



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 6, 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. Ms. Fox was absent [excused].

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, JM Rayburn

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the April 1, 2021 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

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 one case is eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening -- Burger King, Amended Final Development Plan, and inquired if any member wished to move the item to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested the item be moved to the regular agenda.

CONSENT CASE

2. Burger King, 6315 Perimeter Drive, 20-20AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

A request for site modifications for a drive-thru restaurant on an outparcel lot of the Avery Square Shopping Center. The approximately 3-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of Avery-Muirfield Drive with Perimeter Drive and zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modification to the Development Text:

- 1) Under Avery-Muirfield Drive Outparcels, Parking and Loading sub-section: To permit the six spaces on the north side of the building on the northern outparcel to have a minimum dimension of 8 feet in width. Should the site redevelop, the site shall be required to comply with the City of Dublin Zoning Code Section 153.200.

and approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following two conditions:

- 1) The applicant select a composite panel gate color to complement the building, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The applicant verify that the existing light poles meet the maximum height requirement.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

INFORMAL REVIEW CASE

1. Muirfield Village Golf Club at 8670 Muirfield Drive, 21-057INF, Informal Review

A request for an Informal Review of the proposed construction of a new grounds facility and associated site improvements for the Muirfield Village Golf Club. The approximately 3.5-acre site is located east of Muirfield Drive, ±900 feet south of the intersection with Whittingham Drive, and zoned Planned Unit Development District, Muirfield Village.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Rayburn stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of the proposed project. An Informal Review provides opportunity to receive feedback from the Commission in the formative stage of the development proposal. The site is part of a larger 36-acre parcel that includes a portion of the Muirfield Village Golf Course, which is heavily landscaped and maintained. The course includes many different water features, streams, vegetation and mounding throughout the site. Five existing grounds facilities buildings occupy the site including a two-story building used by the Muirfield Village Golf Club for offices and maintenance. The site has approximately 530 feet of frontage on Muirfield Drive, which provides the single vehicular access. Pedestrian access is provided via a shared-use path located on the east side of Muirfield Drive.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to demolish the five existing grounds facility buildings and construct two, single-story buildings on the site. A new administration and maintenance building has an L-shaped footprint and is proposed near the southwest corner of the site along Muirfield Drive. A new

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) building will be located northeast of the proposed administration and maintenance building, in which fertilizers, chemicals and associated equipment to support operations of the golf club grounds will be stored. The existing washpad and canopy structure will be maintained in a new design. A surface parking area comprised of 49 parking spaces and one ADA-accessible space will be located to the west and north of the proposed administration and maintenance building. A dumpster pad is proposed along the western edge of the parking area, and the existing entry drive from Muirfield Drive to the facility would be relocated approximately 160 feet to the north. The mounding and landscaping will be modified to infill the gap left from relocation of the entry drive. The applicant is proposing the construction of two, single-story, pre-engineered metal buildings. The design of the administration and maintenance building will include a stone watertable of cast stone and bronze aluminum clad windows. The upper portion of the building is vertical metal siding in a beige color to match other Muirfield Village Golf Club buildings. The roof is proposed to be sheathed in a metal roofing material in a bronze color. The IPM building will match the administration building, with the exception of the stone watertable. An existing, six-foot wood fence provides screening of the site from Muirfield Drive. A new wood panel fence and gate is proposed at the new drive entry, and a new wood fence is proposed along the western property line to maintain the screening from Muirfield Drive. The applicant has not yet provided details on relocation of the ground sign at the existing access point or how the existing shared-use path and on-road bike lane will be addressed; those details will be required with a formal application. The Commission is requested to consider a proposed demolition, the site layout, architectural design materials and associated site improvements. The following questions were provided to guide the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Board supportive of the proposed site layout and improvements?
- 2) Does the Commission support the proposed building design and materials?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed relocation of vehicular access and the associated gate and fence details?
- 4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Applicant Presentation

Jay Boone, Partner, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce St, Suite 300, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, stated they are attempting to enhance, re-organize and clean up the existing site. Some of the buildings have reached their life expectancy. The intent is to use architectural aesthetics, maintain the existing color palette and add fencing and new landscaping materials to enhance the site. To improve the appearance, stone has been added on the west and north sides, although passing vehicles on Muirfield Drive will be unlikely to see over the berm and fence.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Grimes stated that it appears that the new structures will have a significantly lower profile than existing buildings; the rooflines are lower. He requested clarification of the changes.

