

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

May 24, 2021

Page 5 of 11

Held _____

~~Staff recommended Council approval of the lowest and best the bid of Paul Peterson Company, Inc. in the amount of \$186,997.00.~~

~~Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked about the bridge parapet replacement on the east end of the bridge.~~

~~Mr. Hammersmith stated that the southeast corner of the bridge there is a concrete parapet wall that has received significant vehicle contact, so 20 feet will be removed and replaced with timberback to minimize contact with vehicles.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked if this is a better aesthetic. Mr. Hammersmith stated that it will be a better aesthetic.~~

~~Ms. Fox asked how staff determines when galvanized steel will be used versus timberback. She stated that the Bristol Parkway location for example, may prefer the timberback versus the galvanized steel.~~

~~Mr. Hammersmith stated that it is a design consideration based upon the location and current standards. He stated that they always consider timberback first on residential roadways to see if it will work, but sometimes it is not feasible.~~

~~Mayor Amorose Groomes asked why we had only one bidder. Mr. Hammersmith stated that there were several larger state guardrail contracts that were being bid and given the limited capacity of these guardrail contractors, they would opt for the larger project that is more profitable than the smaller project.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.~~

Resolution 30-21

Acceptance of a Preliminary Plat for Towns on the Parkway Located within the Bridge Street District (Case 20-158PP).

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. Martin stated that this Resolution is an acceptance of a Preliminary Plat for Towns on the Parkway. The site is located north of John Shields Parkway, west of Village Parkway, and south of Tuller Road, and is zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The proposal includes the subdivision of 11.0 acres to establish four lots and the dedication of three public rights-of-way. Planning and Zoning Commission has recommended approval to Council. Staff recommended approval.

Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.

Maor Amorose Groomes verified that the streets located within this area are considered private streets and not public streets. Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mayor Amorose Groomes encouraged the applicant to listen to the Planning and Zoning Commission and their comments.

Vote on the Resolution: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes.

~~**Resolution 31-21**~~

~~**Acceptance of a Final Plat for Bridge Park East, Section 4 (Block C).**~~

~~Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.~~

~~Ms. Martin stated that this Resolution is a request for acceptance of a Final Plat to combine three parcels totaling 12.29 acres and to establish four public access easements for open space to facilitate development of Bridge Park, Block C. The site is located north of Bridge Park Avenue and south of Tuller Ridge Drive between Dale Drive and Mooney Street, and zoned Bridge Street District (BSD) – Scioto River Neighborhood District. The plat establishes a single, 2.286 acre developable lot (Lot 9) along with necessary public access easements for open spaces. Lot 9 is the result of the combination of three parcels: a .183 acre parcel, a .006 acre parcel, and a 2.097 acres parcel. Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval as did Staff.~~

~~Ms. Weinsenauer stated that no comments have been received regarding this item.~~

~~Ms. Fox stated that everyone can be confident in the work that Planning and Zoning put into the approval of this plat.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes.~~



RECORD OF ACTION - REVISED

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: Development of 154 attached, single-family residential units with 0.71 acres of open space on an 11-acre site.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and approve a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057 - 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte Group/Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-033

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve four Administrative Departures:

1. **§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 reductions in primary materials percentages on the following facades of these 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. **§153.062(O)(2)(a)2 *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Lot Coverage
Requirement: Maximum impervious lot coverage shall not exceed 70 percent.
Request: Lot coverage for Blocks A, B, and C shall not exceed 77 percent.
3. **§153.062(O)(2)(b) *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Height
Requirement: That the story heights shall be a minimum of 10 feet and a maximum of 12 feet in height.
Request: To permit the 3rd story of the proposed townhouse units to vary from a minimum height of 9.69 feet, and a maximum height of 12.17 feet.
4. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(2) *Single-Family Attached Building Type*** — Non-Street Facing Transparency
Requirement: A minimum 15 percent transparency be provided on all stories of non-street facing facades.



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

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

- Elevation Models 1, 2, 3 and 7; Side Façade; 3rd Story — 12 percent minimum

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The four Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve **10** Waivers:

1. **§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. **§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. **§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. **§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.



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

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

5. **§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. **§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. **§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. **§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. **§153.062(O)(2)(d)(3)** *Single-Family Attached Building Types* — Building Entrance, Number Required on Street Façade

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. **§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.



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

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The **10** Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

MOTION 3: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with 16 conditions:

- 1) That 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 facade at the end units of any building and no two adjacent units, in any location, both have front façade roof 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) That the applicant work with Staff to develop a cohesive building to building variety concept that provides more balance in the 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;



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

- 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) That 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) That the applicant submit a final phasing, subject to Staff approval, prior to submittal of the Final Plat to City Council; and
- 16) **That 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: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 294AB0C6363F490
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: 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.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Final Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.057 - 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte Group/Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-034

MOTION: Mr. Grimes, moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Final Plat with four conditions:

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

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Plat was recommended for approval with conditions to City Council and forwarded for their review.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Nichole M. Martin
294AB0C6363F490...
Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



- ~~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 Juliete balconies would be ornamental only. Although the Juliete balcony has doors, the depth would not accommodate use.

Mr. Filipkowski responded that the Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Juliete 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 Façade
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 the 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



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 10, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

4. Tuller Road Townhomes **PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991**
20-159PDP-WR **Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

Proposal: Construction of a 155-unit, attached, single-family residential development with buildings to include three to seven units per building on an 11.61-acre site.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and review a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-159

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve two Administrative Departures as follows:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) — Maximum Block Size
Requirement: One side of a block may not exceed 500 feet in length.
Request: 505-foot block length (Block 1) along John Shields Parkway.
2. §153.062(O)(2)(b) — Story Height
Requirement: 10 feet minimum – 12 feet maximum for each story.
Request: Minimum 9.5 feet measured floor to floor.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The two Administrative Departures were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve a Parking Plan as follows:

1. To permit four parking spaces per unit where 125% of the minimum of two spaces per unit is the maximum; and
2. To permit parking and vehicular use areas within Required Build Zones where buildings are required to be located.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 3: Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve four Waivers as follows:

1. §153.062(O)(2)(a)(1) — Front Property Line Coverage
Requirement: Minimum 75% coverage.
Request: Block 2: McCune Avenue=58%; Block 3: Village Parkway=27%; and, Block 4: McCune Avenue=52%
2. §153.062(O)(2)(a)(1) — Occupation of Corner Required
Requirement: Buildings are required to occupy corners of each block.
Request: To permit deviation from buildings occupying the corner.
3. §153.062(D)(2)(b) – Roof Type Requirements – Roof Pitch
Requirement: The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate.
Request: Decorative eaves with a 24:12 (2 percent) pitch.
4. §153.062(E)(1)(c) – Permitted Primary Materials
Requirement: Permitted primary materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, and glass.
Request: Permit thin brick as a primary permitted material.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The four Waivers as written above were approved.



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

MOTION 4: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Waiver:

1. Planning recommends **approval** of the following Waiver:

§153.062(D)(2)(c) – Roof Type Requirements – Parallel Ridge Line

Requirement: When the principal ridge line is parallel to the street: Gable ends, perpendicular ridge lines, or dormers shall be incorporated to interrupt the mass of the roof.

Request: No architectural element to interrupt the parallel ridge line.

VOTE: 0 – 7.

RESULT: This Waiver was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	No
Warren Fishman	No
Kristina Kennedy	No
Mark Supelak	No
Rebecca Call	No
Leo Grimes	No
Lance Schneier	No

MOTION 5: Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the following Waiver:

1. §153.064(G)(b) – Open Space Proportions

Requirement: All open Space Types (except the Greenway) shall be sized at a ratio of not more than 3:1, length to width.

Request: To not meet the minimum proportions for Pocket Plazas B, F, G H, and I.

VOTE: 0 – 7.

RESULT: This Waiver was disapproved.



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	No
Warren Fishman	No
Kristina Kennedy	No
Mark Supelak	No
Rebecca Call	No
Leo Grimes	No
Lance Schneier	No

MOTION 6: Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded, to approve a Preliminary Development Plan with 14 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to reflect 154 units;
- 2) That the applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including on-street parking and tree lawn widths, prior to the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 3) That the applicant provide Washington Township Fire Department an auto-turn analysis with the Final Development Plan, and locate/designate a Fire Apparatus Road (FAR);
- 4) That the applicant meet the provisions of 153.062(D)(2)(c) — Parallel Ridge Line, to provide architectural details to break up the mass of the roofline with the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 5) That the applicant provide a minimum 3-foot variability to the roof height between each unit, unless an alternative design solution reaching the same result is approved by the PZC with the Final Development Plan, as determined at its sole discretion;
- 6) That the applicant use corner-piece design to emulate full-depth brick, in the application of thin brick;
- 7) That the applicant meet the required 80 percent coverage of primary building materials along street-facing facades for all buildings with submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 8) That the applicant works with staff on an appropriate location and screening of A/C units and refuse containers, prior to submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 9) That all parking and vehicular use areas located within a Required Build Zone are screened with a treatment that provides 100 percent opacity;
- 10) That the applicant work with Staff to provide a minimum 50 percent of the total required bicycle parking spaces within open space areas;
- 11) That the applicant work with Staff to provide the total required amount of open space with the Final Development Plan;



**4. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-159PDP-WR**

**PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
Preliminary Development Plan/Waiver Review**

- 12) That the plans be revised to provide the required mid-block pedestrian way in Block 4 prior to Final Development Plan submittal;
- 13) That the architectural style be revised to ensure that each unit appears as an individual attached single-family home; and
- 14) That the applicant work with staff to ensure the front elevations provide traditional elements such as stoops, porches, columns, awnings and brick walks.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490...

