Ridge Special Area Plan has both general and specific recommendations. Single-family, detached residential lots are contemplated adjacent to existing single-family residential. Additionally, there are clustered homes along the Hyland-Croy Road frontage adjacent to Post Road and the US33 Interchange. That Special Area Plan also included a rural roadway character recommendation. That character is already implemented in a number of neighborhoods along Hyland-Croy Road, having generous setbacks from 100-200 feet. Additionally, the Community Plan recommends preservation of the historic farmstead or a portion thereof. The farmstead on this site enhances the rural roadway character and contributes to the overall history of Dublin.

Proposal

The proposal is for development of a PUD neighborhood on the 42.2-acre site that would consist of 102 single-family residential lots, 12.8 acres of open space and 6 new public rights-of-way. The site access aligns with previously established access plans as well as previous proposals reviewed by the Commission. The Conceptual Plan includes the extension of the ML "Red" Trabue Nature Reserve along the South Fork of Indian Run, and the preservation of one historic barn at the intersection of Post Road and Hyland Croy Road, as well as a detention basin and gateway landscape feature. The proposed density is 2.4 du/per acre, which aligns with the Community Plan recommendations. Generally, lot sizes are proposed to transition from larger in the north and east boundaries of the site to smaller in the south and west portions of the site. Lots along the margins of the site will be similar in size to adjacent lots in Post Preserve and Park Place. Smaller lots will be along the Post Road and Hyland-Croy Road interchange. This is consistent with the Community Plan's recommendations. All lots are a minimum of 110 feet in depth, with those adjacent to Post Preserve being 130 feet in depth. Lot widths will vary, with those next to single-family neighborhoods being 75-80 feet in width. The smaller lots in the center of site will be 60 feet in width.

Staff recommends the Commission consider the following discussion questions in their review:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the single-family land use and overall density?
- 2) Does the Commission support the conceptual site layout including streets and lots?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open spaces including preservation of natural feature and cultural resources?
- 4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Charles Ruma, Jr., president, Virginia Homes, 485 Metro Place S., Dublin, OH stated that they were approached with the owners of the Gorden property after the Schottenstein Real Estate Group's previous unsuccessful attempts to develop the property. Before getting involved, they spent time reviewing the previous rezoning proposal to determine how they could create a successful project that would solve the issues that were raised. This is a challenging site to develop creatively, as there is development on all

four sides; essentially this would be an infill development. The Autumn Rose residential development is to the north; plans for retail and commercial in Jerome Township exists to the west; commercial exists to the south; and a substantial SR161 highway ramp exits to Post Road. In addition, Post Preserve is immediately adjacent to the east with three predetermined stubstreets that will connect through this infill property to Hyland-Croy Road. With all those factors, the layout of this site is fairly constrictive. They have focused on lowering the density and creating a consistent product throughout this transitional site. They have been working with staff, who is familiar with the site's issues. They also have been communicating with the residents in the area, sharing their plans with the Post Preserve HOA to ensure they address all their concerns. Looking at the previous issues raised, they believe they have succeeded in creating a vastly improved Concept Plan. They have attempted to address the following concerns:

- 1) Land use. This is a single-family subdivision with homes averaging from \$600,000-\$700,000.
- 2) Density. The density in this development has been reduced to 102 units, which lowers the density by almost 140 units from the previous application. No lots will be less than 60 feet wide. Lot lines will be retained with the Post Preserve neighborhood.
- 3) Open space. They will have 12.8 acres of open space spread throughout the community. The open spaces will be usable, complement the site, and preserve the rural character along Hyland-Croy Road.
- 4) Preservation of the historic barn. They have reworked the storm basin to be able to retain the historic barn with this project.
- 5) Hyland-Croy Road setbacks. There will be a 100-foot setback along the roadway. There will be extensive landscaping and mounding along the roadway, preserving the rural character. The homes will front onto a secondary street that will connect with Hyland-Croy Road.
- 6) Community engagement. That has occurred.

They believe they are proposing a plan that meets the desired goals for this site.

Charles Ruma, Sr., Virginia Homes, 485 Metro Place S., Dublin, OH, stated that the only additional item he would point out is that the interchange that is being built will end up at the intersection of Hyland-Croy and Post roads. That will necessitate the closing of Post Preserve Blvd., which will eliminate the neighborhood's Post Road access. The neighborhood's access will be through this proposed development to Hyland-Croy Road. The location of the ingress and egress through their site has been determined by the City's Engineering Department

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that the northernmost 1/3 of the site that has larger lots will have a lower density than the remainder of the site. What would be the density of that northern section?

Ms. Martin responded that the Community Plan recommends 1 – 2 du/acre in the upper, northern portion and up to 3 du/acre in the lower portion. She has not calculated the density separately. However, as a 45-acre site, prior to the right-of-way take, she had calculated the distribution as 121 single-family units.

Mr. Grimes requested Engineering's overview of the intersection with Hyland-Croy Road and the flow of traffic on that road and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Michael Hendershot, City Engineer, stated that with any proposed development, there are concerns with the traffic that will be generated. There are requirements in place in order to handle those concerns properly. Those details will be part of the Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan stage. That will include a Traffic Impact Study, conducted by professional engineers, which models the traffic on the existing roadways, evaluates the impact of the anticipated additional traffic on the surrounding roadway network, and recommends mitigation measures for that impact.

Mr. Grimes stated that as he understands it, that evaluation has yet to occur.

Mr. Hendershot responded affirmatively. Discussions regarding projected traffic flows and any recommended mitigation measures would be part of a rezoning application. However, there are current CIP projects scheduled to handle the Post Preserve neighborhood access prior to the completion of the interchange construction. Part of the necessary modification will be the extension of Springview Lane and Stillhouse Lane to a single street creating a new access point onto Hyland-Croy Road. This project is required by ODOT to eliminate the Post Preserve Blvd. intersection with Post Road, due to the change and limited access right-of-way created by the US33/SR161/Post Road interchange. The current CIP also contains an intersection improvement project for that newly created entry onto Hyland-Croy Road. The CIP and the anticipated development will accommodate the necessary improvements.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the new on/off ramp construction has a timeframe.

Mr. Hendershot responded that the US33/SR161/Post Road interchange project is expected to be bid in early 2022. The tentative construction completion date is June 2025.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the preservation consultant's and staff's recommendations regarding the historic buildings.

Ms. Martin responded that the property located along Post Road is included in the City's Historic and Cultural Assessment, which was adopted in 2017. A specific review prepared by the City's consultant was based on a site visit, including a review of the barn and other structures. The consultant's recommendation based on the seven integrity markers of the National Parks Service was that, ideally, the entire farmstead would be preserved intact. However, if only one structure were to be preserved, the largest barn alone meets all the eligibility criteria to be considered historic. Staff is supportive of the recommendations and acknowledges that the applicant has selected the latter of the two. That item has been suggested as a discussion question for the Commission.

Mr. Schneier inquired if it was staff's position that retaining only the barn would be sufficient.

Ms. Martin responded that staff has no position at this time. After tonight's discussion, they would be able to solidify a direction.

Mr. Way inquired if the intersections with Hyland-Croy Road were predetermined and fixed, or if flexibility existed concerning the intersections.

Ms. Martin stated that for the most part, they are predetermined and consistent with the City's Access Management Plan that was adopted by City Council in 2006.

Mr. Ruma, Sr. noted that Jerome Township retains some jurisdiction along Hyland-Croy Road, so was involved in determining the access points for this site to Hyland-Croy Road.

Ms. Martin stated that, as part of the previous development proposal, there was significant coordination between City of Dublin Engineering and Union County Engineering to reach agreement on the access points.

Mr. Way stated that the reason he asked was that it would appear if the Hyland Glen Drive were moved further north, it would create more equal spacing between the intersections, potentially creating a safer circulation. Did the developer give any consideration to locating the large vs. small lots differently?

Mr. Ruma, Sr. responded that the intent is for the 60-foot wide lots to be one, empty-nester project, much like the Riviera home products. They would prefer those homes to be located back to back.

Mr. Ruma, Jr. stated that part of that intent also was to locate the larger lots adjacent to the Post Preserve neighborhood.

Mr. Fishman requested clarification of the preservation intent. Would the home also be preserved or perhaps the entire farmstead? If so, who will be responsible for restoring it? What are the plans?

Ms. Martin responded that based on the information currently available, there are no specific plans. In other neighborhoods that have been developed that contained historic structures, if the structures are

preserved, they are dedicated to the City in a reserve of open space. The City would become the owner and be responsible for maintaining that historic and cultural resource. Which or how many structures will be preserved is part of the Commission's discussion tonight. The location of the stormwater basin will be generally in the location shown; however, as the site layout is refined with the Preliminary Development Plan and further engineering studies are done regarding the necessary volume, re-configuration of the stormwater basin could occur.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the decision regarding the historical properties would be the City's.

Ms. Martin responded that it would be the decision of PZC and City Council with the rezoning. However, historically, responsibility of the preservation of historic properties retained has been the City's.