Mr. Boone responded that is correct. The eave on the new building is approximately 14 feet, with the peak at approximately 18 feet in height. The existing building is probably 20-22 feet in height.

Chad Mark, Superintendent/Director of Grounds, Muirfield Village Golf Club, Dublin, OH, responded that the existing buildings are 22 – 25 feet in height.

Ms. Call stated that there are 49 parking spaces and one ADA-accessible space. The ADA standards that she consulted indicated that if there are over 26 parking spaces, two ADA spaces are required. Is there an exception in place due to the site's function, perhaps?

Ms. Rauch stated that for an Informal Review, staff has not fully evaluated all the details; however, the formal application would be required to meet the standards.

Mr. Way requested clarification of what fence would be retained and what would be new.

Mr. Boone stated that the existing chain link fence on the south side will be retained.

Mark Larrimer, Moody Engineering, 300 Spruce Street – Suite 200, Columbus, 43215, stated that the wood fencing on the other three sides would be replaced.

Mr. Way stated that there appear to be two types of wood fence – the existing wood fence and the new wood fence at the entrance, which is a different design. He requested clarity of where the new fence and the older fence style would exist.

Ms. Martin stated that the existing wood fence is included as a reference only. The proposed changes include the retention of the chain link fence on the south and the replacement of the existing wood fence on the other three sides with the new design.

Mr. Way responded that he had thought the existing wood design was being retained except at the entrance. He requested confirmation that all the wood fence would consist of the new design, except for the chain link fence on the south side.

Mr. Larrimer confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Way stated that the new buildings will be larger in mass than the previous buildings. The chain link fence to the south will not provide adequate screening for the residents to the south. Why would they not replace the chain link fencing, as well?

Mr. Boone responded that it would be possible to do so.

Mr. Way stated that he believes it would be a very nice gesture for the residents to the south.

Mr. Way stated that the staff report refers to decorative plants around the west and north sides of the administration building. While he sees them on the north, he does not see them on the west side; only a sidewalk is shown. That side, however, is the front of the building.

Chet Cruce, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce St, Suite 300, Columbus, Ohio, 43215 stated that because the plan is informal, they have not yet drawn up the landscape plan, but they have discussed it. They will be matching the existing landscaping materials at the front gate and the club entrances at all entrances of the building.

Mr. Way stated that he was inquiring primarily about the west elevation of the new building. The narrative states that there will be landscaping on both the north and west sides. Although he can see it on the north side of the building, on the west side there appears to be only sidewalk.

Mr. Cruce responded they would need to put in beds, rather than the sidewalk.

Mr. Way stated that if the building is located six feet further to the east, it would be possible to insert a bed. He also noticed that the dumpster pad is depicted in front of the building. This is a large site. Could a better place for the dumpsters be identified than near the front door of the building?

Mr. Cruce responded that issue remains under discussion. There has been discussion about locating them between the IPM center and the existing washpad.

Mr. Way inquired about the existing entrance, which cuts through the berm. Will the berm and the existing landscape be replaced?

Mr. Cruce responded affirmatively. The dirt removed to construct the new entrance further north will be moved down to make the berm continuous. Deciduous and evergreen trees also will be added to continue the screening where there is currently an entrance.

Mr. Fishman inquired if Mr. Boggs could comment on an earlier question he had posed regarding conflict of interest.

Mr. Boggs stated that in the interest of transparency, Mr. Fishman had contacted him to inquire if his membership in the Muirfield Village Golf Club could be considered a conflict. The Commission has reviewed other cases while Mr. Fishman has been serving on the Commission. As he is not a member of the leadership of the club, having no fiduciary interest in its operation, the legal opinion is that he may participate in this discussion. However, Mr. Fishman wished to bring that to everyone's attention, in the interest of transparency.