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 10, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

5. Tuller Road Townhomes PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991
20-158PP Preliminary Plat

Proposal: Preliminary Plat of ±11.61 acres to create four lots and three public rights-of-way to accommodate a residential development of 155 attached, single-family units with buildings to include three to seven units per building.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-158

MOTION: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the Preliminary Plat to provide specific acreage of each lot; and
- 2) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Preliminary Plat was conditionally recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6363F490
Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



4. Tuller Road Townhomes at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991, Preliminary Development Plan, 20-159PDP

Construction of a 155-unit, attached, single-family residential development with buildings to include three to seven units per building on an 11.61-acre site located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

5. Tuller Road Townhomes at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-012991, Preliminary Plat, 20-158PP

A Preliminary Plat of ±11.61 acres to create four lots and three public rights-of-way to accommodate a residential development of 155 attached, single-family units with buildings to include three to seven units per building on a site located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat. The development will be comprised of 155 attached single-family townhomes homes on 0.7 acres of open space and 3 public streets on a ±11 acre site located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). This differs from a Planned Unit Development (PUD), as no rezoning is required. The zoning standards within the Bridge Street District are already established, and the uses are permitted. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. The site is comprised of two parcels and a tree line bisects the site. It is necessary to consider projects within the context of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Special Area Plan, which was adopted by City Council in 2010 and is included in the Community Plan. The BSD Special Area Plan provides recommendations for land use and character. This site is zoned BSD-SCN, Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active mixed-use environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. Townhomes and multifamily buildings are recommended. A gateway is identified at the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. Neighborhood districts allow for special attention to be given to location and character of streets, buildings and open spaces with an emphasis on a coordinated mix of uses. The BSD Code is built upon a Street Network Framework map, which calls for a 'T' intersection at Village Parkway and Tuller Road. That intersection is located beyond this particular site, and the associated right-of-way is within the City's jurisdiction. As proposed in March 2020, the applicant had planned to incorporate that intersection improvement in this project in partnership with the City. In subsequent conversations, the City has decided that the intersection improvements in that area will be deferred; therefore, the applicant has re-designed the plan within the boundaries of the site. This is a Preliminary Development Plan, and similar to a Planned District, a subsequent Final Development Plan will permit a final review of all details associated with the project. In the Preliminary Development stage, the uses are evaluated. A townhome dwelling is a permitted use on this site. Both the Sawmill Neighborhood standards and the Street Network Map are applicable. The lots and blocks are established with the Preliminary Development, establishing the framework for the development. Building layout, form and height are confirmed in this stage, as well as the amount and location of open space. Parking is the final element of the Preliminary Development Plan. The Final Development Plan provides building type requirements, including materials, architectural details and finishes; the design of the open space; and landscaping and lighting of the public realm.

Proposal

The proposal is for 154 attached single-family units distributed across 30 buildings varying in size from 4 units to 7 units and 0.7 acres of open space. The proposal also includes the extension of McCune Avenue and two new public streets (Grafton Street and Hobbs Landing Drive West), which will provide access to interior private drives accessing private two-car garages for each unit. Compliance with the Street Network Map results in the creation of a proposal that establishes four blocks. The Code includes standards for maximum block dimensions. In the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, any one side of a block may not exceed 500 feet in length, and the cumulative total of the perimeter of all sides of block may not exceed 1,750 feet in length. All the

block lengths are compliant with the exception of the southern length of Block 1, which has a length of 505 feet along John Shields Parkway. The block length is a direct result of the curvature of John Shields Parkway. Staff is supportive of an Administrative Departure to deviate from the numeric standard by 5 feet.

In reviewing the building layout, it is important to consider the Code constraints on the building placements. The build zone for a single-family, attached building type requires a minimum 5-foot setback, but the building must be located within 20 feet of the property line. The proposal meets this requirement in all locations. Front property coverage is also required, which is the percentage of the required build zone occupied by a structure. In several locations, the proposal is deficient in front property line coverage, therefore, a waiver is requested. The deficiency is due to street connections along McCune Avenue, as well as the open space provided at the intersection of John Shields and Village Parkway. In addition, buildings are required to be sited at the corner or occupy the corner. In several instances, buildings are not sufficiently occupying the corner. In all cases, it is due to a desire to provide open spaces at corners and key gateway locations or to permit preservation of mature trees. The final lot coverage will be provided with the Final Development Plan. The maximum impervious lot coverage permitted in this district is 70 percent.

Open Space and Parking

The proposal provides 10 open space areas, including pocket plazas, a square, and several mid-block pedestrian ways. The total open space requirement in the Bridge Street District is calculated differently than that in a Planned Unit Development. The Bridge Street District requires 200 square feet of open space per dwelling unit. Although .71 acres of open space is required, the proposal provides only .64 acres of open space. Staff is recommending that the applicant work with staff to identify ways in which to provide the additional open space and to pursue opportunities to enhance the mid-block pedestrian ways, which could include water features, art and lighting. The applicant is seeking a waiver for the proportion of open spaces. The proportion is required to be at a ratio of 3:1. The intent is to provide square, not linear open spaces. Linear open spaces provide connectivity, while activated open spaces are typically square. Staff is supportive of that waiver. A parking plan is requested with this application. The Bridge Street District parking requirement for townhomes is 2 spaces per dwelling unit. The applicant is providing 2 spaces per dwelling unit plus 2 additional driveway spaces. This results in 308 parking spaces across the site, which exceeds the 161 required. In some cases, the parking spaces occupy the required build zone. In these cases, the parking should be screened at 100% opacity, to be detailed with the Final Development Plan.

Architecture

The Code provides Building Type requirements, which are highly prescriptive, providing parameters to ensure high quality development. The Single-Family Attached Building Type permits buildings that are 1.5 to 4 stories in height. This application is proposed at 3 stories in height. The proposed Building Materials are brick, stone and glass. The applicant is seeking a waiver to be permitted to use thin brick. In previous cases, the Commission has been supportive of the substitution of thin brick for full-depth brick. The Code also provides minimum story height requirements. Although the requirement is 10-12 feet in height, the applicant is proposing a story height of 9.5 feet. Because the request is within 10% of the requirement, it is an Administrative Departure, not a Waiver. The form of the building is an important consideration of the Preliminary Development Plan. The form is largely attributed to the roof. At the Concept Plan for this project, the Commission requested that a more traditional roofline be provided, and the plan has been revised to a pitched roof and traditional materials. Details are provided along the roofline to mimic a flat roof, providing a transition between Greystone Mews and Tuller Flats. The flat details also require a Waiver, of which staff is supportive. However, staff is not supportive of a Waiver to permit an uninterrupted ridge line. As proposed, the ridge line is consistent with no architectural features. More variation is necessary in the height and form of the roofline, distinguishing each unit as a "for sale" townhome versus an apartment building. The elevations provided with this proposal differ from those provided with the earlier Concept Plan. Significantly warmer tones for the Primary Building Materials are proposed, such as brick. The side elevations will wrap the corners with brick. The applicant is requesting Commission feedback tonight on the architecture and the proposed color scheme, in advance of submitting the architecture and color palettes with the Final Development Plan. With the intent of providing a diversity of Building Types, proposed Building Types have been provided.

Conceptual landscape character and features within the public realm and at the gateway of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway also are provided for consideration. Finally, the applicant is requesting a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Preliminary Plat.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio stated that much work has been invested in this proposed development to date. This is a challenging site; there is much occurring around it, and a very detailed Code is associated with it. The Concept Plan for this development was reviewed and approved by the Commission in March 2020. At that time, due to the proposed T-intersection as required by the Bridge Street District plan, a development agreement approved by City Council was necessary, which would have involved a land swap and TIF funding. Since then, it has been determined that it would be advisable to work with only this site, and the project has been redesigned without the T intersection. The Commission's comments with the Concept Plan review were considered carefully, and the proposal has been revised accordingly. Due to the three existing public street rights-of-way, the development to the west, and the Code, the "box" for this development was restrictive. Previously, the Commission stated that the architecture for this development should be differentiated from the Tuller Flats development to be less monolithic. This is a "for sale" product with individual, self-parked units. The architecture has been revised to a more traditional design, including pitched roofs and roof terraces on the fronts of the buildings. They believe they have been able to address the Commission's concerns, and if the Commission approves the requested Waivers, the project can proceed to the next step. They welcome the Commission's feedback tonight, as they move to the final design stage. The rest of their team members also present will be happy to respond to questions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Supelak stated that there are four dead-end streets in this development. Is there a reason they are not being connected to the major thoroughfares?

Ms. Martin responded that staff had encouraged the applicant to disconnect those streets. The Bridge Street District must maintain a fine balance. In addition to connectivity, one of the other principles of this District is to have uninterrupted street frontages that allow for pedestrian circulation in a safe manner. Instead of prioritizing vehicular circulation, which is more than adequate on this site due to the other connections, the attempt here was to prioritize pedestrian circulation and safety.

Ms. Kennedy requested staff to re-state the items that staff does not support.

Ms. Martin responded that staff is not supportive of the Waiver to permit the consistent roofline. Staff believes it is important to differentiate the single-family units and provide more diversity across the development. In addition, a condition is recommended that the required open space be provided. Through creative site design, that should be possible. Staff has also conditioned that the final architectural details and materials on street-facing facades meet the intent of the Bridge Street District. That is very important at the gateway intersection with Village Parkway. Other minor conditions are recommended to ensure clear direction is given to the applicant for the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Fox stated that she was unable to be present for the earlier Concept Plan review. Although she has reviewed those records online, it would be helpful for staff to summarize the primary recommendations that were offered by the Commission.

Ms. Martin responded that for the Concept Plan, the applicant provided two architectural concepts as Option A and Option B. One option was more modern and provided some of the forms reflected elsewhere in the District, such as in Tuller Flats. The other was significantly more traditional. A pitched roof was the Commission's preferred solution, and the applicant has blended Option A and Option B into a cohesive design. The Commission also encouraged that the street-facing façades be activated. Initially, the rooftop terraces were provided at the rear of the units facing the auto-oriented area; now the rooftop terraces are provided facing the principal frontage streets, with select units having the option to have them rear facing instead. The

applicant was also encouraged to refine the design to ensure the auto-oriented areas were minimized from view.

Ms. Fox inquired about the previous discussion regarding the open space.

Ms. Martin responded that the discussion focused on the development of the gateway location at the intersection with John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Fox inquired if the previous design met the open space requirement.

Ms. Martin responded that it did meet the requirement, but the site area was .6 acres larger, which allowed a second pocket park. Now, due to the curvature of the street, that is no longer possible.

Ms. Call stated that there is a 3:1 open space requirement. What are the open spaces included in the requested waiver? One of the main features in the previous Option 1 was the very nice mailbox enclosure. There also was discussion about the addition of amenities and activation of that space.

Ms. Martin responded that the open spaces that meet the required proportion include the large open space square, the gateway location and the open space at the intersection of Hobbs Landing and John Shields Parkway. The open spaces that do not meet this provision are the linear open spaces – the mid-block pedestrian ways. A condition has been recommended that the applicant provide additional enhancements in those areas to counteract the linear form. To provide additional amenities, staff is supportive of a waiver to modify the shape.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if thin brick has been used in the surrounding areas.