Mr. Ruma, Sr. pointed out that the lowest portion of the property, where the house and barn are located, is adjacent to Post Road. Originally, their plan did not include preservation of any of those buildings due to their state of disrepair, the barn being in better shape than the other structures. After reviewing the previous proposal's discussion regarding preservation of the historic barn, they decided to re-shape the pond along Post Road to provide adequate space to retain the barn.

Ms. Call requested clarification of the process and timing when a historic preservation resource is dedicated to the City.

Ms. Martin responded that the City has not had a case like this in recent history, and some processes have changed over time. The process would need to be coordinated with the Directors of Development and Facilities. The framework is established with the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, but the actual dedication of open space occurs when the Final Plat is recorded with Union County.

Mr. Ruma, Sr. stated that they were involved with the preservation of a historic barn in a similar situation – the Conine Farm, Wedgewood Glen, off Smoky Row in Dublin. They were able to proceed by protecting the barn structure during development. After it was completed, the City rehabilitated the structure for preservation purposes over the next few years. They have done this previously and are confident with that process.

Mr. Supelak stated that the City would be placing the property owner in a double jeopardy position in asking for the land to be dedicated to the City but also penalizing them for giving up the open space.

Ms. Martin responded that the land would still count toward the required open space.

Mr. Supelak inquired, whatever the preservation ultimately consists of, who would design the site. Would a decision be made to preserve the site without knowing its intended design?

Ms. Martin responded that a conceptual open space would be provided with the Preliminary Development Plan, but open space is not fully designed until the Final Development Plan. The developer and staff are experienced in defining those details. The Commission is asked for feedback regarding the land use and the site layout. It appears the Commission is indicating there should be some preservation of the historic structures.

Ms. Rauch stated that Commission feedback is requested whether the proposal meets the criteria of the Code and the Community Plan, and if the Commission desires preservation of one or all of the historic structures.

Mr. Fishman inquired if whatever decision is made regarding the historical structures would affect the size of the retention pond.

Ms. Martin responded that all of those items would require further study. The development team has engaged a civil engineer. With a formal application, more details would be provided; however, all stormwater on the site would be managed per the City of Dublin Stormwater Regulations.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the pond would be a detention, not retention pond.

Mr. Hendershot clarified that retention ponds are the wet basins; detention ponds are the dry basins. There are other stormwater measures that could be proposed. Permeable pavers and underground storage facilities are options that could be considered with a design engineer, as the project moves forward.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call asked the Commission members to provide input on the following discussion questions.

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the single-family land use and overall density?
- 2) Does the Commission support the conceptual site layout including streets and lots?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual open spaces including preservation of natural feature and cultural resources?
- 4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Ms. Fox thanked the applicants for engaging the Post Preserve residents. That is one of the first items the Commission looks for and appreciates. It is reassuring that the layout was initiated with the intent to address the concerns previously raised. While she is happy to see that the proposal includes single-family homes, she is also supportive of cluster homes. She would not be opposed to a little more density in the southern portion of the site. Although there is not much opportunity for a different layout in the northern portion, is there any opportunity for cluster housing in the lower portion of the site, breaking up the linear layout of the typical suburban development? Although the site is constricted by its long and narrow dimensions, there are two great amenities on this property:

- 1) The historic farmstead is a gateway entrance to Hyland-Croy Road, and provides the neighborhood a buffer between the nearby commercial site and the roadway. She would prefer the entire homestead be preserved, excluding the toolshed. What opportunities could exist with preservation of the farmstead for future social connection purposes? The City is looking for infill developments to offer walkable amenities, places around which a sense of community can be created.
- 2) The greenway leading to the Red Trabue Preserve. With the contemplation of the 2035 Framework Plan, Council is considering formation of a major east-west greenway across the City. The Preserve could be an entrance to that greenway. Would it be possible to incorporate a layout that would take advantage of an opportunity to view this amenity?

Ms. Fox invited the applicant to comment on the potential of the above opportunities.

Mr. Ruma, Sr. responded that Post Preserve is adamant about having adjacent single-family that is similar in nature to the existing homes in Post Preserve, and they have attempted to ensure that occurs. On the east boundary adjacent to Post Preserve, the lots have a 130-foot depth. This will preserve the existing tree line, but it will also preserve the ability to build homes similar to those adjacent in Post Preserve. In regard to the other point, there are three points of access predetermined by the City, which dictate how traffic must flow through this subdivision. Not only must that roadway be maintained, but due to their concern about traffic, Post Preserve residents are opposed to a roadway directly to Hyland-Croy Road. Currently, the neighborhood is comprised of stub streets. Altering that to a more direct route is a matter of concern to those residents. Finally, as was pointed out, this site is very narrow. Taking into consideration the required streets, size of the lots, the 100-foot setback off Hyland-Croy Road, and the need to preserve consistency of the lots adjacent to the existing neighborhood, there is not much room. Adjusting it differently would require marginalizing the product. Incorporating high-density cluster housing will require multi-family development, which is strongly objected to by Post Preserve.

Ms. Fox stated that Post Preserve residents may be concerned about the construction of an apartment complex. With cottage cluster units, it might be possible to have more attached, 1.0 or 1.5 story units. They could then focus on providing the homestead within the cottage community.

Mr. Ruma responded that might be possible, if they did not retain the 11 lots that are adjacent to Post Preserve, which are the larger lots. Because there must be a roadway to service those lots, not much

latitude remains to include cluster housing. However, in reality, 60-foot lots are essentially cluster housing.

Ms. Fox responded that she is not opposed to that density. What she is looking for are more usable, walkable, socially connected spaces that will encourage the residents to walk down the street and talk to their neighbors. In some 55+ communities with smaller homes, the residents appreciate being able to take a walk to a community center, pool or a garden. With the farmstead amenity and the greenway to Red Trabue Preserve, it would be nice to orient the lots to be more amenity-focused than street focused. She understands the constrictions of the site and is just putting forth the challenge. She would like to see the entire farmstead preserved, as it is a great opportunity for the City, a gateway to Hyland-Croy Road and an amenity for the neighborhood by fostering social connectivity.

Mr. Ruma stated that the report calls for the farmstead to be preserved; is she calling for something more?

Ms. Fox clarified that it would include the house and the barn.

Mr. Ruma responded that he has a different position regarding the house, because it is in serious disrepair to the point of being dangerous. It would require significant work to enable utilization of that structure.

Mr. Grimes stated that, in general, he likes the number of lots and the layout, which would be good for the adjacent Post Preserve neighborhood. His concern is what effect would preservation of the barn or additional structures have on the City's long-term plans for the farmstead. That would impact how the lots on that end of the property would be laid out. If only the barn is retained, how would it be utilized? It would need to be a "walk to" only feature, as parking in that area is not desired. He is concerned about long-term plans with the preservation of that or more structures. He is also concerned about traffic. Hyland-Croy Road is becoming increasingly busy, particularly with the very busy Post Road-Hyland-Croy intersection. Currently, the streets that will empty into Hyland-Croy Road are very quiet, narrow, stub streets. There now will be three access points to Hyland-Croy Road. He is in support of the single-family land use and overall density; however, he would like to see the details of the Traffic Impact Study. In regard to retention of the cultural resources, he might be supportive of retaining the barn only, if there were a long-term City plan for that resource.

Mr. Ruma clarified that the most southern point of ingress/egress is a right-turn in and right-turn out.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the proposed plan, although he could also be supportive of increased density, if it could be accomplished in a creative manner. With respect to preservation, the applicant is willing to preserve the barn. The question is if the City wants to accept that offer. If the applicant does not want to preserve anything else, he would not be supportive of requiring it. Without the City's acceptance of the barn and the terms and conditions therewith, he would not be interested in seeing even the barn preserved.

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the proposed plan and density. This is a very tight site, and the linear plan is dictated by that. Having followed this site for a number of years, he believes this is the solution ultimately necessary to enable development of this site. He believes the existing homestead and pond could be a design opportunity. He would not preclude what should be saved without first considering the open space design opportunities with the potential preservation of the structures. It could be an exciting amenity. It is a valuable piece of land that should have some specific design considerations. Such consideration would clarify what structures could be restored, and if restored, how they would be a positive component of the design and plan.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Mr. Way's comments. This is a narrow site. He would not be in favor of any greater density due to Post Preserve's concerns about traffic. This site is very close to US33. He viewed the historic homestead and read the consultant's review. The house was added to as late as 1970. The existing structure is no longer a true historic structure. We should look at the opportunities of preservation of the buildings, which would require the input of some design experts. Open space can

be very important in this neighborhood. He would be supportive of elimination of the lot next to the pond, as it would provide a better open space. He is supportive of the single-family use and the lot layout.