Mr. Fishman stated that he was surprised to see all-metal buildings with pre-fab roofs. In Dublin, typically, metal buildings are permitted only in industrial areas. They certainly have never been allowed in Muirfield Village. The existing wood fence is a six-foot fence, but it was grandfathered in. When he was on the Board of the Muirfield Association, per Code, the Association was not permitted to install a new 6-foot fence around the pool. He is surprised by the proposed fencing but even more surprised at the metal, pre-fab buildings with low-pitch roofs. None of those exist anywhere in Muirfield Village. The shallowest roofs permitted in Muirfield are those with a 6:12 pitch, and certainly no metal buildings.

Ms. Call inquired when the City of Dublin has permitted construction of metal buildings.

Mr. Rayburn responded that he is aware of no such occurrence, which is the reason for one of the discussion questions. Perhaps the IPM building could be considered a unique scenario because it will house fertilizer and other chemicals, but that would warrant the Commission's discussion. Staff, however, was not supportive of that proposal for the administration and building. The applicant can provide more explanation on the reason the metal material is proposed.

Mr. Fishman noted that when the Muirfield Association previously constructed a building in which to store fertilizer, poisons, etc., they were told a metal building would be permitted if the exterior was clad in wood. They also were required to have a 6:12 minimum pitch roof. Driving around Dublin, he has seen no metal buildings other than in industrial areas, and certainly not within Muirfield. Other than the one 6-foot fence along Muirfield, which was grandfathered in, no other 6-foot fences have been permitted.

Ms. Call inquired if staff has any history on the six-foot fence.

Ms. Rauch responded that they have no history on how that came to be. There are no development text requirements available. Therefore, it would be a matter of the Commission's discretion. A four-foot fence would be more consistent with previous decisions for both residential and non-residential sites.

Mr. Schneier noted that in the interest of full disclosure, he also is a member of the Muirfield Village Golf Club. He would like to hear why the applicant proposed the use of metal. Was it strictly on the basis of cost?

Mr. Mark responded that it was primarily due to the fact that in the IPM Center, chemicals and dispersible granulars and liquids are stored. When he looked into requirements regarding storage of these materials, he learned that wood, which can absorb chemicals, is frowned upon. Therefore,

they were attempting to construct an environmentally friendly building in which to mix, load and store chemicals and the equipment used for the application thereof. All their sources have suggested metal as the most safe and economical material.

Ms. Call inquired about the administration building.

Mr. Mark responded that over \$2 million worth of equipment will be stored, maintained and serviced in that building. Although, there is an administration wing to the building, primarily the primary purpose of the building is the storage and maintenance of equipment, and the building is ventilated appropriately for that activity. A metal building also provides the most fire safety/resistance.

Mr. Boone noted that because there was a need for the IPM Center to be constructed of metal, from an aesthetics perspective, they did not want to change the material of the administration maintenance building.

Ms. Call stated that City operations involve many of the same uses and equipment. Is a staff member present who can comment on the City's facilities for similar storage of chemicals? The City also has an administration building in which millions of dollars' worth of equipment is stored.

Ms. Rauch responded that she does not believe the City's Service Center site contains metal buildings, but she would attempt to pull up that information while the discussion proceeds.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call led the discussion on the review questions, beginning with the first portion of the following question:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed relocation of the vehicular access and the associated gate and fence details?

Commission members indicated that they were supportive of the proposed relocation of the vehicular access.

Ms. Call stated that the City has not been supportive of 6-foot fences, particularly not solid 6-foot fences. There is the option of a 4-foot fence. What are the Commission's comments regarding the fence details, specifically the height and style?