Ms. Martin responded that most of the buildings within Bridge Park area use thin brick. Due to the height of the buildings, full depth brick would become very heavy. In some instances, Tuller Flats also uses thin brick.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes it is problematic to have dead-end streets here, although he understands the desire for a more pedestrian environment. However, the entire Bridge Street area is a more quasi-urban area, and this is a townhome development. He does not believe there would be an issue with having a couple more connected streets; otherwise, a vehicular circulation issue is created on this site. In the Concept Plan, there were some corner issues; those have been improved, but there is need for further improvement. The architectural renderings provided with the Concept Plan were more compelling than those provided with this proposal. The corners of the buildings present opportunities for improvement. He recognizes that a finite number of variations to the units are practical, but the two end units near the pocket park at John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway should not have the standard "end" architecture. Something additional is needed, such as a two-story extension that might address the corner condition differently. There are a few obvious places for such variations to be added. He agrees with staff regarding the need for variation in the roof ridge line. That is the only variation that could also be experienced on the back façade. A ridge line variation will be important.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is important that the buildings look like individual single-family homes, not apartments. The intent is that this not be another Tuller Flats development. He also would like to see more greenspace. Currently, the area is very dense. The original intent with the Bridge Park development was that pocket parks and open space would minimize the density. Therefore, in addition to making these buildings appear more residential, it is essential to achieve as much greenspace as possible.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the information submitted by the applicant states, "The Pulte Group submits this plan in furtherance of the goal of providing a unique product type.... The buildings will create vibrancy along the public streets and be additive to the visual character of the area." Unfortunately, those comments are in conflict with some of the waivers being requested tonight. She is not supportive of the Roofline Waiver or the Open Space Waiver, as those waivers do not create vibrancy nor add to the visual character of the area.

Ms. Fox stated that this is her first review of the proposed development. As always, she is interested in the streetscape provided. In her view, the first concept was more traditional than this concept. The previous concept had a greater mixture of façade materials and more negative versus positive spaces. The Commission is requesting a different look than what already exists in Bridge Park. On principal frontage streets, any terminal vistas and gateways should have an interesting look. Simply providing a greenspace is not sufficient in a gateway area. She believes the architecture should be unique, unlike anything seen elsewhere in the District. She understands the desire to keep the units at the mid-\$300s price point, and there is a need for such a product. It is important, however, that the development still have a look of high quality. The proposed facades do not have a timeless look of a development that would last 30-40 years. Although the Commission previously suggested a more traditional architecture, she believes it needs to be much more traditional. To help the applicant understand what she is looking for, she has forwarded to Ms. Martin some streetscape photos to share.

[Slide images shown.]

Ms. Fox pointed out that all of the photos show ways in which to achieve a more traditional front door look. There is an invitation to come to those front doors. The front facades have detail and movement; they are not flat. The buildings are large with linear units. In some of the building examples, there is a variation between levels in the units. In other building examples, there is significant difference in the detailing; some have columns and stoops, where one could sit and have a cup of coffee. In all the examples, the individual units look uniquely individual and extremely inviting, and provide a traditional look that currently does not exist in Bridge Park. She believes these type of units would not be overly expensive to achieve and would be extremely marketable. In regard to open spaces – she preferred those proposed in the previous plan, where the buildings faced the open spaces. In this revised plan, the open space seems to have been added wherever there was room.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if these front-door design ideas would have been more achievable at the Concept Plan review stage. At this point, the plans may be too solidified to revise significantly.

Mr. Schneier stated that this is an attempt to put a development in what probably is not the best location in the City or Bridge Park. John Shields Parkway may eventually lead to an abandoned AMC Theater. Perhaps we are unfairly expecting the applicant to improve what exists here. Regardless, it is essential the site be developed per the character of the Bridge Park neighborhood. While he agrees with Ms. Fox's perspective, is this development too advanced to permit such modifications? If not, would the applicant be agreeable to such modifications, which could change the character somewhat? This development will be a great asset and improvement to the area. He is unsure how much more should be expected of the proposed development in view of the fact that it is probably not in the best area of Bridge Park.

Mr. Underhill stated that he believes adding the variation in the roof ridge line could present some design difficulties, but they could be overcome. Some of the project photos provided by Ms. Fox were quite beautiful, and some of the elements could be incorporated into the design, which would activate the streetscape. In this stage of the development, it is very appropriate to offer suggestions for the final design that will be presented. He invited Mr. Filipkowski, the architect for the project, to respond to the suggestions.

Keith Filipkowski, Director of Construction Operations, PulteGroup, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that he is the architect for this project. He is very open-minded to the suggestions shared. The design is not too far advanced for some of the suggestions. They also are amenable to adjusting the roofline. The best way in which to achieve that is yet to be determined. However, they understand the concept, and the reason it is requested. They agree that it would help to break up the scale of the building, With the Final Development Plan, they will be adding the finer details, including more focus on the front entryways and additional architectural details. Similar to the Juliette balconies that have been added to side elevations, perhaps there are other accents or projections that could be added to the front elevations. The comments and photos shared tonight have provided some good ideas.

Ms. Martin responded that the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) is the opportunity for the Planning Commission to impose any conditions or provide final direction to the applicant to incorporate elements into the design. If the Commission is looking for specific traditional elements or materials, now is the appropriate time to add that condition. Similarly, if there are architectural details the Commission does not consider appropriate, it is appropriate to provide direction that those be refined, as well.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the revised plan, including the pedestrian pass-through areas. He is in agreement with staff's recommendations regarding the waivers, including the one for disapproval. He agrees that the roof ridge line should be broken up. The view of this development from the AMC Theater should be that of variation. If the AMC Theater site were to be redeveloped at some point in the future, the view of this site will be important. In considering Mr. Supelak's concern about the dead-end streets, he wonders if there will be sufficient room to back up or turn around within the neighborhood. However, the pedestrian circulation is consistent with what is desired. The corner parks on John Shields Parkway should be inviting signature sites. In particular, the gateway open space on Village Parkway should be made interesting.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees with Ms. Fox's suggestions. It is essential to improve these front elevations. That can be accomplished with brick walks, columns and deviations in the façade. The current residential development in this area appears so dense; it resembles office or commercial space. There is an opportunity with this Pulte development to achieve a residential community that is unique and rich looking. Adding the suggested architectural elements would be a significant improvement. The photos shown by Ms. Fox are exactly what it is needed. Adding such amenities would make the individual units look like attached single-family homes.

Mr. Supelak suggested adding vertical landscaping to create distinct separation between the units. Mr. Underhill thanked him for the suggestion. Those elements would not pose a significant cost addition.

Ms. Fox stated that as they work on adding some of these suggestions to the design, her hope is that these buildings will not look like those on every other block in Bridge Park -- rectangular facades exist throughout the district. A variation in design, style and shape is needed. Adding trim detail to the windows is important. The buyers of these units do not want their units to look exactly like the others. Separate them out and add detail that makes each appear to be a separate unit. Add traditional elements to the front doorway that are warm and inviting. That will break up the monotony of the contemporary, urban look that exists throughout Bridge Park. If they could reduce the depth by four feet, perhaps there would be more opportunity to create an entranceway with a front stoop. The balconies are a nice feature, but she would recommend adding an overhead cover, if possible. Could the positions of the balconies on the elevations be staggered, so that the height variation would offer a level of privacy? This would be preferable to having all the balconies on the same flat plane. Awnings are traditional elements that could soften the view along the street. The gateway location and the terminal vista are very important. She preferred the pocket park, walk-through spaces in the first plan, which provided more space. The spaces proposed in this plan are tiny and uninviting; she would encourage creation of spaces in which people can comfortably stop awhile. In her view, this plan is not yet where it needs to be.

Ms. Call stated that she appreciates the changes made -- the addition of brick, improvements to the side elevations, and the additional parking spaces. The Commission is concerned about density and intensity, and while what is proposed is a good use of density, it is a little too intense. She is supportive of pulling back the front façade somewhat to add a more warm and inviting front door. She is supportive of staggering the roofline. She is not supportive of adding plantings on either side of a required walkway and calling it usable open space, nor of a waiver of the 3:1 required ratio of open space. She believes the verandas are a positive addition to the units, but adding an overhead cover would make them usable more months of the year. She is supportive of the requirement for 80% primary materials. Similar to the vertical landscape element that Mr. Supelak suggested, she would suggest similar elements be added to the streets that terminate but do not connect to other roads. If those are being used as a pedestrian thoroughfare, adding vertical greenery at the

terminus would be inviting. Although not a complete screen, they would eliminate the straight views into the driveways, and create a sense of privacy and seclusion for the neighborhood.

Mr. Underhill stated that if some of the waivers are not approved, they would be required to meet those particular Code requirements. However, they will do their best to do so. They have no objection to the conditions recommended in staff's report, nor would they object to the addition of a condition to clarify the Commission's direction regarding the front doorways.

Ms. Call stated that the vote would be taken first on the Administrative Departures and Parking Plan, followed by clarification of the revisions and then the vote on the Waivers, Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the following 2 Administrative Departures:

- 1) Administrative Departure to permit a 505-foot block length for Block 1 along John Shields Parkway where 500 feet is required.
- 2) Administrative Departure to permit a minimum story height 9.5 feet where 10-12 feet is required.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the proposed Parking Plan:

- 1) To permit four parking spaces per unit where 125% of the minimum of two spaces per unit is the maximum;
- 2) To permit parking and vehicular use areas within Required Build Zones where buildings are required to be located.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

Per Mr. Grimes' inquiry regarding the open space waiver request, Ms. Martin clarified that open spaces should be square or rectangular. The mid-block pedestrian ways are narrow and linear. Due to their shape, some members have stated that they are not supportive of counting them as open space. Disapproval of that Waiver would mean those areas are not eligible to be counted as open space.

Following clarification, Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the following Waivers:

- 1) Waiver to permit reduced front property line coverage along Block 2: McCune Avenue (58%), Block 3: Village Parkway (27%), and Block 4: McCune Avenue (52%) where a minimum 75% is required.
- 2) Waiver to permit deviation from buildings occupying the corner where occupying the corner is required.
- 3) Waiver to permit a reduced roof pitch of 24:12 for decorative eaves where a roof pitch of 6:12 to 12:12 is required.
- 5) Waiver to permit thin brick as a permitted primary building material where full depth brick is required.