Mr. Supelak expressed support of the single-family development, density and layout. He complimented the applicants on the proposal. This is not an easy lot to develop, as there are many prescribed moves. They have arrived at a nice treatment of the site with the density adjusting as it converges with the main thoroughfares. He is not yet willing to express support of preserving only the barn. He would prefer to understand what could be done with the site. He agrees that the design of that must be parallel with the proposed development for the Commission to be supportive of the overall proposal. Perhaps this would require involvement of the City's Parks and Recreation Department. When it is designed, he could be amenable to reducing the number of structures preserved. Although at this point the plan is only conceptual, he is supportive of the stonewall, a buffering element by the interchange exit ramp. There is a great opportunity for a gateway element at that arrival point into Dublin. It is more of an opportunity for Dublin than for this particular community, and we need to be mindful of that in considering the potential design of the homestead.

Ms. Call stated that her thoughts were very similar to Mr. Way's, so she would not re-state them. Summarizing the Commission's responses to the four discussion questions: the Commission is generally supportive of the single-family land use, density, layout, conceptual open spaces and preservation of the natural spaces. As the conceptual design progresses, the Commission and the applicant will work together to achieve a plan that the developer is proud to build and the City is proud to showcase. It is apparent that the record of the discussion from the previous proposal for this site was studied, because the applicant addressed many of the concerns accurately. Engagement of the community was very important and appreciated. Does the applicant request additional clarity on any of the items? The applicants thanked the Commission for their helpful feedback. They will attempt to make any necessary adjustments to the plan to ensure it is the product they want to present and the City desires.

Ms. Call reiterated that the Informal Review provides a concept; the traffic details will be addressed in the next step of the review process.

Mr. Way noted that in response to the previous suggestion to eliminate the one lot next to the retention basin – if that were to occur, the road could be pulled to the north, away from the homestead.

Mr. Ruma reminded the Commission that the previous application had 250 units, 150 of which were an assisted living facility. The remainder of the units were crowded into the remaining portion of the site. They have attempted to meet the concerns and objectives of Post Preserve, and giving up another lot would be difficult.

Ms. Fox stated that it would be important to engage either Council or Parks and Recreation staff to answer some of the questions raised. She would prefer to preserve the entire homestead, if possible, as it would be consistent with the direction of the Community Plan.

Mr. Ruma stated that retaining all the buildings, some of which have no merit, would not work with the site drainage facilities and the intersection. Preserving the homestead would require moving the retention pond further north, which would result in a loss of more lots.

Mr. Supelak inquired what would happen with the land resulting from the vacation of Post Preserve Blvd. Would that land be available, if more area were needed for the pond?

Ms. Martin responded that staff had already explored that idea. However, Post Preserve Blvd. contains a number of utilities within its right-of-way. Even though that access point will be closed, the City will

retain the right-of-way for utilities. There is also a waterline on the north side of that roadway. It would not be possible to locate a retention basin over a waterline.

Mr. Ruma thanked Commissioners for their time and very helpful feedback

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

2. Flex/Industrial Building at 6777 Crosby Court, 21-061INF, Informal Review

A request for the construction of an approximately 140,000-square-foot flex/industrial building located within the West Innovation District. The 9.3-acre site is zoned ID-3 Research Assembly District and is southwest of the intersection of Crosby Court with Dublin Plain City Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of an application for construction of an approximately 140,000-square-foot flex/industrial building located on a 9.34-acre site within the West Innovation District. 6777 Crosby Court is located on the western boundary of the City of Dublin within the West Innovation District (WID). The site is north of VA Data, which is developed with four data center buildings, and west of Command Alkon an office/warehouse building. The West Innovation District (WID) is similar to the Bridge Street District in that it was implemented to allow for flexibility in design and to expedite review procedures within a specific area of the City. Applications within the WID that meet the requirements listed in Zoning Code Sections 153.036 – 153.042 are eligible for review and approval by the Administrative Review Team (ART). The ART has the ability to approve Administrative Departures, which are procedures that allow the flexibility necessary to permit minor deviation from the Zoning Code to address unusual conditions, both known and unforeseen, under circumstances that do not alter the permitted uses. In the event that an application varies from the requirements of the Code or is denied approval of an Administrative Departure, applications would be reviewed and determined by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). The site is owned by the City of Dublin and is currently vacant. This is a joint application between the City of Dublin and VanTrust Real Estate, who would develop the site in partnership with the City.

Proposal

This is a request for non-binding feedback on the site layout, particularly the number of parking spaces and the parking locations. The proposal is for a 140,000-square-foot multi-tenant flex/industrial building. The building will be comprised of warehouse and office uses, with the significant majority of it being warehouse use. The proposed building is centrally located on the site, with two vehicular access points located along Crosby Court. Vehicular access to the site is only permitted along Crosby Court, as access is prohibited along Houchard Road and Dublin Plain City Road/SR 161 by the recorded plat. The site plan depicts parking along the north, west, and east sides of the building, with several loading docks to the south of the building. The WID Code requires all parking, except for visitor parking, to be located along the side or rear of the structure. The site has three street frontages. The multiple street frontages create a challenge in locating parking on the site that meets zoning requirements. Based on the uses and the WID parking requirements, 56 parking spaces would be required; the proposal is for 163 parking spaces. The intent of that number is to provide maximum flexibility and marketability for a future tenant. At this point, the tenant is unknown. This proposal meets the pavement setbacks, acreage and lot coverage requirements, with the exception of the parking setbacks. Based on Code, the parking requirement must be 30 feet; the proposal encroaches within 15 feet of pavement. One linear retention basin is provided along the southern property line of the site. The orientation of the pond is conceptual and will need to be modified to meet the needs of the site and the requirements of the City Stormwater regulations.

Staff has offered the following discussion questions for the Commission's review:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout including parking locations forward of the building and stormwater management basin configuration?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Parking Adjustment to allow for 163 parking spaces where 56 are required?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of a 15-foot front pavement setback along Houchard Road and Dublin Plain City Road?
- 4) Any other considerations by the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Phil Rasey, VP of Development, VanTrust Real Estate, 775 Yard St #300, Columbus, OH 43212, stated that they have been working with the City's Economic Development team on this site and look forward to the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Gilger, Ec. Development Director, stated that this is a challenging site with three different road frontages. The intent is that this building will accommodate up to four tenants with individual entrances. The site plan provides forward parking in order to best serve the four front entrances, in addition to separating the parking for visitors and employees from the loading dock area. The intent is to emphasize the jobs and production versus warehousing. That is the purpose of the request for additional parking. The stormwater pond has been included in the plan as a placeholder, but it has not been designed or engineered at this point. Because the site drains to the south, the pond will be configured on the south side of the site.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that he realizes this is an industrial site; however, no landscape buffer appears to be provided along SR161 or the other roadways. That is unusual for a City-owned site. Are there any plans for buffering from SR161 and Houchard Road?

Ms. Gilger responded that the nearby VA Data building has a significant buffer with the setback, bikepath and landscaping. They would anticipate something similar for this site on all road frontages.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there would be buffering specifically on SR161.

Ms. Gilger responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there would be a retention or a detention pond on the site.

Ms. Gilger responded that has not yet been designed. The Commission's feedback is needed on the parking count and location before they could address how the stormwater would function.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would prefer the pond be a retention pond, which holds water, and that it be visible from the roadway, providing an amenity on the industrial site with a metal building.

Mr. Rasey clarified that the proposed building would be constructed of precast concrete not metal. Although there will be frontage on three roads, the intent is that the SR161 frontage be the primary frontage and be heavily landscaped. The building façade on that side would have architecturally interesting features, including glass on the corners and in the center. The intent is that the building would appear to be an office building, similar to their Blazer Parkway project. Although the site drains to the south, they could consider the possibility of locating the pond in a manner to emphasize the aesthetics of the site.

Mr. Way inquired if it would be possible to connect to Houchard Road.

Ms. Gilger responded that there would be no ability to do so, due to how the site is platted. Access to Houchard Road is not permitted. The only access permitted is from Crosby Court.

Ms. Fox inquired if this would be a 2-story building.

Mr. Rasey responded that it would be a 1-story building approximately 32 feet in height. That height could accommodate 2-story office within, but initially, it will not be 2 stories.

Ms. Fox stated that it would seem a compromise could occur if the pond were removed. That would permit more opportunity for parking spaces and provide more frontage on SR161. More landscaping features would be possible, which would create a more attractive look than would exist with two rows of parking. Could Engineering staff confirm the possibilities of moving the retention basin?

Mr. Hendershot responded that possibility could be explored. The tentative location of the pond is due to the site's drainage outlet to the southeast. Other stormwater control measures could be utilized, which can be defined as the design progresses.

Mr. Way stated that he is attempting to understand the nature of this product. There is no tenant; the proposal would maximize the site; parking space is being increased; and there is a massive loading dock area to the rear of the structure. This looks more like a distribution center than a flex building. What happens if the anticipated user does not come along, and all that paved area is not needed? He understands they are attempting to create an opportunity for an anticipated tenant, but should that not occur, this site will have a large amount of unused paved surface.