Mr. Way stated that the berm and landscaping on this site are unique, and they provide a very effective screening. It does much to solve the visual issues of the site. In order to hide the ground-level items, the fence is appropriate. A 4-foot fence would be inadequate. Because of the berm, the view of the fence is essentially hidden. He is more concerned about the chain-link fence because of the residential community to the south. With the new, bulkier building, the residents will have a different view. He was happy to hear that the applicant had no objection to extending the wood fence to that side. He likes the proposed design of the wood fence; it is better than what exists. He is supportive of the proposed fence and design.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is puzzled by the fence. Since its beginning, the Muirfield Village development has not allowed any fences, and in Dublin, chain link fences are prohibited. There have been exceptions only in industrial areas. Even though one of the proposed buildings is an industrial type of building, this is not on an industrial site. The site is surrounded by a golf course and 2,800 private residences. If the Commission chooses to permit the wood fence, it would be a significant exception. It could be hid, however, by opaque landscaping and mounding. The previous fence was questioned several times when he was on the Board. He recalls receiving a letter from the Muirfield

Association many years ago, which stated that in every case, screening and containment should be achieved by landscaping rather than fences. Fences deteriorate as they age; landscaping improves. In regard to metal buildings, there are none in residential neighborhoods. In regard to the safety issue -- when he was on the Board of the Muirfield Association, a building for the Association was constructed for a similar purpose, and either a masonry building or a metal building clad in brick, stone or wood could be constructed. The pitch of the roof certainly does not affect the safety of the building; it could even improve it. In summary, he is not in favor of a wood fence that can be seen from the road or the neighbors' homes. The previous chain link fence was not appropriate. If it were to be approved with this case, the neighbors' view through that fence would be of a metal building -- an industrial site. Mounding and landscaping supersede fences. There is no place in Dublin that a 6-foot wood fence is permitted. He is opposed to both the metal buildings and the wood fence.

Mr. Schneier stated that no one likes the fences, but no one wants to see what is behind the fences. The height of the fence should be commensurate with what we are attempting not to see. Given the uses here, he believes a 6-foot fence is acceptable, although landscaping in lieu of a fence would be nice.

Mr. Grimes stated that he is supportive of the fence and its design. Replacing the chain link would be advisable, as well. Adding landscaping around it should hide most of the fence.

Mr. Supelak stated that the current site is quasi-industrial, so it needs to be screened, especially as it is adjacent to a residential community. He has no issue with either a 4 or 6-foot fence, although a 6-foot fence in this particular location makes sense. It would be lovely if, in place of a fence, the screening could be in large part, landscaping. However, he does not object to the fence and would anticipate the gaps in the current landscape screening will be filled in with this project.

Ms. Call stated that in general, she is not supportive of deviating from Code and making exceptions. For every argument for the exception, there is one against it. In the City of Dublin, historically and per Code, 6-foot privacy fences have not been permitted. From an aesthetic perspective, a 4-foot, semi-private fence for security flanked by dense landscaping is more in the spirit of the Muirfield Village lifestyle. The City is very green, has dense landscaping, and maintains its properties. Since that is the purpose of the IPM building, she would be supportive of a 4-foot, semi-private fence that is densely screened from adjacent neighborhoods to maintain the residential feel of the parcel. However, this is a very large PUD and has some flexibility. She would be interested in seeing the language of the PUD to learn what was originally permitted in this area.

Mr. Way stated that we have not really addressed security. In addition to the fence, there are also gates at the entrance. He understands that there are many items in this facility that they do not want people to have access to. He believes having a fence that secures this site and keeps people out is advisable. A 4-foot fence would not provide security or limit potential access to dangerous materials. In these days, that is very important.

Ms. Call noted that there are other sites within the City where the wrong access could result in less than optimal conditions.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any questions on this discussion item.

Mr. Boone responded that he does not. He is a firm proponent of security, and consequently, proposed the higher fence with screening attributes.

Ms. Call inquired if Ms. Rauch had information to provide on the City's service center. Ms. Rauch stated that the City's service center is within a PUD, which is comparable with this case. The development text for that site permits concrete/masonry units, which is what the majority of that building consists of. It is permitted to have a metal roof, as well. There are buildings associated with fleet maintenance that are within a different zoning, but with the same design requirements.

2) Does the Commission support the proposed building design and materials?

Mr. Supelak stated that some Commissioners have already expressed discomfort with the proposed materials, and he is, as well. These buildings are quasi industrial and provide a service function for the Muirfield Village Golf Club, but there are other service centers around the City who are required to have an approved CMU material. He would advocate that this site should abide by those requirements, as well.