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

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Boggs recommended that the remaining two waivers receive separate motions and votes.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Waiver:

- 4) Waiver to permit an uninterrupted ridge line parallel to the street that does not include architectural details where architectural details are required.

Vote: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Schneier, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Call, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Mr. Grimes, no; Ms. Kennedy, no.

[Motion failed 0-7]

Matt Callahan, VP of Land Acquisition, PulteGroup, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, stated that in regard to the following Waiver concerning open space, staff had recommended approval with certain conditions. They would be willing to work on the conditions with staff and present a solution with the Final Development Plan to address the concerns raised tonight.

Ms. Martin responded that if that is acceptable with the Commission, the applicant could rescind the Waiver request tonight. This item would be before the Commission again with the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Call stated that her concern is that at the Final Development Plan stage, the footprints of the buildings have been finalized. If there were any requirement at that time to incorporate additional open space, it could not occur on the site; it would need to be added off-site. That solution would involve a Fee in Lieu of. Although the Commission has no issue with the density, it does have an issue with the intensity.

Commission consensus was that the open space issue not be deferred to the Final Development Plan stage and to proceed with a vote on the Waiver.

Mr. Grimes moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the following Waiver:

- 6) Waiver to permit open space proportions to exceed the maximum 3:1 (length:width) proportions

Vote: Ms. Call, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Ms. Fox, no; Ms. Kennedy, no; Mr. Schneier, no; Mr. Supelak, no; Mr. Grimes, no.

[Motion failed 0-7]

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following 14 conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the plans to reflect 154 units;
- 2) The applicant work with the City Engineer to finalize the public street sections, including on-street parking and tree lawn widths, prior to the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 3) The applicant provide Washington Township Fire Department an auto-turn analysis with the Final Development Plan, and locate/designate a Fire Apparatus Road (FAR);
- 4) The applicant meet the provisions of 153.062(D)(2)(c) — Parallel Ridge Line, to provide architectural details to break up the mass of the roofline with the Final Development Plan submittal;
- 5) The applicant provide a minimum 3-foot variability to the roof height between each unit, unless an alternative design solution reaching the same result is approved by the PZC with the FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, as determined at its sole discretion;
- 6) In the application of thin brick, the applicant use corner pieces designed to emulate full-depth brick;
- 7) The applicant meet the required 80 percent coverage of primary building materials along street-facing facades for all buildings with submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 8) The applicant should work with staff on appropriate location and screening of A/C units and refuse containers prior to submittal of the Final Development Plan;
- 9) All parking and vehicular use areas located within a Required Build Zone are screened with a treatment that provides 100 percent opacity;
- 10) The applicant work with staff to provide a minimum of 50 percent of the total required bicycle parking space within open space areas;
- 11) The applicant work with staff to provide the total required amount of open space with the Final Development Plan;

- 12) The plans be revised to provide the required mid-block pedestrian way in Block 4 prior to Final Development Plan submittal;
- 13) The architectural style be revised to ensure that each unit appears as an individual attached single-family home;
- 14) The applicant work with staff to ensure the front elevations provide traditional elements such as stoops, porches, columns, awnings and brick walks.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Preliminary Plat with the following 2 conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the Preliminary Plat to provide specific acreage of each lot;
- 2) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

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

OTHER ACTIONS

- **Proposed 2021 PZC Meeting Dates**

~~Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the 2021 proposed meeting dates.~~

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

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~A joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB/BZA is scheduled for December 14 to provide an update re. policies, challenges and issues. In advance of that meeting, Commissioners should forward desired discussion topics to the Chair.~~
- ~~The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.~~

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

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 5, 2020 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Tuller Road Townhomes 20-019CP **6851 John Shields Parkway Concept Plan**

Proposal: The development of 168 attached single-family homes with .9-acre open space, three public streets, and associated site improvements on an 11.61-acre site.
Location: At the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway
Request: Review and recommendation to City Council for a Concept Plan.
Applicant: Matt Callahan, Pulte and Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge LLC
Planning Contacts: Nichole M. Martin, AICP Planner II
Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us and
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-019

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Call seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for Concept Plan – Option A with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant clarify and update the plans accordingly if 168 or 171 units are proposed prior to City Council review;
- 2) That the applicant revise the site layout to minimize view of auto-oriented drive and the rear of units from Principal Frontage Streets;
- 3) That the applicant work with the City Engineer to establish dedicated parking lanes with bump-outs prior to the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 4) That the applicant update the plan to meet the maximum impervious lot coverage permitted by Code;
- 5) That the applicant revise the building elevations to have four-sided architecture with additional attention to the side and rear of the homes prior to the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 6) That the applicant revise the building elevation to limit the application of cementitious siding and panels prior to the Preliminary Development Plan;
- 7) That the applicant identify air conditioning unit locations and other utility locations with required screening prior to the Preliminary Development Plan; and
- 8) That the applicant update the plan to meet the open space diversity required by Code.



**3. Tuller Road Townhomes
20-019CP**

**6851 John Shields Parkway
Concept Plan**

VOTE: 4 - 0

RESULT: The Concept Plan was recommended for approval to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Absent
Jane Fox	Absent
Warren Fishman	Absent
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Nichole M. Martin

294AB0C6362F490
Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



~~TABLED CASES~~

~~1. Dublin Gateway (Gorden), Preliminary Development Plan~~

~~Ms. Kennedy stated that this case is a request of a rezoning of ±45.4 acres from R, Rural District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District to facilitate the future development of 90 single-family lots and an Adult Congregate Living Facility (ACLF) with ±12.5 acres of open space and five public streets. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road. Along with this request is also a request for review and an approval recommendation to City Council. The applicant has requested this application be tabled.~~

~~2. Dublin Gateway (Gorden), Preliminary Plat~~

~~The subdivision of ±45.4 acres into 90 single-family lots, rights-of-way for five public streets and eight open space reserves. The site is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road and Post Road.~~

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to table the requests for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and for the Preliminary Plat.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.~~

~~[Motion passed 4-0]~~

NEW CASES

3. Tuller Road Townhomes, John Shields and Village Parkways and Tuller Road, 20-028CP, Concept Plan

Ms. Kennedy stated that this application is a request for review and feedback of a future possible development to include 168 attached, single-family homes in 35 buildings with three public streets, and associated site improvements on an 11.61-acre site at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. This site is BSD-SCN, Bridge Street District – Sawmill Center Neighborhood District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and a recommendation of approval for a Concept Plan for the construction of 168 attached, single-family homes with .9 acres of open space, three public streets, and associated site improvements on ±11.61 acres located within the Bridge Street District (BSD). The BSD development process for new, large-scale development proposals includes three steps, beginning with a Concept Plan. The Concept Plan when intended to be tied to a development agreement requires the Commission to make a recommendation to City Council regarding whether the concept could fit within the District. If approved by Council, it will be followed with a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan. The site is located northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. Recent adjacent development includes Tuller Flats, which is a for-rent apartment complex. Greystone Mews, an attached, single-family home development, is located to the south. Office and service-oriented uses are located to the north and east. The Bridge Street District Special Area Plan was established in 2010 and a Code for development of that area was adopted in 2012. In May 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission informally reviewed a proposal for a 2.48-acre portion of the site to be developed as townhomes and multi-family lofts. That proposal did not go forward. The BSD Code establishes Neighborhood Districts where special attention to location and character of buildings,

streets, and open spaces is important to establish a coordinated mix of uses that fulfill the objectives identified in the BSD Special Area Plan within the Community Plan. The Sawmill Center Neighborhood District is one of four neighborhood districts located within the Bridge Street District. The neighborhoods are intended to allow for special attention to location and character of streets, buildings and open spaces to establish a coordinated mix of uses. This neighborhood was envisioned to support a mix of uses, including entertainment and service uses supported by residential and office uses. The intent of the Sawmill Center Neighborhood, as outlined in the BSD Code, is to provide an active mixed-use environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. The Bridge Street District Street Network is the backbone of the BSD Code. It establishes regional connectors, district connectors, and neighborhood streets. With this application, the applicant will be creating that backbone for development. The undeveloped site is located north of John Shields and west of Village Parkway. The existing tree row bisecting the site will be removed.

Proposal

The proposal is for 168 attached single-family units distributed across 35 buildings, which vary in size from three units to eight units, and 0.9-acre of open space on an ±11.61-acre site. The proposal includes the extension of McCune Avenue and two new public streets and will be developed in four blocks: A, B, C, and D. The blocks are proposed to be established by squaring off the intersection of Village Parkway and Tuller Road, and the extension of McCune Avenue (east-west) and creation of two new public streets (north-south). The primary access is centrally located along John Shields Parkway. There is one secondary access point along John Shields Parkway, and two secondary access points along Tuller Road. The site is also accessible along Village Parkway via McCune Avenue. Six internal private drives are proposed. The drives access the rear-loaded garages associated with each unit. The street network map establishes standards for structures that front two streets. Some of the District connectors are established as principal frontage streets. That designation can be added to any street type, although typically not a neighborhood street. John Shields Parkway, Village Parkway and Tuller Road are all principal frontage streets. This designation is intended to minimize the number of vehicular conflicts along those frontages as well as establish a continuous, pedestrian-oriented, street-focused character. All of the buildings in the development will face a principal frontage street or a publicly accessible open space. With the roadway improvements, the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway, which is currently curved, will be squared off. That proposed roadway project is one of the primary reasons the plan will be forwarded to Council for consideration of an infrastructure agreement. Some of the proposed private internal drives will terminate adjacent to principal frontage streets. Staff recommends these elements be revised prior to the Preliminary Development Plan, as principal frontage streets are intended to have building frontages and not visible access to parking areas. Additionally, there are several units where the rear of the unit faces a principal frontage street. For further development of the plan, the applicant will need to address the character of those rear elevations or modify the site layout to screen the elevations. In regard to the proposed four blocks, the Code establishes maximum block lengths and perimeters. The purpose of the regulation is to ensure that the blocks are walkable. The applicant is meeting all of these Code requirements. Further analysis will be provided with the Preliminary Development Plan.

Building Types

Building types are used in the Bridge Street Code versus Permitted Uses, which increases the flexibility of uses within the District. Based on the type and use, the Single-Family Attached building type is anticipated to be the building type selected in the Preliminary Development Plan.