Ms. Gilger stated that this is a joint project, and both parties share the goal of securing certain tenants for this building. Within the West Innovation District (WID), there is a shortage of research, development and production space. This type of building is highly desired in the Dublin market. The City has been losing out to projects on Industrial Parkway that are seeking this type of development. The City does not want to see this turn into only a warehouse or distribution center. Having visitor and employee parking at the front of the building lends itself toward multi-tenant and production space, as it separates the employee spaces from the loading docks. Because this site is located in the WID and along the US33 Smart Corridor, this building will be marketed to a different commercial demographic. There is very low vacancy in this type of building within Dublin. Typical users for this type of space have a large office presence at the front. VanTrust Real Estate has recently built some of these buildings in Dublin, so Mr. Rasey can elaborate on the type of tenants seeking this form of space.

Mr. Rasey stated that they believe there is a shortage in the market for this type of higher-end, manufacturing/warehousing space. Due to the cost of rent with this building, the market itself will weed out the types of tenants not sought. This opportunity was recognized last year, when a potential user approached the City Economic Development Director. Unfortunately, the space available for that user had insufficient parking space. His company is willing to take a speculative risk to provide a facility for the City Economic Development team to market. Having a building that would be deliverable in months, rather than a year, would be an attractive opportunity for the City. Although 140,000 square feet is not one of the larger buildings they have constructed, it will be appropriate for four tenants. The cost of these types of buildings is increasing, and constructing a 140,000-square foot building would be cost prohibitive for many businesses. They are attempting to achieve as much flexibility as possible with the building to attract a different size of company. They are looking forward to working through this project with the City.

Mr. Way thanked him for the helpful explanation and his assurance regarding the market for this project.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call asked Commission members to provide input on the following discussion questions:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed site layout including parking locations forward of the building and stormwater management basin configuration?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Parking Adjustment to allow for 163 parking spaces where 56 are required?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of a 15-foot front pavement setback along Houchard Road and Dublin Plain City Road?
- 4) Any other considerations by the Commission.

Ms. Call stated that in her line of work, she works on the software for distribution centers. The size of those distribution centers ranges from 400,000 to 1.4 million square feet. Apparel companies, aeronautic parts, and wine distribution are uses of these types of buildings. She points that out to provide scale perception of the proposed 140,000 square foot building.

Mr. Way stated that he understands their goal of providing a building that will serve the market. He understands that the organization of the site – service docks and stormwater management to the rear, and the fact that this may be a multi-tenant building - results in a need to distribute parking around the building. He would like some information on the architecture. While the applicants have indicated this will be a showcase building with glass and will front onto Dublin-Plain City Road, little architectural information has been provided. Without those details, he would want to see more berthing and screening of the parking; with the 15-foot setback, that will be a challenge. Perhaps after seeing the architecture, his concerns with the setback will be alleviated. He has concerns regarding the amount of paving, but if the proposed number of parking spaces is necessary for this use, he would have no objections.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is in favor of the proposal. He defers to the expertise of the applicant and the City's Ec. Dev. Department.

Mr. Grimes stated that this is an efficient use of the parcel. Crosby Court currently appears capable of accommodating the proposal. At this point, it is difficult at this point to project future road widening needs due to increased traffic volume. It is also difficult to assess the available greenspace due to the manner in which the site is laid out. The stormwater management component needs to be addressed, and there is a large amount of pavement. Concerning the 15-foot pavement setback -- it will be essential to see that in context. He is supportive of the concept to fill a market need within the City.

Ms. Fox stated that she is cognizant of the fact that the City wants this partnership, and she would like to see the project happen. However, a 2-story building would be permitted here, and reducing the building footprint would reduce the percent of pavement on the site.

Ms. Gilger responded that in the US33 Smart Corridor, a significant amount of mobility research is occurring, which requires high bay access to a drive-in dock at the rear. Those require special ventilation, so, typically, a very tall one-story building is preferred. A 2-story building would not lend itself to the type of research and development that is desired.

Ms. Fox expressed appreciation of the explanation regarding the proposed footprint. She has no objection to adding needed parking spaces, but she is concerned about adherence to the WID principles and intent regarding the open space and streetscape. In this case, we are discussing a 15-foot setback and the amount of pavement in front of the building. The important elements identified in the WID Master Plan are building setbacks, stormwater management, building heights, parking methods and roadway character, especially on main thoroughfares. The text states that, "the landscaping along the roadway edges should be lined with shade trees, flowering trees that provide an identifiable character to the road..." SR161 leads into Plain City. The Master Code was written to enable the Commission to address

that corridor in the best way. She would not object to one row of parking in front of the building, as there is opportunity for parking to be located to the rear of the building. She strongly believes a 30-foot setback is necessary along SR161, although perhaps 15 feet would be acceptable on Houchard Road. She agrees that using the retention basin as a water feature in front of the building would enhance that side of the site. She noted that a bikepath along SR161 would connect to the new Union County trailway on Industrial Parkway; therefore, that space should not be narrowed to the point that there is insufficient space to add a bikepath connection. She reiterated the need for a 30-foot setback along SR161 and for one row of parking in front of the building and additional parking at the rear.

Mr. Supelak stated that Ms. Fox's concern regarding the setback along Dublin-Plain City Road is also his primary concern. He could be flexible on the other issues. He is supportive of the proposed development, which maximizes the site. The only issue is the amount of "things" consuming the surface; those should be adjusted to achieve the 30-foot pavement setback along SR161. While it would be preferable to increase the setback along Houchard Road, he could concede on that point. He looks forward to seeing the landscape plan and architecture, as the project develops.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Mr. Supelak's and Ms. Fox's comments.

Ms. Call stated that she also agrees with the previous comments, particularly the need to increase the setback along the Dublin-Plain City Road, which is a major arterial. She has less concern with the setbacks along the two minor roads. She is uncomfortable with 163 parking spaces. The Commission has reviewed previous proposals requesting additional or reduced parking for speculative reasons, but the Commission's decision has been to remain with the required number. She is confident the appropriate stormwater management solution will be identified by City Engineering. She agrees with the suggestion to make the retention pond a water feature on the site, if possible. She inquired if the applicant required any additional clarity.

Ms. Gilger responded that they would look at ways to increase the SR161 setback. However, two rows of employee and visitor parking are needed at the front of the building, rather than near a warehouse dock door. They would work with Engineering on the stormwater management plan and also will ensure the viewshed on SR161 meets the desired standards.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Way noted that there appears to be an incomplete loop circulation around the project. A vehicle would need to exit to Crosby Ct. and re-enter the site. He would encourage that loop be completed onsite, without the need to re-enter the public right-of-way.

Mr. Supelak expressed agreement with the recommendation.

Ms. Fox inquired the possibility of moving the building further back on the site, which could provide sufficient room for two rows of parking at the front of the building. Other means of stormwater management could be used as an alternative to the retention pond. The streetscape view is an important factor. The Code was written to ensure that element occurred, and it is important that the City itself abide by Code. She would recommend moving the building back.

Mr. Rasey responded that they would look into the possibility of removing the retention pond to adjust the layout as suggested. They were attempting to align with the curbcuts on Crosby Ct., so must also consider that factor.

Ms. Call thanked the applicants for their presentation.

NEW CASES

3. All R Friends, PID 273012214, 21-024FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for the construction of an approximately 8,000-square-foot building with associated site improvements. The 3.3-acre site is zoned Planned Commerce District, Thomas Kohler, Subarea B1 and is located northwest of the intersection of Parkwood Place with Emerald Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for All R Friends on a site located west of Emerald Parkway at the northern end of the Thomas Kohler Planned Commerce District (PCD). Access to the 3.3-acre site is provided by a private drive from Emerald Parkway. This private drive, which is part of the subject parcel, also provides access to the Gardner School, located immediately to the east of the site, as well as to the BMI Federal Credit Union, located immediately to the south of the site. The site is presently undeveloped and includes a shared stormwater management basin in the northeast corner, as well as a shared-use path that extends along the western edge. A landscape buffer along the western edge of the site provides separation between commercial properties and the neighborhood to the west. The PCD development text requires buildings to be primarily earth tones -- muted and natural. Permitted exterior materials include warm-tone brick and stone, with stucco, wood and decorative tile permitted as accent materials. In January 2021, the Commission provided an informal review and feedback for an approximately 8,200-square-foot building. The proposed site plan essentially is as was presented to the Commission in January. The Final Development Plan aligns with the majority of the items included in the Preliminary Development Plan development text for the planned district. The use of the proposed 8,200-square-foot building is Adult Day Care with 26 parking spaces. Access is provided via the private drive with a circular landscape island and turnaround. The site contains an established landscape buffer. The landscape buffer requirements include both a mound and a split rail fence. The applicant has reflected the mound on the plans; however, staff recommends a Minor Text Modification to eliminate the requirement for a mound, as it would conflict with an existing mature tree stand. The split-rail fence and landscape detail would be retained, as they enhance the character of the rear of the property along the publicly accessible shared use path.

Proposal

The proposal is for a 1.5-story, square building, approximately 28 feet in height, which meets the overall height requirement. The building has a pyramidal roof form with a central entry on the east elevation. Roof pitches for the primary structure are proposed at 5:12 where 6:12 is permitted, which does not meet the development text requirements; therefore, a Minor Text Modification is required. The building will be primarily clad in brick, stucco and stone. Staff has conditioned that the architectural stone feature on the sides of the building be modified to terminate at the eave line of the building, which is more architecturally integrated. The applicant has provided conceptual renderings for the Commission's consideration, which include signs; however, no sign details were provided with this application. A future Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) will be submitted to the Commission for consideration of a sign package. The applicant is required to coordinate with the City of Columbus and City of Dublin regarding fire, sewer and water service for the site.