Mr. Way stated that he understands that these are industrial buildings, have a certain function and will experience a high level of activity, with moving trucks and equipment. Durability is necessary. The City's Service Center looks very durable, and the buildings on this site would benefit, as well, from being constructed of more durable materials.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would agree. It is difficult to find justification for the metal material. As Ms. Rauch pointed out, the City Service Center buildings have a similar use and are not constructed of metal. It would appear that should be the case here, as well.

Mr. Grimes stated that the buildings have been proposed as a result of experience and years in the business; the applicants are aware of what they need. However, the form is less than desired. It is not what we would expect from this site, not only because of its presence within this community, but also because of the service provided to the membership and the greater community. In his view, the form should be improved to be more aesthetically pleasing and worthy of those in the golf community, who would appreciate something more complementary to its position within that community.

Mr. Fishman expressed agreement with his colleagues' comments, and he has been convinced of the need for a 6-foot fence. However, he does not want to see that precedent set. The fence would need to be opaquely landscaped for the following reasons: so that the neighbors cannot see the fence; because 6-foot fences are not permitted anywhere in Dublin; and wood fences are not permitted within the Muirfield Village development. He agrees that security is needed; however, in today's world, electronic security is easily provided. Teenagers do not have any difficult scaling 6-foot fences. His primary concern is that when the Commission deviates from Code, it sets a precedent. In regard to the building, he was very surprised that a metal building with a shallow roof has been proposed, as it is not permitted in Muirfield Village.

Ms. Call stated that her comments exactly mirror Mr. Supelak's comments regarding the building.

3) Is the Board supportive of the proposed site layout and the overall site improvements?

Mr. Fishman stated that in many areas, Muirfield Village has done a great job in providing opaque screening. He agrees with Mr. Way's suggestion to move the location of the building slightly, so that landscaping can be provided along the west side. For 40 years, Muirfield has emphasized the necessity for landscaping and mounding. It should not be any less for this facility. The landscaping should be outstanding, consistent with the Muirfield Village tradition.

Mr. Grimes, Mr. Schneier and Mr. Supelak indicated that they were supportive of the site layout and improvements.

Mr. Way stated that he believes the administration and maintenance building is appropriately oriented on the site. His only concern is the IPM maintenance building, which appears to be situated too closely to the southern property line -- the side that faces the residential neighborhood. He would recommend that the applicant explore the possibility of locating it further to the north. It might also improve the site circulation. The L-shaped layout creates a yard in the center of the site and helps to screen the yard activity from the surrounding uses; that layout makes sense. There is no landscape plan at this point on which to comment, but he would note that the frontage of this site on Muirfield Drive is successful because it consists of a fence, a berm and landscape. Those three components reinforce each other. He would like to see more combination of landscape and fence on the other sides, also berming, if the opportunity exists. It is important that they do not rely solely on the fence; it should only be one element, along with landscaping. Landscaping softens the view of the fence, which is the item of concern.

Ms. Call stated that she is generally supportive of the layout. She echoes Mr. Way's concerns about the adjacent properties, and she would be supportive of shifting the building to the north. The concerns have already been voiced. Muirfield Village does landscaping incredibly well, and the Commission is anticipating more of that as this application proceeds through the formal review process. Together, we can achieve something that is complementary to Muirfield Village and Dublin.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant has any questions concerning the last two discussion items. Mr. Boone responded that he would like to point out that the new building has been located further north than the existing building by several feet, so that suggestion has already been met. In regard to the suggestion to add stone to the sides of the building that are not seen -- would it be acceptable to add stone or concrete block only on the west and the north faces of the administration building, which are the only visible sides?

Ms. Call stated that she would not object to that argument for the building that functions more as a storage shed. However, on the administration building, even though the building contains an ancillary use for other functions, all sides should be treated the same.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission did not state that stone must be used, it could be masonry. He is not supportive of treating the sides differently; the whole building should be treated equally. He is not supportive of treating the IPM building differently, which is the first building seen on the site. All sides of all the buildings should be treated equally.

Mr. Supelak expressed agreement with Mr. Way's position. If standards are in place for other provisional service buildings, they should apply to the IPM building, as well. There are masonry units that can tolerate chemicals. At this stage of the review, he is not willing to grant relief for the back side.