Each building type includes development standards, which are reviewed conceptually in context with the District. This includes the siting of buildings within required build zones; maximum height; lot coverage; permitted materials; parking requirements; and open space.

Architecture

Proposed renderings depict 3.0-story to 3.5-story contemporary buildings emphasizing geometric forms, with parapet roofs emulating a flat roof or pitched roof appearance with a neutral color palette. The applicant has provided two options: Option A, with two variations -- a flat roof or a pitched roof, and Option B. The options are the same base building with alternative exterior characters.

Option A

The difference between the Option A - flat roof and Option A - pitched roof variations is that the pitched roof option allows for a 3.5-story structure with an upper story loft and roof terrace. Staff recommends Option A with a flat roof due to the established modern character of the District. Staff has recommended that the flat roof parapet with a pitched roof should be investigated further by the applicant. The majority of the proposals depict an architectural character that is contemporary and geometric in form, similar to other developments in the Bridge Street District. The base of the structures are clad in brick with cementitious siding on the second and third stories, and in selected areas, some cementitious panels. Staff has recommended that select units be completely brick in order to provide diversity across the elevation and reduce the application of cementitious siding. Also recommended is that the character of the auto-oriented areas, as well as the sides, ensure four-sided architecture. Staff recommends that the garage doors be painted within the auto-oriented areas. Staff has also recommended that the brick on the side elevations should be maintained at the same height as on the front elevations, but could be reduced on the rear elevation. There is a lack of fenestration on the side elevations, which can be revised.

Option B

The applicant has indicated that the intent is that the entire development be of one character. Option B is a side gable structure with decorative front gable elements to add visual interest. This proposal has significantly less brick than the Option A variation. It uses a mix of cementitious materials including horizontal siding, vertical board and batten siding and panels.

Staff has reviewed the Concept Plan against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with nine conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired the reason the applicant desires to redesign the roadway intersection to remove the curve. How would that affect the flow of traffic within the area?

Ms. Martin responded that with the formation of the Bridge Street District in 2010, a traffic study was conducted on the entire 1,000-acre area. As a result of that study, a street network with street classifications was established. A street grid network was also created for the purpose of distributing traffic efficiently. This anticipated squaring off of the intersection was included in that grid, which has been in place since the Bridge Street Code adoption in 2012.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is currently on-street parking on John Shields Parkway. Could there be on-street parking on some of the surrounding streets, as well, such as Tuller Parkway, Village

Parkway and the proposed Public Street A? These streets make up the perimeter boundaries. Ms. Martin responded that at this point, the recommendation would not be to re-design those portions of Tuller and Village Parkways. However, the new streets and the extension of McCune could be designed to accommodate on-street parking with bumpouts, in coordination with the Engineering Division.

Ms. Call requested information about the tree line that would be removed. That information is lacking in the packet.

Ms. Martin stated that, at this time, the request is whether the Concept Plan can be further designed and developed under the Bridge Street District Code. If approved, the applicant would be required to provide that level of detail with the Preliminary Development Plan, which would include a tree survey. Any trees that cannot be replaced on site would require a fee paid in lieu of to the City's Tree Fund.

Ms. Call stated that according to her calculations, the open space numbers appear to be off. Perhaps she is missing an area calculation. Is the intent that the small triangular space at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway be included in the open space calculation?

Ms. Martin responded that it should not be included in the calculation, as it will not be Open Space. It is included in the calculation of impervious area.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a definition of what constitutes a park. Are minimum amounts of amenities required?

Ms. Martin responded that the Bridge Street Code includes a table that provides minimum and maximum sizes for each open space, as well as development requirements regarding what can be included. The applicant would need to follow that, if they proceed with the design.

Ms. Call stated that these buildings are required to front principal roadways. There are some good examples of how that has been accomplished, but most are larger structures. Are there examples within the Bridge Street District of smaller parcels such as this that front on multiple corner lots? She is trying to understand how, when there are buildings that oppose one another, there would be buildings that wrap frontages on all four corners.

Ms. Martin responded that the most analogous development would be Tuller Flats. However, they do not have three sides on principal frontage streets. They are two-sided on principal frontage streets or cornered by neighborhood public streets.

Mr. Grimes inquired if, in context with the development further down the street, staff would have any preferences in regard to the roofs and architectural materials in the proposed development. What would staff recommend continuing, changing, or making more unique?

Ms. Martin responded that the Building Code requires building diversity not only within one development but also across developments. Staff would recommend this plan address that context, as a modern, contemporary, infill project, diversifying it from other projects.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio stated that also present for this case is Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, who will be covering the housing product and

other locations within the nation where the builder is building this product. This will be one of the first locations in this area for this particular product. He will provide some background on this site. Previously, an independent living facility project was proposed for this site, with which he was involved. After undergoing numerous hearings with the Commission and City Council, the project was abandoned. He and Mr. Callahan have tried to take information from those earlier hearings and use it in developing this proposal. One of those earlier concerns was the monolithic building with significant street frontage. This new proposal includes multiple buildings. There were also earlier concerns about the lack of open space along John Shields and lack of opportunities for interaction between buildings and the community. There are balconies on the backs of these units; there may be ways to have those on the fronts, as well, or in lieu of rear balconies. That is a level of detail that would be covered in the Preliminary Development Plan, not the Concept Plan stage, of the development. Staff's concerns as identified would be addressed in that next stage. This is a "for sale" product for which a range of buyers is anticipated – empty nesters, young professionals and families. Pulte's history in other markets reflects this buyer trend. Pricing will be in the mid-\$300K. There is a rental product to the west, and Bridge Park has a unique mix of residents. They believe the proposed product will meet a market niche between the two. The squaring off of Tuller Parkway is proposed, and is the primary reason that this application will be reviewed by City Council, as well. A development agreement will be necessary to accomplish a land swap. It will involve some financial assistance from the City via a TIF or other means, due to the fact that it is a project that will benefit the area at large.

Architecture is a difficult topic, because it tends to be in the "eye of the beholder." With the previous project, the applicant received conflicting feedback during reviews. One opinion directed them to follow the Tuller Flats example; another requested more traditional architecture. With this new proposal, they have provided two options of different directions. The examples are not specific proposals for Dublin; they are examples of other projects they have built. Their goal is to obtain clear direction on which direction to take this project, which they will then Dublinize as they proceed.

The applicant is in agreement with all of staff's recommended conditions except the third condition, which is related to maximum parking. The calculations appear to suggest they are greatly exceeding the maximum Code requirement. However, the nature of this product – having a garage that is internal, beneath and behind the living space – lends itself to needing a small driveway. With a "for sale" product, there is an expectation for a driveway. Backing out directly onto a community driveway is not the expectation here; that would be more common with an apartment complex. They believe this is a situation where a deviation may be warranted; although, they are open to providing other places in which guests could park outside of the proposed spaces.

Matt Callahan, Pulte Homes, 475 Metro Place S., Dublin, 43017, stated that Pulte Homes is best known for building conventional, single-family homes throughout central Ohio, with a few isolated townhome products. In some of their other urban markets, townhomes are their primary product type. In central Ohio, they have been looking for the right opportunity and location for this product. When the previous application for this site was being considered, he was present for another case but recognized the opportunity for this site. They have studied the Bridge Street Code and looked at the context of the surrounding area, and have developed an approach and proposal that they believe fits well within the District. They have offered an affordable option for purchasing a new home within the Dublin community.

Greg Chillog, Principal, Planner/Landscape Architect, The Edge Group, Inc., 330 W. Spring Street, Columbus, 43215, stated that this plan essentially designed itself due to the prescriptive nature of the Bridge Street Code. The primary task was to understand the Code. He will attempt to identify where and why the open spaces are where they are. John Shields Parkway is the spine through the District, and they would like to create a rhythm of different spaces and different sizes of the project viewed along that roadway. Beginning at its intersection with Village Parkway, that roadway extends down to the river. At its halfway point, the Tuller Flats community has a large, prominent park, so what they have attempted to provide is a gateway element, such as a pocket plaza with some pavement, seating and perhaps a community feature or some branding element for the District. Continuing along John Shields, there would be two additional pocket plazas before reaching the large, central greenspace. Before reaching that central greenspace, there would be a diversity of building frontages and open spaces along the roadway. Inside this development, along the public streets, will be some smaller, more traditional pocket parks with a community amenity, such as a mailbox kiosk. They have worked hard to provide mid-block crossings for pedestrians through the development. From east to west, the grade drops approximately 25 feet across the site. That helps with the rhythm of the buildings, allowing them to adjust the grade between the buildings. This building type provides more opportunity to do that, as opposed to larger, more monolithic structures. They have worked on providing 22- to 24-ft. wide private vehicular driveways along the private roads or alleyways, which will provide access to the rear of the building with the attached, integrated two-car garages and vehicular stacking space in front of the garages. In the next phase, they will address ways in which to integrate and screen that private stacking space separate from the public space in the front. These driveways are essential for a "for sale" product.

Keith Philipkowski, Pulte Homes, 475 S. Metro Place, Dublin, 43017, stated that he is the architect for this project. [Displayed slides of streetscape views of the proposed community.] He understands that the Bridge Street Code establishes specific measures to account for building variety, and color and massing differences in the homes are ways in which to promote that diversity. Their intent is to customize the elevations for the community as a whole. Although not shown in the Concept Plan, finer details such as the screening of utilities are very important and will be addressed as the project proceeds. The inspiration of their design is primarily Tuller Flats, due to the similar geography. There is also an option for a more traditional appearance. At the Concept design stage, they are very open to design suggestions and would appreciate that feedback to ensure they pursue a desired direction. They have worked on both a flat roof and a pitched roof design, attempting to blend some features. Some detail is provided regarding how the overhang reacts with a gabled roof. The community may be able to see a gabled roof from the front façade and the ends of units more readily. Staff has recommended the flat roof option; however, that option may be problematic for achieving a third-level walkout onto rooftop terraces. Part of the inspiration for rooftop terraces is the intent to create an opportunity for outdoor living. To achieve that, rooftop terraces are very important. Decks also will be provided on the rear elevations to promote the outdoor living aspect. In regard to four-sided architecture, the side elevations will be addressed in a more pronounced manner as the plan proceeds. In regard to the Code requirements for fenestrations, windows will be added where possible, simultaneously protecting the interior configurations of the homes. If the window opportunities become too limited, they are interested in collectively identifying a solution. For any floorplan Pulte introduces, there is a lengthy 12-step process, beginning with ideation and ending with a prototype building. Virtual visualization is utilized, as well as consumer feedback testing. The concept is to have a

floorplan shell with interchangeability. For instance, the floorplan rendering shown would be re-configured based on kitchen placement. Although the townhouse product is not the core of Pulte's business in Ohio, in Cleveland they do offer a variety of townhome series. The core of their business is in New England. The floorplan shown is one of their most successful in urban markets. Over time, it has been fine-tuned to cater to the market. The Option B alternative shown has a more traditional look, but other traditional looks are possible, dependent upon the Commission's feedback. He requests the Commission's preference regarding a flat vs. a pitched roof.