Staff has evaluated the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of three Minor Text Modifications and approval of the Final Development Plan (FDP) with five conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Chris Jolley, Project Manager, Darin Ranker Architects 5925 Wilcox Place, Suite E, Dublin, OH 43016, stated that currently, All R Friends services are located within a rented facility elsewhere in Dublin. They are interested in finalizing this permanent location for their services. He noted that adjusting the roof pitch to 6:12 would require changing the central clear-story windows, which are open to a central space, not a second story. Raising that height would also require raising the height of the roof, which would then exceed the overall permitted building height. It would also throw off the proportions of the interior space, making it appear more of a chasm space. Most of the clients of this business do not drive. The facility has vans that provide transportation services for their clients.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired the reason the applicant wishes to change the roof pitch from 6:12 to 5:12.

Mr. Jolley responded that it is a function of the size of the building and having a central space with a clear-story window. If a 6:12 pitch is used, the clear story volume will be extended higher. It would cause the height of the upper roof to be increased. The overall height of the building would exceed the allowable height of 35 feet. Additionally, the volume of the space the clear story opens into would be out of scale.

Ms. Fox inquired if All R Friends has any clients in wheelchairs.

Ken Cook, All R Friends, applicant, 5950 Wilcox Place, Dublin, OH 43016, responded affirmatively.

Ms. Fox stated that the reason she asks is that the entrance doorways are only three feet wide. Because she has a family member in a wheelchair, she understands the need for entranceways that provide a double-door opening. In her view, 3-foot wide doorways do not accommodate disabled clients adequately; navigation of the space becomes awkward.

Mr. Jolley responded the entry door would be 3 feet wide (36 inches). Per ADA accessibility standards, the minimum width is 32 clear inches. An 18-inch, operable sidelite is located adjacent to the doorway, which would provide a 4.5-foot wide opening, if needed.

Ms. Fox inquired if there is a transparency requirement for the front façade.

Ms. Martin responded that there is no transparency requirement. The development text was established in 1996; those items were not contemplated at that time.

Mr. Way inquired about the circulation at the entrance. The two columns supporting the roof are very close to the curb. There is potential for incoming vehicle conflict and inadequate circulation space for people and wheelchairs around the columns. This space seems constrained for clients who need adequate space for maneuverability.

Mr. Cook responded that the entryway at this Dublin facility is as large, maybe larger, than those at their other facilities. In most cases, the vans park in the parking lot, then the passengers exit the vans and access the building. Only in a heavy rain would the vans be pulled directly up to the portico. Van exits are to the side or the rear of the vehicles, and the parking lot will provide adequate space for that maneuverability.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the entryways. There are two equal entryways, but is one primary? Mr. Jolley responded that the facility operates with two teams based upon the needs of the individuals. Each group enters through a different set of doors to access their primary space within the building.

Mr. Fishman stated that in view of the amount of parking needed, there seems to be an excessive amount of pavement in front of the building. In such parking lots, tree wells are provided within the parking lot to break up the mass of the space.

Mr. Cook responded that was the result of the Fire Department's requirement for sufficient clearance for their trucks to circulate through the area.

Mr. Jolley stated that not that many parking spaces are needed here; a double-load corridor would have been sufficient. The amount of space is to provide turning space for a fire truck. The reason more pavement has been provided than needed is for fire truck maneuverability, due to the central island feature in the center.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that concerning the architecture -- minimal accents are provided around the fenestrations on the front elevation. Perhaps there are changes in the brickwork courses to articulate headers and sills, but those have not been depicted. He would advocate for precast stone sills and headers to help articulate the fenestrations more fully. The parking lot is a large swath of blacktop. Even with the firetruck circulation, there are ways to reduce the surface area. However, this is a complicated site, and the applicants are addressing it well. He has no other concerns.

Mr. Fishman stated that the large circle seems to be increasing the blacktop area, which we attempt to avoid in Dublin. Perhaps it could be re-designed and broken up differently, but in a manner that would still provide adequate space for fire truck turning. While the two entrances and pillars are not particularly attractive, he understands the need. His primary concern is the parking lot.

Mr. Grimes stated that the applicant has made good use of the site. He is supportive of the Minor Text Modification. He has no objections.

Mr. Schneier stated that the lighting modification was an improvement. He has the same concern with respect to the amount of pavement. He cannot define an appropriate solution, but would be supportive of one, if proposed.

Mr. Way stated that he also is supportive of the Minor Text Modification. He has no concerns with the proposal, other than remaining unconvinced of sufficient wheelchair clearance between the planting beds and the piers. In regard to the excessive pavement, if a wider sidewalk was implemented in front of the building, that would reduce the amount of asphalt. The renderings shown do not define actual dimensions, nor are the planters shown; however, they appear to depict insufficient room for wheelchairs to traverse the space.

Ms. Fox expressed agreement with the concerns. These details are important. What is the width of that sidewalk?

Mr. Jolley responded that it is approximately 8 feet wide.

Ms. Fox inquired the distance between the building and the column.

Mr. Jolley responded that it would be approximately 5-6 feet.

Ms. Fox inquired the distance between the column and the front of the planting bed on the sidewalk.

Mr. Jolley responded that it would be at least 3 feet.

Ms. Fox responded that would be insufficient space. Perhaps the portico could be extended outward further and the sidewalk space increased. Although not a critical item, she is not in favor of two entrances, as they would not be usable for future tenants. As was pointed out by Mr. Supelak, although the other facades provide more interest around the window, additional architectural detail is needed on the front façade, such as precast stone lentils and sills. Finally, where will the lighting fixture be placed on the front façade?

Mr. Jolley responded that there is a wall sconce adjacent to the sidelite at each door, and cam lights are provided in the soffit at the entryway.

Ms. Fox inquired if lighting would be provided on the back patio area. What time does the facility close?

Mr. Cook responded that their clients leave prior to 3:00 p.m.

Ms. Fox stated that within the City, many water retention basins are becoming waterholes. The Community Plan and Code require riparian barriers or plantings around retention ponds to make them healthier and more attractive. She would recommend adding some natural plantings as riparian barriers around the edges of the pond.

Ms. Call stated that in addition to Ms. Fox's recommendation for riparian barriers, the conditions stated are to work with staff to ensure proper navigation for ingress/egress and work with staff to incorporate additional architectural detail on the front elevation.

Mr. Fishman stated that there are parking lots in Dublin where driveable brick has been added as directional guidance. That material could add some interest to a vast sea of blacktop. He is supportive of Ms. Fox's recommendation for landscaping around the pond. A fountain could also aerate the pond and add aesthetic interest.

Mr. Cook responded that their plans include a fountain in the pond.

Ms. Call requested Mr. Hendershot to comment on the turning requirements for fire trucks.

Mr. Hendershot responded that the Fire Code requires sufficient space for a fire apparatus to circulate through the site. They must be able to turn around, although it is not necessary that it be a continuous movement. An auto-turn exhibit was provided in the meeting packet that demonstrated that turning movement. Staff could work with the applicant to evaluate the opportunity to minimize the amount of pavement necessary to meet the Fire Code turn-around requirements.

Mr. Cook clarified that they initially attempted to minimize that parking lot. It was expanded due to the Fire Department's turning radius requirements.

Ms. Call inquired if the 3 additional conditions would meet the Commission's concerns.

Commission members were supportive of the additional conditions.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would have any objection to the additional conditions suggested. The applicant indicated they had no objection.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following 3 Text Modifications:

- 1) Modify the development text requirement to permit a roof pitch of 5:12, where 6:12 is required.
- 2) Modify the development text to remove the requirement for a landscape mound on the west portion of the site.
- 3) Modify the development text to permit LED site lighting, where high pressure sodium lighting is required.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with 8 conditions:

- 1) The architectural elevations be revised, reducing the height of the stone accent walls to be even with the roof eaves, prior to building permitting and subject to Staff approval;
- 2) The applicant apply for and receive approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for signs before applying for Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards;
- 3) The plans be revised to remove the landscape mound, subject to Staff approval.

- 4) The applicant work with Staff to address outstanding landscape concerns prior to building permitting, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) The applicant obtain approval from the City of Columbus and City of Dublin of the proposed fire hydrant location to the satisfaction of the Washington Township Fire Department;
- 6) The applicant work with staff to ensure proper navigation area for building ingress and egress, taking into consideration increased accessibility, subject to staff approval.
- 7) The applicant work with staff to provide additional architectural detail on the front elevation of the building, including lintels and sills, subject to staff approval.
- 8) The applicant work with staff to reduce the blacktop area forward of the building while still accommodating a Washington Township Fire Department fire apparatus, subject to staff approval.