Mr. Schneier and Mr. Grimes expressed agreement with the previous statements.

The applicants indicated they had no further questions.

NEW CASE

3. Germain Honda, Phase IV at 6715 Sawmill Road, 21-031FDP, Final Development Plan

A request for exterior and site modifications for an existing car dealership. The approximately 12.5-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is southwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for Germain Honda, Phase IV. The site is located within the Bridge Street District (BSD) and zoned, BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. The FDP is the final step in the 3-step development process. The site is currently developed as an automotive dealership. Under the recently adopted revisions to the BSD Code, in the future, this application would be eligible for an Amended Final Development Plan. Because that Code revision was not in place when the applicant began this process, the Commission has seen this case on several previous occasions. This site is located on the west side of Sawmill Road, immediately south of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. Today, the site is a single parcel, although it was originally several parcels with different uses, including a gasoline station, real estate offices, and automotive sales. [Slides of site shown.]

In 2018, the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed and approved Phase I, which included the demolition of a vacant 2,000SF building, parking, landscaping, and lighting modifications for a .64-acre portion of the site. In 2019, the ART reviewed and approved Phase II, which included parking, landscaping, and lighting modifications. In 2020, PZC reviewed and approved Phase IV, the Concept Plan, which included vehicular circulation, pedestrian connectivity, parking, lighting, landscaping, architectural modifications and signs. In 2021, PZC reviewed and approved Phase IV, a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), which provided building modifications and site improvements. The Final Development Plan (FDP) includes site access, vehicular circulation and pedestrian activity, parking, lot coverage and lighting, landscape screening and vehicle display. It also includes modifications to the new and used car stores. Phase IV implements a number of approvals identified with Phase II, including the removal of an access drive on Sawmill Road; the addition of an access point on Dublin Center Drive; parking lot modifications; and a sidewalk. It also includes the demolition of a metal form on the used car store, which will accommodate additional onsite parking. The demolition creates a larger building setback from the right-of-way, which is inconsistent with the development regulations of the BSD; therefore, a waiver is required from the Building Type standard. The existing site layout and existing use will remain. With the maximization of onsite parking, it will be possible to eliminate offsite vehicle storage. Sidewalk connections will be provided along Sawmill Road, a portion of Dublin Center Drive on the north side, and a portion of Dublin Center Drive along the west side. The sidewalk alignment prioritizes tree preservation while balancing the need to preserve mature trees. Due to the existing mounding and mature trees, the applicant is not proposing sidewalk along the curvature of Dublin Center Drive. Approval of a waiver with the Final Development Plan is required to permit the condition. Approval of a parking plan is also requested, permitting two vehicles per 1,000 square feet of building area plus one space per 2,000 square feet of outdoor display. Proposed in Phase IV are a total of 1,063 vehicle spaces, including: 406 parking spaces, 657 inventory area and 164 display spaces. The landscape plan includes grasses, lilac, hydrangea, honeylocust and dense yew shrubs. The intent of the landscape plan is to provide maximum screening of vehicular use areas, while providing selective viewsheds for vehicle display areas. A condition has been added that the height of the dry-laid stone streetwall be increased from 30 inches to 33 inches. This will provide full screening of the vehicle use areas.

The site lighting provided with this phase will be consistent with the LED lighting previously approved. The character of the new and used vehicle stores will remain the same as in the Preliminary Development Plan. The material will be the same as exists today but will be repainted alabaster white. A new architectural drum feature, consistent with the Honda brand, will be installed. The feature will be clad in the alternative silver metal panel, rather than blue. The used car store will mimic the new car store in a similar color and design. A Master Sign Plan will be scheduled for a future date for Commission review. Staff has reviewed the project against the available criteria and recommends approval of two waivers, a parking plan and the FDP with 4 conditions.

Commission Questions

Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance [Archall], 49 East Third Avenue, Columbus, OH 43201, stated that with him tonight are the landscape architect, Gregory Krobot and Tom Hart, who are available to answer questions.

Mr. Way stated that he has a question about raising the height of the stonewall from 30 to 33 inches to hide the vehicle display area. Part of the stonewall is located on top of concrete, and is only 1 foot, 6 inches in the car display area. Where would a 33-inch wall be?