There was no public comment.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired if the floorplan has sufficient flexibility to provide a mix of front and rear terraces.

Mr. Philipkowski stated they had discussed that concept, but preferred the public-facing opportunity for outdoor living. He believes there may be that flexibility, but it would require further vetting. If that is an element the majority of the Commission would prefer, they would focus their efforts on achieving it for the next phase of the approval process.

Mr. Grimes inquired about the intent for provision of mail and for refuse/trash pickup. Would it be the homeowners' responsibility or would there be a common area for collection?

Mr. Callahan responded that there would be a private trash pickup for each home. The homeowner association would handle that contract, and the cost would be included in the monthly HOA fees. In regard to mailboxes, the USPS has new regulations requiring all new communities to have centralized mailbox facilities. This is also the case for new single-home communities. In this particular community, the plan includes two centralized mail facilities along the McCune Avenue extension. Those areas would be gathering spaces, as well, not just centralized mail locations. The space could include benches, gazebos and trellises.

Ms. Call stated in regard to parking:

- a. If there is a balcony overhang on the rear elevation, having a street with cars driving immediately beneath would be undesirable. Therefore, she has no objection to individual driveways on the back of the units, which would provide two exterior parking spaces in addition to the two interior garage spaces.
- b. What is the anticipated parking occupancy rate? The proposal would provide 364 spaces in excess of what is required for the project. Could it be an over-parked product? Is an interior garage parking rate of 80% anticipated? If so, what would the anticipated exterior parking rate be?

Mr. Callahan responded that with owner-occupied homes, private parking is very desirable to owners. Some owners use their garages for storage, so will need the additional exterior parking spaces for their vehicles, keeping them out of the public drives and roadways. They do not believe the proposed community will be overparked. They are currently building a townhome community in the Pickerington market, which is a distinct, very different approach for townhomes. At the request of the existing homeowners, they have added additional parking areas to the community. In attached-unit communities, parking becomes a premium, and often is insufficient. He does not believe this project could be overparked, but they will work with staff to identify the correct solution.

Mr. Chillog stated that from the design perspective of the townhome product, interior parking inside the structure is an essential. It provides the homeowner parking privacy and security.

Ms. Call stated that the principal roadways here are John Shields Parkway, Village Parkway and Tuller Road. The Code requires that a building structure face the principal roadway, but where there are two 90-degree angles, that is difficult to accomplish. How would those corners appear if they were fronted by buildings?

Mr. Chillog responded that those corners are very important. Extra time and attention will be necessary to achieve the best appearance possible. The streetscape is as important to Pulte as it is to the City. It is essential that there be accent features in these key places for the product to present well. It may be necessary to over emphasize four-sided architecture here. It is difficult to articulate how it would look without actually designing it, however.

Ms. Call stated that she believes staff's concerns are with two particular road stubs. Four-sided architecture may address the building itself, but it would not address the fact that the frontage needs to be fronted by a building. Are there other incidences in the District where multiple sides of the same building have a frontage requirement?

Mr. Chillog responded that they do not have an L-shaped building with this product type that would satisfy the Code requirement on that corner. This is an opportunity for them to come up with a creative solution that provides a visual barrier from the public side to the private side. It may be architectural, landscaping or both.

Ms. Call stated that they mentioned mailbox structures and benches in the interior pocket parks. Are any other amenities being considered for those interior pocket parks?

Mr. Callahan responded that ideas have been discussed for these gathering places, such as covered structures. Particularly for the pocket parks on the north side of McCune Street, they want to articulate with some design features. They will bring back more evolved ideas on those features at the Preliminary Development Plan stage. In regard to the earlier question about the building frontage on the corner – treating those key points via the buildings and through site and landscape architecture - planning will be important. What occurs on the ground and in the surrounding areas has as much visual effect as what occurs on the building. A combination of both will be utilized to come up with the best solution.

Ms. Kennedy, referring to the lower left corner of block B, stated that a road dead-ends there. The materials refer to a masonry or wrought iron element being placed in that location. The "feel" between the buildings is abrupt. Due to the amount of material already present at that corner, what is the logic in adding such an element at that location?

Mr. Chillog responded that at the Concept Plan level, it is suggested because the Code requires it there. Although it is responsive to the Code requirement, they recognize that a 3-ft. high masonry wall does not work there.

Ms. Martin stated that staff has a collaborative relationship with the applicant, so they will be working together to identify an appropriate resolution.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if staff's preference would be a landscaping element.

Ms. Martin responded that they would begin by looking at the site layout with the applicant to determine if the smaller building closest to the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Public

Street A could become more than a 4 or 5-unit building and the 8-unit building on Public Street A become only a 5-unit building. Thereby, the drive would terminate at the rear of the John Shields building. These are some of the options that could be discussed as the plan develops.

Mr. Callahan stated that it is important that they remain consistent with the rest of the building structures. When he refers to emphasizing character at a corner, they will be mindful of not being out of character with the whole, as well. They would prefer to integrate other methods of addressing the corner rather than physically changing the layout. He does not want the expectation to be anything different than they would consider to be appropriate in the end.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if, with the flat roof variations of Option A, the pitched roof would be necessary to have rooftop terraces.

Mr. Chillog responded affirmatively. As he considers how best to achieve that solution, it is very important to have feedback from the Commission on the flat roof option with rooftop terraces.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the product would be consistent throughout the four blocks, or would there be a mix of floorplans, perhaps differing in the blocks.

Mr. Chillog responded that one or two primary floorplan configurations would be used throughout the community, but those floorplans can be diversified throughout the units.

Mr. Grimes inquired about the roads.

Ms. Martin responded that all of the new and extended streets would be public neighborhood streets designed to public standards. The driveways or alleyways accessing the units will be private and maintained by the HOA, as established by the developer.

Mr. Callahan referred to the pitched roof rendering, and noted that this design concept is interesting. The buildings have the appearance of flat roofs because of the parapet extension off the front; however, they have pitched roofs, which provide ability for rooftop terrace, third-floor living. They are interested in having the Commission's feedback on this option.

Mr. Chillog stated that one of the ways variety is achieved is through roof design. In instances where they may not elect to have rooftop terraces – such as building sites less suitable for that feature -- there would be ability to lower those roofs.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Kennedy stated that Mr. Underhill has requested Commission feedback particularly in regard to flat versus pitched roofs and the parking deviation.

Mr. Underhill responded that is correct. On everything else, they have clear guidance.

Ms. Call stated that she has no concerns related to the proposed parking. Of note, the Code's minimum is also the maximum permitted. She would like to see some integrated on-street parking, particularly in the pocket park areas. There is some on-street parking along John Shields Parkway, but there should be some opportunity for visitor parking outside the unit driveways. In regard to the pocket park amenities, a mail kiosk is not really an amenity, although they can look attractive if located within an enclosure as opposed to consisting of a multi-tenant mailbox arrangement. She would not visit a park to look at the pretty mailboxes, but she and her children would have gone there to use play equipment, for a picnic, for Frisbee golf, or other real amenities. In the urban areas of Dublin, people want to live, work and play. While a resident could take a walk to see a movie or go to a farmers market, what are the true amenities for this

particular neighborhood? Dublin likes to be “a cut above,” so the Commission is interested in partnerships. That is the reason the Commission asks detailed questions – to formulate that partnership and learn how amenable the applicant is to such a relationship for the purpose of achieving the best product possible for present and future Dublin residents. She really likes the roof terraces, so prefers the pitched roof option that looks like a flat roof, particularly with the rear terraces, as depicted in the meeting materials. She also likes the variety of open spaces, which creates an interesting visual experience along the street to the culmination of the new park on Riverside Drive. She is excited with the degree of opportunity here and is interested in a collaborative effort to realize it. This Concept Plan proposes a fantastic product, and she is looking forward to seeing it completed.

Mr. Grimes stated that he likes the rooftop terraces, as well. It is a very nice feature that distinguishes the product. He is concerned about the view when travelling down John Shields Parkway. The property located above this development, and residents travelling down Tuller Road will be looking at this product as the gateway piece. This will be a highly visible product from all directions. Care must be taken as to how it presents from all angles, not only as the face of this product. but for its “feel” to the greater community.