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

4. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991, 21-033FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for 154 attached, single-family residential units with 0.71 acres of open space. The 11-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

5. Towns on the Parkway at PIDs 273-008811 & 273-012991, 21-034FP, Final Plat

A request for approval of a Final Plat for subdivision of 11 acres to establish four lots, three public rights-of-way, and associated easements. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat for the development of 154 attached single-family townhomes homes, approximately 0.7-acre of open space, and three public streets on an ±11 acres site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). The Bridge Street District review process was realigned in 2019 to more closely mimic the Planned Unit Development process. The three steps required in that development process are Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan and Final Development Plan. In March 2020, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed a Concept Plan for the development of 168 attached single-family townhomes, 0.9-acre open space and three public streets on ±11.6 acres site. In December 2020, the Commission reviewed and approved a Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for 155 attached single-family townhomes, 0.7 acre of open space, and three public streets. In February 2021, the Commission provided feedback on an Informal Review of the proposed architecture for the development.

Site

The site is approximately 11 acres in size and is located north of John Shields Parkway, west of Village Parkway and south of Tuller Road. It is surrounded by existing development, including Tuller Flats to the west, existing office and hotel buildings to the north, Dublin Village Center to the east, and the Greystone Mews neighborhood to the south.

Proposal

The Final Development Plan (FDP) proposal is to establish 4 blocks of development with 154 attached single-family units distributed across 29 buildings, which vary in size from three units to eight units, with

0.7-acre of open space. The open space will include 3 pocket plazas and 4 pocket parks. Because the amount of open space provided is deficient 3,000 square feet, a condition to the approval will require the applicant to work with staff to submit a revised open space plan. Landscape details have been provided. Details regarding benches, bikeracks, pavers and screening are also included with the FDP. Conceptual renderings of the gateway character at the intersection of John Shields and Village Parkway were included in the packet. With a FDP, in addition to the site-specific standards, the Commission is tasked with reviewing the proposal in regard to building type requirements. Building types are generally based on use and form. The Single-Family attached building type is the building type in this development, which establishes the site standards. Some waivers and administrative departures were approved with the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) due to the curvature of the surrounding street network; however, an additional waiver is needed for Block D due to the increase in impervious lot coverage in that block. With the FDP, all building and architectural standards are required to be met. If not met, Administrative Departures and Waivers are required, as are requested with this FDP. The applicant has worked to incorporate the Commission's feedback and staff's comments and established seven architectural unit types. The intent is that these unit types will be combined in various groupings to provide architectural diversity. The Commission had requested a traditional architectural character for this neighborhood, which has been reflected in the final design. The designs are primarily clad in brick and cementitious siding. Many of the unique architectural features will be fabricated from polyurethane, which permits additional architectural detailing and is resilient and maintenance-free. Staff recommends approval of a Waiver to permit this material. [description of architectural details]. The applicant has provided a variety in side and rear elevations, which vary based on the footprint of the unit. [photo of typical rear elevation shown.] There are two gateway elevations. They will not have rooftop balconies, but will have a closed, full roofline to accent the open space. Five material color schemes were provided. They will be combined based on the architectural features of each unit type. A detailed building variety plan and a number of architectural character renderings were provided for the Commission's review.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends the Commission's approval of 4 administrative departures; approval of 10 waivers and disapproval of 2 waivers; approval of the FDP with 16 conditions; and a recommendation for City Council approval of the Final Plat with 4 conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, stated that the architect has tried to incorporate all of the input provided by the Commission during the past reviews. Casto has owned this property for several years, and recognized that an apartment development is not desired here. PulteHomes is able to provide the product the community needs within the Bridge Street District. They believe it will fit well within the greater fabric of the community. This project has evolved over time, and they are now presenting the fourth design iteration. When they began this development process, the anticipated price point of the units was \$300,000 - \$350,000. With the changes that have been made as a result of the Commission's direction, the price point has increased to the \$400,000 - \$500,000. They have no issue with most of staff's recommendations; however, there are two Final Development Plan (FDP) conditions they would like to discuss:

- (3) *Use of polyurethane trim.* It is important to be able to use that material on all building elevations; and
- (5) *Rooftop terraces should be prohibited from locations at end units of buildings.* They would like to have the ability to include rooftop terraces at the rear of the end elevations, which would be less impactful than front terraces.

Keith Filipkowski, Director of Construction Operations, PulteGroup, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that at the last review, there was general support for a traditional architectural style, so that has

been maintained. With these most-recent improvements, they have attempted to focus on the front entranceways. They have complied with Code in terms of the depths of the porches. For any full covered porches, there will be a 6-foot clear space, which will provide usable opportunities. They have articulated the appearance of the rooftop terraces, front and rear, and how those will be incorporated with the interrupted roof ridgelines. They have proposed that in the instances where front rooftop terraces are provided, they occur with the unit elevations that have the raised roof. That will allow the terraces to be hid within the envelope of the existing roof condition. They have also worked on the appearance of the architecture on the side and rear elevations, incorporating some specialty masonry details. There is an elevated sense of architecture for the gateway in the southeast corner. They believe they have responded to all of the Commission's comments to the extent possible. With respect to the polyurethane trim – achieving the finer details in the trim that will be provided with the front entryways requires use of a material that permits those details. In his research, he has not found another material that offers a pre-manufactured solution that will ensure quality. They have requested use of that material be permitted on the ground level of the units. In terms of the end unit rooftop terraces, the intent is to offer the rooftop terraces on the front elevations of those units with raised roofs. Rear rooftop terraces would be available for any of the units, including end units, as the end units are the premium units on any building. They will address the visibility factor for both the unit owners and the public.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak inquired if the units would not be built until the buyers had made selections re. elevations and balcony details, or would the construction be completed first and the units subsequently sold.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the building string would be identified first, working with staff to ensure a mutually agreeable building variety. After those elements are identified, buyers would be offered an option of interior structural options associated with the units. The rooftop terrace would also be an option. Ideally, the units would be sold before construction begins, but that may not occur. Construction may begin with a 50% sold occupancy.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there would be other exterior elements on which the buyers would have discretion in addition to the rooftop terraces.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that they would have no other discretion on the exterior elements.

Ms. Fox inquired if all buyers of units would be permitted to select a rooftop terrace on the front elevation. Mr. Filipkowski responded that a front rooftop terrace would be available only for units with raised roof heights.

Ms. Fox inquired if that might mean only two or three of six units that would have raised roof heights.

Mr. Filipkowski responded affirmatively. Rear rooftop terraces, however, would be available for any of the units, although not both front and rear on the same unit.

Ms. Fox complimented Mr. Filipkowski on the many attractive architectural changes made. She remains concerned about the potential appearance of the front rooftop terraces on the streetscape. She also would like to have clarification of the polyurethane trim material that is proposed. Will a particular brand be used; does it have a warranty; and what is its durability for both lower and upper levels?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the intent is to use Fypon for the decorative trim. It is an excellent product both in terms of durability and appearance sustainability. They are very comfortable with the product and use it for much of their single-family and townhome architecture.

Ms. Call requested staff's comments concerning the product. Is it a product typically used within the City, and if so, is distinction made between its use at ground or upper levels?

Ms. Martin responded that there is precedent for this type of product being requested in the Bridge Street District; however, previously, it has not been approved. There may be merit here, given the fact

that this type of architecture is far more detailed than the modern, streamlined forms existing elsewhere in the District. Staff recommended approval of the synthetic material on the upper stories, but had recommended wood or an alternate synthetic material be used on the ground story. The architect has indicated that potentially, some of the architectural detailing may need to be simplified at the ground story if made from a natural material. Historically, however, this material has not been approved.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the box bays and Juliette balconies would be ornamental only. Although the Juliette balcony has doors, the depth would not accommodate use.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the Juliette balcony projection is 12 inches. Code permits it to project up to 24 inches but not extend 6 inches past the fenestration. Although, they did not provide a dimension in the materials, they would ensure they were compliant with Code.

Mr. Fishman inquired if this is a condominium project with an homeowner association (HOA) responsible for maintenance of the buildings.

Mr. Underhill responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman stated that previously, polyurethane material has not been approved. He has observed many polyurethane windows that are faded, warped and damaged. What is PulteHome's history of use with this trim material?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that Fypon is a proven, superior industry material. The geometry of a long fence plank is different than that of compact corbels and dentils, which would not readily permit warpage. Pulte Homes has one of the best warranties in the industry, including on materials, mechanical plumbing, water infiltration and structural. They stand behind their products, as does Fypon. Field-built trim that is not being painted or otherwise maintained has potential to rot, warp and twist.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there is a site the Commission could visit and view use of the material, such as single-family homes that would now have some age.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that there would be examples that they could identify and provide to the Commission, if not on a Pulte Home, perhaps on an older home.

Mr. Fishman stated that this is a large project within Bridge Park, and its character will be impactful as it ages. Using quality materials on a project this size is very important in such a prominent location. He is unfamiliar with the product and would like to view the product in use and with age – 10 years old, perhaps. How long has this product existed?

Mr. Filipkowski responded that he is unsure about its inception of use. However, their concern is the same as the Commission's, and in their opinion, the best product to use is the Fypon. Otherwise, they would not suggest it.