Ms. Martin stated that the higher walls would not be in the vehicle display area. The walls that would be 33 inches in height would be those that accent the curvilinear sidewalk along Sawmill Road. Those walls are strategically placed with landscaping between with the intent of fully screening the vehicular use area, where parking or vehicle storage will be located.

Mr. Way stated that he did not see a plan that depicted the layout of the bollards in relationship to the display area. Are they located inside the stone wall on the vehicle display area?

Ms. Martin deferred the question to the landscape designer on the project.

Gregory R. Krobot, Landscape Architecture, 231 Buttles Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, stated that their original design included bollards with chains; the chains were removed at the request of staff. At that point, the 1 foot, 6-inch wall height was added for the vehicle display area.

Mr. Way responded that they are essentially lighting bollards; they do not deter traffic.

Mr. Krobot confirmed that their purpose is for illumination.

Mr. Way stated that the materials page references clear, anodized mullions; however, the renderings depict black mullions.

Mr. Todd responded that the intent is that they be clear, anodized to match what exists.

Mr. Way inquired if the dry-laid stone wall around the display area would have a smooth curve or be segmented, as the renderings appear.

Mr. Todd responded that the intent is that it would be a smooth curve. All the walls will have a smooth curve, not segmented.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has conducted earlier reviews of this project. Previously, there was significant discussion on the need to provide sidewalk connectivity with this project where

possible. It is unfortunate that the connection cannot be provided in the corner, due to the degree of difficulty and need to achieve a balance with tree preservation.

Mr. Way noted that, as a new Commissioner, he has not participated in the earlier reviews. He was struck by the fact that the plan shows sidewalk extensions to driveways, where they end. How does a pedestrian respond to that termination? Would it be necessary for them to retrace their steps or cross the road? This appears to be an issue.

Ms. Call responded that is one of the issues the Commission discussed previously. Although it is currently an issue, eventually, the parcel will be redeveloped. During that redevelopment process, the missing sidewalk connections would be prioritized. The most that can be done at this time is installing stretches of the sidewalk.

Ms. Martin stated that explanation is correct. While some sections of the sidewalk are not connected to anything, current developers must begin to add some sections of the sidewalk connection. The scope of the site and building modifications for this redevelopment is extensive, due to the need to achieve compliance with the Bridge Street Code. Sidewalk connectivity has been pursued to the extent possible with this applicant, particularly on the north side of Dublin Center Drive; however, it terminates at a T intersection. The only other connection point is at the intersection of Dublin Center Drive Road and Snouffer Road with Sawmill Road. The pedestrian crossing across Sawmill Road will now be accessible, as well as the COTA bus stop located on the frontage of this property.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following 2 Waivers to Zoning Code Section 153.065(I)(1)(F) – Walkability Standards:

- 1) To install pedestrian facilities along the perimeter of the site excluding the Dublin Center Drive curve.
- 2) To modify the Used Car building eliminating a building addition that is forward of the primary structure that effectively increases the distance the building is set back from Sawmill Road further than conforms with the BSD Code.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of a parking plan permitting 1,062 vehicle spaces.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of a Final Development Plan with the following 4 conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff to ensure all lighting requirements of the Code are met and the light level along Sawmill Road is subdued, subject to staff approval.
- 2) Increase the street wall height from 30 inches to 33 inches.
- 3) The applicant work with staff to select decorative bicycle racks, outdoor seating, and a waste receptacle, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant work with staff to replace or remove the gates located at the entrance along Dublin Center Drive.

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

[Motion carried 6-0.]