Mr. Supelak stated that he entirely agrees with the points made about four-sided architecture. Sensitivity can solve some of the corner and rear of building conditions. This item is addressed by #6 in the recommended conditions. He concurs with Ms. Call on the unit driveways. They are an important amenity to homeowners. There is also merit to having opportunities for on-street parking adjacent to pocket parks. It may be nice on Public Street A. On-street parking provides opportunity for front door approaches to the homes for visitors, as opposed to garage approaches. In regard to the architecture, he recognizes that this is a product already used in other areas that is being adapted to this community, but it is a good product. With this many buildings, diversity will be very important. With rowhouse buildings, there are some opportunities for diversity on the elevations. However, the end units have opportunities to be massed a little differently, and thereby be addressed through four-sided architecture. There are some end units, for instance, that do not face another unit. Larger bumpouts can change the relief on a side unit and provide opportunity for a second balcony, perhaps. Empty nesters often prefer living space without stairs. There is opportunity to reduce the height of end units. In the bottom of the left corner, there was a suggestion to swap the building on Public Street A with the building on John Shields Parkway. However, if the building on Public Street A were to be repositioned slightly and a special unit added at the elbow, that would close the street up and create an intentional corner. There would be no need to add wall features or other articulations. Focusing on sensitivity with the corners will begin to define those opportunities. An additional level of design is needed at this point. Staff provided material recommendations for the facades. On the third level of some buildings, all brick was used. On some elevations, there were multiple types of brick or stone. Two materials rather than one will help with diversity, so he concurs with staff regarding the need to extend the diversity up the façade. If a parapet is used with a flat roof solution, he would advocate for adding more vertical relief. He likes the rooftop terrace concept, if the roofline aesthetics succeed. It is a selling point and an amenity that will enrich this community. Balconies on the front façade would provide diversity on that side. He likes the proposed approach to open space and amenities. He recognizes that the plan is in the concept stage, but the landscaping appears to be low-lying. He would encourage incorporating vertical landscape elements to the building facades. Chimneys can add articulation, perhaps in the end units, which are aesthetically lacking. He is confident this

experienced builder will address such issues, and if the corner conditions are addressed well, he is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is in agreement with other Commissioners regarding a preference for Option A with a pitched roof. She likes the open space continued here as it is in other areas of Bridge Park. There are opportunities in this area for great views. As mentioned earlier, she would prefer the proposed masonry or wrought iron element be replaced with a landscape element. She concurs with the comments on the building wrap-arounds and how those are represented on the corner spaces. The pocket park areas facing John Shields Parkway are so small that they are likely unusable. She would like to see some additional considerations for those open spaces. Perhaps having fewer small spaces in favor of some larger spaces. She concurs with Mr. Supelak's comments that there are some opportunities to make the architecture more expressive and interesting. At this point, it seems too sterile. She would like to see more character and dimension. The proposed structures are similar to apartment buildings – flat fronts without diversity. She would encourage a more individual character, a different look from anything around the site. With those recommendations, she is very excited about this proposed addition to Dublin.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had received responses to his questions and had clear direction. There are some Commission members absent tonight.

Mr. Underhill responded that they appreciate the feedback and consensus among the members present. Their guidance is appreciated.

Mr. Chillog inquired if, as he works on refining the proposed design, he is unable to accomplish all of the direction given, would the Commission be opposed to his changing directions to a completely traditional architectural character. Is the Commission interested in seeing only a contemporary style of architecture?

Ms. Call responded that she much prefers Option A with the pitched roof over Option B, or a contemporary, minimalist design, assuming the quality is high.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Bridge Street Code is more amenable to one architectural approach over another.

Ms. Martin responded that the Bridge Street Code principles can be applied to any architectural style. The traditional style must meet the development character defined in the Code.

Mr. Supelak that he concurs with Ms. Call's comments, but Option B is also good, as the dormers help in breaking up the roofline. If not Option B, any other traditional design could do so, as well. Pulte is an experienced builder, and he is confident that they can work with staff and achieve the best design solution for this site.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she prefers a traditional design. It is different and would stand out more as opposed to matching everything around it. It is more similar to the construction at The Grand, which achieves more diversity. However, she is supportive of either design approach, as long as it is of a high quality and meets the required characteristics for this site.

Mr. Underhill reiterated the applicant's request to delete Condition #3, related to the parking. With the condition, if they are unable to meet the Code requirement, it would be necessary to return to the Commission later to request a waiver. They would like to have the ability to resolve the issue without that necessity.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the applicant would be in agreement with the remaining eight conditions.

Mr. Underhill responded that the applicant is in agreement.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Call seconded to recommend approval of the Concept Plan to City Council with the following 8 conditions:

- 1) The applicant clarify and update the plans accordingly if 168 or 171 units are proposed prior to City Council review.
- 2) The applicant revise the site layout to minimize the view of auto-oriented drives and the rear of units from principal frontage streets.
- 3) The applicant work with the City Engineer to establish dedicated parking lanes with bump-outs prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 4) The applicant update the plan to meet the maximum impervious lot coverage permitted by Code.
- 5) The applicant revise the building elevations to have four-sided architecture with additional attention to the side and rear of the homes prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 6) The applicant revise the building elevations to limit the application of cementitious siding and panels prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 7) The applicant identify air conditioning unit locations and other utility locations with required screening prior to the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 8) The applicant update the plan to meet the open space diversity required by Code.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
[Motion passed 4-0]

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Kennedy noted that there were no requests to remove the following items from the Consent Agenda:

~~4. The Corners, Rings Road and Frantz Road, 20-028 FP, Final Plat~~

~~The subdivision of ±24 acres into three lots for the future development of ±70,000 square feet of office and commercial space and a public park. The site is at the intersection of Frantz Road and Rings Road and currently zoned OLR, Office Laboratory & Research and PUD, Planned Unit Development District.~~

~~There was no public comment.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to recommend approval of the Final Plat to Council with the following two conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal, and;~~
- ~~2) That the City coordinate the vacation of the retention easement in the southeast portion of the site.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.
[Motion passed 4-0]~~

~~5. University Boulevard, Shier Rings Road, 20-027 FP, Final Plat~~

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

February 25, 2019

Page 11 of 15

Resolution 13-19

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement with the Dublin City School District Board of Education for Fleet Shared Services for Compressed Natural Gas School Buses.

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the City of Dublin and Dublin City School District Board of Education have an ongoing shared services agreement with regard to the gasoline and diesel fuel service area and providing those fuels. The District recently purchased five compressed natural gas (CNG) school buses. City and School District staff have reviewed operations within their respective organizations and have determined fueling and preventive maintenance/repairs for the District's new CNG school buses would best be provided by the City of Dublin. It would result in improved efficiencies and benefit both organizations. The City's Fleet building is equipped with the required ventilation to perform maintenance on CNG vehicles indoors, and the City's technicians have the specialized training required to maintain CNG fleets. All services would be provided on a time and material basis. CNG fuel would be charged at the base price of fuel plus a surcharge that is established as part of the cost of services ordinance each year. The City of Dublin would invoice the School District monthly. Staff recommends Council approval of Resolution 13-19. The School Board approved this resolution at their last Board meeting.

Vote on the Resolution: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

OTHER

- Basic Plan– The Residences at Tuller Heights

Mayor Peterson moved to table the Basic Plan, as requested by the applicant.

Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.

- Independence Day Price Changes

Ms. LeRoy stated that the memo in the packet outlines the changes proposed for the 2019 event.

- Price of tables – increase from \$125 to \$150. Tables seat 10 people. The table price was last increased in 2014. The tables sell out on the day the table sales begin. Comparing prices with other jurisdictions who sponsor such events found that the City's prices are much lower.
- Wristbands. Change proposed from no charge on day of event to a charge of \$5 for wristbands on the day of the event. The pre-sale wristbands would also be sold for \$5. This recommendation is partially a result of confusion about wristband sales. Many residents have commented that they pay to purchase wristbands in advance of the event, while the wristbands are free the day of the event. The charge has been imposed in previous years to ensure people purchasing tickets prior to the event do attend the event. The number of wristbands available is based on capacity for safety purposes as determined by the Fire Department. Staff is now recommending that the fee for pre-sale wristbands increases from \$3 to \$5 and that \$5 is charged for wristbands the day of the event.

Ms. De Rosa stated that if the intent of charging for wristbands was not to raise funds, but ensure the residents had priority access to the wristbands, then she does not understand why all will now be charged \$5 for wristbands – pre-sale and at the gate. She does not understand the logic behind this.

Ms. LeRoy stated that pre-sales ensure that people will attend the event, especially in a rain situation. There is a limit to the number of wristbands available, so it is important that wristbands be available at the gate to fill the stadium. Staff recommends continuing the pre-sale of wristbands, which will be available only to Dublin residents/Dublin School District residents. The number of wristbands sold will likely increase dramatically, as the same price will be charged for pre-sale and at the gate.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

February 11, 2019

Page 7 of 11

~~Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolutions.~~

~~Mr. Gracia stated there is no additional information. These are related to the PACE financing discussed earlier this evening.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa asked for clarification of the process for the legislation to implement this. Ms. Readler responded that for each PACE financing project, the City is required to approve resolutions and ordinances under the Ohio Revised Code. The resolutions require one reading and the ordinances require two readings. In the past, emergency action has been requested at the second reading of the ordinances due to the tight timetables for the financing approvals. After researching the Charter, there is a section that enables legislation to be effective immediately upon passage if related to assessments for improvements petitioned for by property owners. Therefore, emergency action will not be needed for the ordinances at second reading, as they will be effective upon passage based on the Charter provision 4.04(a)(3). The City does very few assessment projects and therefore has not had cause to use this Charter provision previously. But for each PACE project, resolutions and ordinances are required, per the ORC.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa thanked staff for their research and explanation of the process.~~

~~Vote on Resolutions 08-19 and 09-19: Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.~~

STAFF COMMENTS

- ~~• Dublin Corporate Area Plan Implementation Strategy – Request to Refer to Community Development Committee~~

~~Mr. McDaniel noted that this Plan was adopted in September of 2018. It includes an overall strategy encouraging certain uses, mixes and forms of development to maintain the viability of the planning area that has been designed by the Plan. Staff is working on steps for short-term and long-term implementation of this Plan and requests referral to Community Development Committee for review and guidance regarding next steps for the effective implementation of that Plan.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved referral of the DCAP implementation strategy to the Community Development Committee.~~

~~Ms. Alutto seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes.~~

- ~~• Update of Economic Development Strategy – Request to Refer to Community Development Committee~~

~~Mr. McDaniel noted a memo in the packet references the ongoing Economic Development Strategy Update that is being conducted by Dublin staff and TEconomy Partners LLC. Staff wants to engage the Community Development Committee throughout this process for feedback and discussion in order to formulate a recommendation to Council. The recommendation to Council would likely occur in early August. There is a timeline provided regarding the anticipated meetings needed with the Committee. The timeline envisions the topic coming to CDC on March 4. Staff is requesting referral to CDC.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved referral of the Update of the Economic Development Strategy to the Community Development Committee.~~

~~Ms. De Rosa seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.~~

OTHER

- ~~• Request to Remove the Basic Plan Review for The Residences at Tuller Heights from the Table and Schedule it for Council Review~~

~~Mr. McDaniel noted that this Basic Plan was reviewed by Council in August of 2018. Council provided feedback at that time, and staff has continued to work with the applicant on revisions. The applicant is requesting this matter be removed from the table and scheduled for hearing on February 25.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved to take this from the table and schedule for hearing on February 25.~~

~~Mr. Reiner seconded the motion.~~

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

February 11, 2019

Page 8 of 11

Vote on the motion: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel highlighted other reports included in Council's packet:

1. The Engaged Communities Awards application was submitted in a timely fashion as outlined in the memo.
2. There was a follow-up memo regarding Council's request that staff presentations be included in the packet prior to Council meetings. Staff is working to accommodate this request, and he acknowledged Ms. De Rosa's work on this process.
3. He and Ms. Crandall are reviewing some potential changes to the format of the staff reports, and Council will see these in the coming weeks.
4. Noted that the transfer of some duties from Planning support staff to the Clerk of Council office has been completed in accordance with Council's direction. He thanked the departments involved for effecting this transition.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Committee:

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, Chair reported that:

1. A copy of the proposed agenda for the retreat has been circulated to Council members for their review and input. Council members had the opportunity to provide input on the proposed agenda. The retreat will be held at the future City Hall building at 5555 Perimeter Drive on the evening of February 21 and all day Friday, February 22. The meeting is open to the public.
2. The Council employees' performance reviews are scheduled for an executive session the evening of Wednesday, February 27.
3. Board and commission interviews will be scheduled soon.