Mr. Fishman stated that, regardless, he would like to see it aged. Has Mr. Filipkowski personally viewed it in an aged condition? This is a very important project, on which slim brick also is being permitted, and he has serious concerns about the quality and longevity.

Mr. Filipkowski clarified that they have proposed real brick for the project rather than slim brick.

Mr. Fishman thanked him for the clarification. Quality and longevity are the important elements to him. He has seen many other products that did not meet the anticipated expectations.

Ms. Fox inquired if Fypon is the white, solid synthetic material that can be purchased at many lumber and Home Depot stores. It looks like wood with a simulated wood grain.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that he believes that is a less durable, composite material. The same articulation in moldings cannot be found in the products in those stores. They will be using a product with specialty details consistent with traditional architecture.

Ms. Fox stated that she raised the question because there are concerns about durability of the product, and she has had the experience of replacing wood window trim that had rotted 2 or 3 times. It was replaced with an alternative synthetic product approximately 10 years ago, and today, looks just like the original wood product. It has resisted all water damage and remained consistent in both hot and cold

temperatures. She is not opposed to a synthetic product, particularly if he would have to simplify the architectural details. If staff is convinced that the product will meet the required durability and aesthetic standards, it could be appropriate when this level of detailing is desired.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the amount of open space. One of the waivers would permit 27,000 square feet where 30,000 is required, but the plan indicates 30,000 square feet.

Mr. Underhill responded that his understanding is that it will be 30,000 square feet. He requested Mr. Chillog to address the question.

Greg Chillog, Planner/Landscape Architect, Edge Group, 330 W Spring St, #350, Columbus, OH 43215 stated that as a result of recent discussions with staff, it is now essentially a technical or accounting issue. Some of the boundaries depicted on the submittal have been revised and other boundaries adjusted to make up the deficiency. When the report was written, the amount of space was deficient because of an inaccurate boundary, but they have now identified a way to remedy the deficiency.

Mr. Way referred to the C-1 Pocket Park. A low, curvilinear wall is shown in the plans, but there is no reference to what material is used.

Mr. Chillog responded that is actually curb detail, so would be made of concrete.

Mr. Way inquired if it would not be made of granite, which would match the planters along the street. Mr. Chillog responded that it would not be granite.

Mr. Way inquired about the wood fence that ties two of the buildings together.

Ms. Call inquired if that is the same wood fence for which staff is recommending disapproval.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that if that means the fence will be eliminated, he is supportive of that decision.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox reiterated her compliments on the architecture. The changes made have elevated this project to a level that she is confident will be proven to be timeless and attractive. She appreciates the applicant's responsiveness to the Commission's previous comments. If staff is confident, she would be supportive of the use of polyurethane for this project. She is not supportive of giving choices with the front rooftop terraces. She has no concerns with rooftop terraces on the rear elevation. Great care has been taken with creating the architectural variety, and she is concerned that the front rooftop terraces could become the focal point instead of the attractive architecture. In regard to the detail at the rear of the buildings, the balconies and the garages appear all the same, which is a disservice to the rest of the architecture. Could the garage door styles and railing materials be varied for particular units? At the street level, all the garages appear the same. She drove through Bridge Park earlier and observed that many of the Juliette balconies in Bridge Park, even the smallest, contained chairs. These balconies are popular, providing opportunity to sit outside. She would prefer a modification that would permit these balconies to be 3 feet deep, which would permit an individual to sit on their balcony. It would provide more interest and activate the street. The pocket park is located at a significant, gateway corner. She would like to see that be more interestingly designed and landscaped – perhaps with some artwork or a fountain, something that sets it off as the entrance to neighborhood. The entrances to Greystone Mews, next door, are designed more comprehensively and distinctively. Another issue, which also was pointed out by staff, is that some of the elevations look the same; for example, Elevations 3 and 5 look the same, as do Elevations 3 and 6. As depicted, only a change in materials has been made. It is important that staff work with the architect to ensure there is a good variation from one building to another, even if it means an additional style is necessary.

Mr. Fishman stated that he assumes this project will have a well-funded HOA, which would have the responsibility of addressing any issues with the appearance of the polyurethane. He appreciates that the applicant took the Commission's previous comments into consideration. He was pleased to learn that instead of thin brick, full brick will be used, which reflects quality. He agrees with Ms. Fox's preference to see the rooftop balconies at the back, not the front, and that the Juliette balconies be usable. Those that currently exist in the District are being used. He appreciates all the efforts made on this project.

Mr. Supelak stated that this project is architecturally rich and detailed. This has not been easily achieved, given the array of styles present. Although a good variety has been provided, if that variety is evenly distributed, it becomes homogenous in a different way. That is the danger at this point. It has been some time since he last used Fypon, but he could be convinced of its use on the lower level. Wood cannot be detailed as well as Fypon, a molded, synthetic material. Perhaps it would be beneficial for the Commission to view an actual sample before committing to its use. He agrees that there is a need for a focal element in the gateway park and the park in the southwest corner. He agrees that there are opportunities to add some variation in the garages – the Clopay catalog offers several designs. Variation in the rails on the upper balconies would also improve the appearance of the rear of these buildings. He really appreciates the high-impact ends – the box bays at the gateway and the herringbone details. He believes a few more could be added, particularly near the main park on the west side. Buildings 14, 15 and 16 have ends in proximity to the park, where there will be significant foot traffic. The ends of those buildings would benefit from having box bay bumpouts. Aside from those suggestions, this is an attractive project. Kudos to the applicant for navigating this process with the Commission.

Mr. Grimes stated that there has been a thoughtful development of this project. In regard to the polyurethane project – perhaps this is the time to try it. The materials may be what is needed to differentiate this project. He likes the idea of a 3-foot Juliette balcony. He has no objection to both front and rear terraces. It is obvious from the number of waivers and conditions that staff has worked diligently with the applicant to be responsive to the Commission's previous comments. He thanks the applicant for offering this beautiful project; he would like to see it happen.

Mr. Schneier stated that this iterative process has yielded a fantastic result. He echoes a couple of his fellow Commissioners' comments. Having the Juliette balconies be functional would be preferable and consistent with the City's desire to encourage opportunities for people to be outside and offering both front and rear rooftop terraces is a plus. He has no objection to the polyurethane material. The joint effort invested has achieved an excellent result.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with fellow Commissioners' comments.

Mr. Way stated that, as a new member on the Commission, this is his first review of the proposal. This is an incredible project and will be a great addition to this area. He is amazed at the amount of investment made in the "look and feel" of this development. It is spectacular. His only comment also concerns the gateway corner, which at this point is not reflecting a "gateway" impression. Some additional elements could make the difference. He does not believe a concrete seatwall there would fit. The planters along the street are granite. If that feature were to be used here, stone should be used.

Ms. Call requested clarification on the direction the Commission desires to give on the polyurethane and prohibiting rooftop terraces on the end units. The applicant has requested ability to offer rear terraces only on the end units.

Ms. Fox stated that she had not realized that a terrace, either front or rear, would be available on every unit. Her concern is that the feel of the front terraces does not appear to match the lower architecture. They appear to be cut out with only a rail added. Could they limit the number available on a building or could better integration with the lower architecture be achieved?

Mr. Supelak inquired if the percent of terraces at the front could be limited to a certain percent. Ms. Fox stated that they are only permitted on the units with the higher roofs, so are already somewhat restricted. However, the front terraces will change the view at the street level, so should they be permitted?

[Number and percentage of front terraces discussed.]

Ms. Fox stated that the reason she encouraged deep porch stoops and usable Juliette balconies was to offer ability for outdoor activity at the front and perhaps have less need for front terraces. She has no objection to the terraces at the rear, but would prefer not to see them on the front.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with Ms. Fox's position. What the architect has achieved with the beautiful architecture could be minimized with views of the front rooftop terraces.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission should see what 3-foot Juliette balconies would look like. He is not sure the Commission would like that look within the composition of these facades. He could not support that without first understanding how they would look.

Mr. Fishman agreed.

Ms. Call stated that it would be a shame for this project to come this far, then, at this point, require 3-foot balconies that we may not like the look of when constructed. It would be a disservice to the applicant, the Commission and to the City itself. We have an application on the table, and the Commission needs to make a decision on the conditions proposed. She has seen polyurethane peel and that material gives her some unease. Although an HOA will be responsible, it is preferable that there be no issues to address. The other condition in question is permitting terraces on the end units. In regard to front terraces, the roof articulation will limit the number of front terraces and prevent any two being side-by-side. What is the Commission's position on permitting some front terraces?

Mr. Supelak clarified that where there is a choice, front/parkside terraces will be the choice, so a maximum of 50% of the units would have front terraces.

Mr. Filipkowski clarified that in the instance where there is a reverse gable at the front or a box bay that engages with the main roof, that architectural element would not be disturbed. Rooftop terraces would not be available on those units, so the percentage of front terraces would be further limited. This plan has evolved, and although a terrace railing system with trim on the ends was proposed with the earlier iteration, that is no longer included. With 3.5 stories and parapet walls, the front terraces will be much less visible.