4. Historic Design Guidelines – Administrative Request, 18-037ADM

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

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) has viewed the draft document and forwarded it to the Commission with a request for recommendation of approval for City Council. The Historic Design Guidelines are proposed as a companion document to the Architectural Review District Code. The revisions to the Code and the Guidelines are the result of a four-year process, which involved several review bodies. At the Commission's previous review of the draft Guidelines, the Commission recommended revisions to several items. The proposed modifications include the following revisions within the document:

- Cultural landscape and natural resources – Include a more robust background section, as well as more detailed language regarding topography, ravines and springs, flora and fauna, earthworks, cemeteries, historic features, and public art.
- Commercial storefronts - Provide additional clarity for design and materials for rehabilitation.
- New construction – Clarify the applicability standards, as well as building mass and scale and placement.
- Site design – Clarify the applicability standards, as well as natural features, landscaping, walls and fences, decks and patios, lighting, and mechanical equipment.
- Signs – Include minor change to the sandwich board sign section.

Staff is seeking a recommendation of approval to City Council as a companion document to the recently adopted Historic Dublin Code.

Commission Discussion

Commission members discussed the Guidelines' language regarding maintenance versus modification or altered historic stonewalls. The Commission's recommendation was to revise the language to, "original stonewalls and fences should be maintained and retained and should not be altered in any way."

Commission members discussed ARB's authority in regard to landscaping within the Historic District. Staff and legal clarification was made that although Historic District site design is subject to review by the ARB, utilizing the Historic District Code and the Historic Design Guidelines, residential landscaping projects alone are not subject to review of the ARB, because no change is being made in the architecture of the structure. In that case, the Historic Design Guidelines would not be consulted, unless it was the desire of the homeowner to consult them.

Commissioners applauded all the parties, who had worked on the Historic Design Guidelines. It is a great document, which will provide valuable guidance for the Historic District.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on this case.

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded a recommendation for City Council approval of the Historic Design Guidelines.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

COMMISSION TRAINING

- **Dublin Corporate Area Plan**

Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the Dublin Corporate Special Area Plan (DCAP). In the near future, the Commission will be seeing proposed Code, Guidelines and area rezonings related to this area. The City's Community Plan is the overarching document that guides growth and development decisions within the community. Within that are Special Area Plans, which provide an additional level of detail and policy direction for a specific geographic area. The DCAP is one of those. Zoning is the legal mechanism that will govern land use development, and proposed rezonings come before the Commission for review. The DCAP includes the Metro Office District, the Blazer Research District, and a portion of the Emerald Corporate District. The goals of the Plan are to focus on repositioning the City's legacy office. The DCAP area has many office sites in need of reinvestment, and it is essential to insure the zoning tools are in place to implement successful reinvestment. The DCAP area is divided into various Mixed Use Regional (MUR) Sub-Districts. The Plan provides building height guidelines, depending on the location. It also provides guidelines regarding uses for presently undeveloped sites. When the DCAP was approved in 2018, City Council provided direction on moving forward with the implementation. The direction was for Phase 1 to focus on the MUR 4 Sub-District, the area located on the east side of Frantz Road adjacent to Llewellyn Farms. Phase 2 will be the MUR 1 Sub-District, the Metro Blazer area. Future research will be required for the MUR 2 and 3 Sub-Districts, in which there are many PUDs. Ms. Rauch reviewed the elements of the MUR 4 Sub-District. The next step will be the proposal of a new section of the Zoning Code for the MUR 4 Sub-District, along with Design Guidelines and a rezoning. When completed, the same process will occur for the MUR 2 Sub-District.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Call inquired if it would be possible for menu board proposals to be handled administratively by staff, rather than as Consent Cases.

Ms. Rauch responded that many of these proposals are within PUDs, which would involve different standards. She would discuss the possibility of doing so with Mr. Boggs.

Mr. Boggs stated that the primary complicating factor would be the PUDs involved. For straight zonings, and perhaps as they relate to the Sign Code, it may be possible for many of the cases. They would look into the suggestion.

- Ms. Call noted the recently passing of a Dublin resident and previous City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Department employee, Gary Gunderman. Mr. Gunderman worked for the City for many years and has many friends here. She would like to highlight his service to the City of Dublin and extend condolences to his family and his friends for their loss. Mr. Gunderman's wife, Chris, will be making a donation to the City for a planting in her husband's

name. She also indicated that she was looking into the opportunity of providing training opportunities on behalf of her husband. More information will be shared when available.

- A joint meeting for Board and Commission training is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Monday, May 17, 2021. Mr. Greg Dale will be facilitating the meeting.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, May 20, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council