Ms. Fox stated that she would prefer the Juliette balconies be somewhat usable, but that will be an architectural decision.

Ms. Call inquired if there was consensus on permitting the polyurethane on both upper and lower stories. [Commission indicated consensus.] There was no request for staff to view material samples.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any questions or objections to the condition concerning landscape design details in the gateway park.

Mr. Underhill responded that a fountain would be difficult to add at this point, but they would look into opportunities for addition of artwork.

Ms. Martin indicated that it would be staff's expectation that granite be incorporated into the landscape design instead of concrete, which would result in a mix of materials, brick, granite and concrete.

Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, requested the recommendation to be clarified.

Ms. Martin responded that the recommendation was to replace the concrete curb and/or seatwall with granite. It would not be a holistic redesign of that space but an elevation of the material selections in the gateway open space only.

Mr. Callahan responded that they would work with staff to identify the right material solution there.

Ms. Call inquired if there was consensus on adding variety to the garage detail and railing.
(There was insufficient support to add that condition.)

Mr. Supelak noted that it would remain a suggestion, not a requirement.
[Conditions were reviewed and clarified.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following 4 Administrative Departures:

1. Section 153.062(E)(1)(a). General Building Types - Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials.

Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors to be constructed of primary materials.

Departure: Permit reductions in primary material percentages on facades with the following Elevation Models:

- Elevation Models 1, 4 and 7; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 76 percent
- Elevation Models 3, 5 and 6; Side Façade (High Impact Option) – 79 percent
- Elevation Models 5 and 6; Front Elevation – 79 percent

2. Section 153.062(O)(2)(a)2. Single-Family Attached Building Type - Lot Coverage

Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage shall not exceed 70 percent.

Departure: Lot coverage for Blocks A, B, and C shall not exceed 77 percent.

3. Section 153.062(O)(2)(b). Single-Family Attached Building Type - Height

Requirement: Story heights shall be a minimum of 10 feet and maximum of 12 feet in height.

Departure: Permit the 3rd story of proposed townhouse units to vary from a minimum height of 9.69 feet, and a maximum height of 12.17 feet.

4. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(2). Single-Family Attached Building Type - Non-Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: Minimum of 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.

Departure: Permit 12 percent transparency for side facades of Elevation Models 1, 2, 3, and 7.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following 10 Waivers recommended by staff:

1. Section 153.062(E)(1)(a) General Building Types - Primary Materials, Minimum Primary Materials

Requirement: A minimum of 80 percent of each building façade visible from a street or adjacent property, exclusive of windows and doors shall be constructed of primary materials.

Request: Permit Elevation Models 2 and 3 to provide a minimum of 70 percent primary materials at the front façade, and for all Elevation Models to provide a minimum of 66 percent primary materials with the non-High Impact Option.

2. Section 153.062(E)(1)(d)(h) General Building Types - Permitted Secondary Materials

Requirement: Permitted secondary materials are limited to details and accents and include glass fiber reinforced gypsum, glass fiber reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber-cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding. Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved as permitted primary or secondary materials by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: Permit architectural details, trim and shutters to be constructed of polyurethane.

3. Section 153.062(H)(1)(h) General Building Types - Windows, shutters, awnings and canopies, Window Proportions

Requirement: Windows in single-family detached, single-family attached, apartment building, podium apartment building, historic mixed-use, and historic cottage commercial building types shall have vertical proportions with architecturally or historically appropriate window divisions. Horizontally-oriented windows are permitted for these building types only on non-street facing building façades.

Request: Permit windows with a horizontal orientation on street-facing side elevations.

4. Section 153.062(O)(2)(a) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Lot Coverage

Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage for Single-Family Attached Buildings shall not exceed 70 percent.

Request: Lot coverage for Block D shall not exceed 85 percent.

5. Section 153.062(O)(2)(b) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Height, Minimum Finished Floor Elevation (FFE)

Requirement: That the FFE for the ground story be a minimum of 2.5 feet above the height of the adjacent sidewalk elevation.

Request: To permit the majority of the townhouse units to not meet the minimum 2.5-foot difference in elevation between the FFE and the adjacent sidewalk elevation.

6. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(1) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 20 percent transparency be provided on all stories of street facing facades.

Request: Reduction in the percentage of street facing transparency required for all side facades of all Elevation Models to the following percentages at street facing side facades:

- Ground Story - 17 percent minimum
- Third Story - 11 percent

7. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(1-2) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Blank Wall Limitations, Street Facing and Non-Street Facing

Requirement: Blank walls are not permitted. A blank wall is an elevation with 15 foot or greater stretch of façade by windows or other architectural elements.

Request: Permit a maximum 19 foot blank wall along the side facades of all seven Elevation Models at the ground story and 2nd story.

8. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(2) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Non-Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: A minimum 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.

Request: Reduction in the percentage of non-street facing transparency required for all rear and side facades of the following Elevation Models to the following percentages:

- All Elevation Models; Rear Façade--Ground Story - 6 percent minimum

- Elevation Models 4, 5 and 6; Side Façade--3rd Story - 11 percent minimum
9. Section 153.062(O)(2)(d)(3) Single-Family Attached Building Types - Building Entrance, Number Required on Street Facade
Requirement: A minimum of one principal building entrance must be located along the street facing building façade.
Request: Permit Buildings 14 and 16 to not provide a principal building entrance along the street facing façade.
10. Section 153.064(G)(1) Open Space Types - General Requirements, Size
Requirement: Pocket Plazas shall be a minimum of 300 square feet and a maximum of 1,200 square feet in size and Pocket Parks shall be a minimum of 0.10 and a maximum of 0.50 acre in size.
Request: To permit Pocket Plaza area to expand up to a maximum of 2,778 square feet and Pocket Park area to reduce to a minimum of 2,778 square feet.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with 16 conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including tree lawn and sidewalk widths, and adjustments to the on-street parking layout, as necessary, prior to submitting Final Plat to City Council;
- 2) That the site staking plan and Final Plat be updated to reflect Corner Side RBZ distances along Holcomb Street and Seville Street;
- 3) That proposed roof penetration locations be located on the non-street side of the roof ridge lines, and that vents and other utility elements be located on the rear façade of the building and painted to match the color of the adjacent exterior cladding material;
- 4) That the optional roof terraces be prohibited from the front façade of the end units of any building; and no two adjacent units, in any location, both have front terraces;
- 5) That the Juliet balconies, open porches and stoops comply with all dimensional requirements for installation and size;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to create a terminal vista along John Shields Parkway in the area of the mid-block pedestrianway through the specification of Elevation Models that can provide strong vertical architectural elements flanking the pedestrianway;
- 7) The applicant work with staff to develop a cohesive building to building variety concept that provides more balance in she amount of diversity proposed within each building through the measured repetition of elevation models and color schemes within each building;
- 8) That the applicant work with staff to resolve the discrepancies in proposed amount of open space provided;
- 9) That the applicant provide supplemental information regarding the underground stormwater management chambers to ensure no conflicts exist with the proposed landscape plans in these areas, subject to staff approval and prior to submitting for building permits;
- 10) That planting plans for all areas of the site to receive landscaping be updated to include plant specifications, locations and quantities, subject to Staff approval prior to submitting for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant work with staff to preserve the maximum number of existing street trees along Tuller Road/Village Parkway, utilizing similar tree protection methods employed during the construction of Tuller Flats along Tuller Road to the west;
- 12) The applicant submit a final detail for space between vehicular driveways, not utilizing gravel mulch between the driveways, subject to staff approval;

- 13) That the applicant work with staff to refine the planting plan and street wall details to screen the vehicular use areas located within 20 feet of any right-of-way, as required by code;
- 14) That the applicant revise the layout of the proposed bollard lighting along the mid-block pedestrianways to a staggered pattern, and provide photometric site data for the areas of the proposed bollard lighting;
- 15) The applicant submit a final phasing, subject to staff approval, prior to submittal of the Final Plat to City Council.
- 16) The applicant revise the landscape design details for the gateway corner in accordance with the Commission discussion specifically to incorporate public art and to increase granite, brick, and/or other accent materials, subject to staff approval.

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

Mr. Grimes, moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Plat with 4 conditions:

- 1) The applicant remove all RBZ information from the Final Plat;
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council;
- 3) The applicant update the open space provisions to align with the Final Development Plan;
- 4) The applicant add public access easements in any areas where publicly accessible open space is proposed.

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

Ms. Call thanked the applicants for working with the Commission on this product -- 90% of which was invested by the applicants.

Mr. Underhill responded that the process has resulted in a fantastic product. This is a good example of how public-private partnerships can work.

COMMUNICATIONS

- The Commission thanked staff for the joint training session on May 17. The goal is that the bodies will continue to improve their team effort, which will be constructive for applicants, staff and members.
- Ms. Fox indicated that Council has begun discussion of "big ideas" for the 2035 Framework Plan. Commissioners will be involved in the envisioning process, as it continues. She would provide more details at the next meeting.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, June 3, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council