Community Development Committee:

Mr. Reiner, Chair reported that the Committee met on February 4 to consider the review of the proposed amendment to the approval process in the Bridge Street District Code. Staff will provide information back to the Committee prior to moving this forward to Council.

The second item was review of Code Section 152.086(C) of the Subdivision Regulations (Fee in Lieu of Land Dedication). The Committee supports Option 5, which requires the developer to pay a fee in lieu of that is based on an individual appraisal by the City, the cost of which is to be reimbursed by the developer.

Ms. Readler stated that a Code amendment will be brought forward to Council by Planning on this recommended change.

In response to Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes' question of timing, Mr. McDaniel stated he will check with Planning staff.

COTA:

Ms. De Rosa thanked the leadership of COTA for stepping up last month to offer assistance to residents and neighbors affected by the partial federal government shutdown. COTA provided free bus services for those impacted. This highlights how the community stepped up to support in any way possible. She also commended the City of Columbus and the City of Dublin for reaching out and looking at items such as water bills or other where some type of relief could be provided to those furloughed workers. She appreciates the work of the staff on these matters.

Dublin Community Foundation:

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes stated the Board met last week and is beginning a new grant cycle. All of the information is available on their website for interested parties who are seeking grant funding.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

August 13, 2018

Page 16 of 26

~~Mr. Gracia stated that it is very important in terms of retention, as once the business has the connection, it is very expensive to duplicate. They will build their entire network on this connection. Many projects are in the pipeline waiting to have this connection.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Fox, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose-Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.~~

Resolution 47-18

Appointing Members to the Bridge Park New Community Authority.

~~Mayor Peterson introduced the Resolution.~~

~~Ms. Mumma noted that in 2015, the Bridge Park New Community Authority was authorized by Council, and Council appointed four of the seven members of the Board pursuant to Ohio Revised Code. The terms of two of the members have expired, and staff is recommending reappointment of Ms. Readey and Mr. Schwieterman to a two-year term, respectively, ending March 31, 2020.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose-Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes.~~

Resolution 48-18

Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Second Addendum for a One-Year Extension of a Lease with Chiller, LLC for 7001 Dublin Park Drive (the "Chiller").

~~Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.~~

~~Mr. McDaniel acknowledged Mr. Foegler's work in preparing this information. Mr. Foegler worked for the City in 1992 when this project was initiated. It is amazing to review the growth in participation in this ice facility over the past 25 years. The Chiller lease with the City expires in September of 2018. Staff is recommending an extension of this lease for an additional year to allow time for the Chiller's assessment of recapitalization for the facility and potential expansion.~~

~~Staff recommends approval of this resolution in order to extend this lease for one additional year.~~

~~Mr. Keenan noted that people come from all over the state for ice time at this facility. He appreciates the work staff has done on this matter.~~

~~Vote on the Resolution: Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose-Groomes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.~~

OTHER

• Final Plat – Autumn Rose Woods, Section 1

~~Ms. Husak stated that this is a request for platting of 37 lots – Section 1 – of Autumn Rose Woods. The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this in August of 2017 and recommended approval. Staff is recommending approval as well. Council had approved the fencing change for this development in June of 2018, and this is the replatting that follows.~~

~~Mayor Peterson moved approval of the final plat.~~

~~Mr. Keenan seconded the motion.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose-Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes.~~

• Basic Plan Review – The Residences at Tuller Heights

~~Ms. Shelly stated that Council is requested to consider tonight the following: the Basic Plan, the fee-in-lieu of open space request, and designation of the next reviewing body for future site plan review.~~

- ~~• The applicable Zoning Code sections relate to the development plan review, the lots and blocks, the street types, the neighborhood standards (Sawmill Center Neighborhood District), and the uses.~~
- ~~• The site is located along John Shields Parkway, near the Tuller Flats and Greystone Mews residential communities.~~
- ~~• The current site is undeveloped.~~

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

August 13, 2018

Page 17 of 26

Held _____

- In regard to the lots and blocks, this involves the street grid for Bridge Street District. The proposed streets are Neighborhood Streets, as per the Code Street Grid System.
- The concept is to straighten out the Tuller Road and Village Parkway intersection, and add two additional Neighborhood Streets.
- This overview demonstrates that the development itself is compatible and fits in with the overall development occurring in the Bridge Street District.
- The property is located within the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. Within this District, dwellings for multi-family apartments are permitted. The proposal is for a 55 plus residential community.
- The proposal is for an approximately 147,000 square-foot building with 135 units. Proposal includes 67 parking spaces – 34 on-site with four handicap, and 29 on-street spaces – primarily for visitors.
- The open space required is .62 acres, and the current proposal includes .24 acres.
- The proposal includes two pocket plazas and a smaller greenspace to the north and east. In addition, the residents would have access to a rear patio, a front patio that is part of their bistro service. There is a street wall adjacent to John Shields Parkway sidewalk, which would also be for the public, but not necessarily qualifying for an open space category.
- She shared renderings of the pocket plaza that would be adjacent to the porte-cochere; the patio space adjacent to the bistro; streetwell along John Shields Parkway; and the rooftop amenity deck.
- In addition to the open space proposed for the site, she noted the open space adjacent to the site: Cooperstone Park at the back of The Mews; Tuller Flats Square within one-half mile; John Shields Parkway greenway that connects Village Parkway all the way down to the river; and Riverside Crossing Park.
- A preliminary rendering of the building shows a diversity of massing with a corner element as a visual cue.
- The Basic Development Plan criteria have all been met, with the gap in the requirement for open space being met with a fee-in-lieu-of.
- The open space criteria have been met as well with the open space fee-in-lieu-of request.

The recommendation from the Administrative Review Team is for the Basic Plan – including the lots and blocks, the fee-in-lieu-of, be approved and that Council recommend a reviewing body for the Final Development Plan and for the Site Plan. These reviews would include the additional features and architectural massing.

She noted that the applicant is present to respond to any questions.

Mayor Peterson invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Aaron Underhill, attorney with Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, representing the applicant stated that he is looking forward to moving this project along the path of more detailed plans and architectures. Representatives are present tonight from Graziano Construction and Development, Pittsburgh.

He commented as follows:

- Clarified that what this use is *not* is an assistant living or independent senior living facility. He is aware there is some fatigue on the City's part with these types of proposals. He has been involved in many of those over the last five to ten years.
- What this use *is* is multi-family in the truest sense of the word. It will look, act, feel and function like a multi-family project and, in fact, it is. There are no healthcare workers on site; these will be older adults, as the facility will be age restricted in accordance with federal law – 55 and older. They expect the demographic to be even older than that. The only distinction between this and a Tuller Flats are the types of amenities offered to the residents and the age of the residents. There is no buy-in fee; this is not an institutional type of use. It is clearly within the multi-family use permitted in this zoning district. They believe this represents a good opportunity to diversify the housing opportunities in this area for the older demographic.
- Things that will be offered on-site in the community buildings are a bistro, a pub, a fitness center, organized activities, and shuttle services to travel offsite.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

August 13, 2018

Page 18 of 26

Held

- This development will have no impact on Dublin Schools given the 55 and older age restriction. They wanted to make sure that this is a distinguished use from the other institutional uses Council has seen.
- There are kitchen units in each of these as is typically seen in a multi-family project. They do not have a cafeteria per se, but there are dining opportunities for residents on site.
- Graziano Construction representative present is Denise Pampera, the third generation owner. This is a 100 percent female-owned family business for 66 years. They not only construct but own, hold and operate these facilities. Therefore, they have a vested interest that it is a quality product and that it will function as presented.
- He offered to respond to any questions.

Mayor Peterson invited Council members to comment.

Ms. Fox stated that she has no concerns with a 55 and older community.

- Her issue with this is the configuration of the block. This was raised by PZC as well. The block maximum length is 500 feet. Two-hundred fifty feet is the maximum length permitted in the Bridge Street Code; this one is 485 feet.
- It was requested at PZC that a mid-block pedestrian throughway be provided. The plan provides a mid building throughway, but this does not meet the 15-foot, open to the public throughway as required in the Bridge Street Code. There are particular requirements in Basic Plans about blocks, access, and alleyways and pedestrian ways that are laid out in the District Plan. They are not satisfied by this particular Basic Plan.
- Another issue that the entrance – the face of this building – does not face John Shields Parkway. It faces Street B. Typically, in the BSD, the energy of the face of the building is to be on John Shields Parkway. There is an entrance, however the real entrance is on the other side, as well as the parking.
- The other item brought up at PZC is that the open spaces and common spaces are intended to be public spaces; many of these are not.
- She has issue with the fee-in-lieu-of, which is occurring with many other developments in Bridge Street District. As a result, the pocket parks are being lost and instead directed to the Tuller Square space. The City is eliminating the opportunities for small pocket parks by allowing fee-in-lieu of open space dedication.
- PZC was shown a variety of more traditional details on this building, and PZC asked them to bring those forward. However, that is not reflected in the current plan.
- Most importantly, we are not allowing for the blocks to be divided into more intimate spaces; we are not following some of the Bridge Street District design guidelines for those.

Mayor Peterson summarized her concerns: the block length, the architecture, the open space and the orientation of the building.

Ms. Fox added that the corner is a gateway and PZC requested some interesting unique tower items be added for that reason. Secondly, she wants a mid-block pedestrian separation – the building is too long.

Ms. De Rosa commented:

- She agrees with Ms. Fox's comments.
- At this point in time, a fair bit of development is in place and underway in the District. She has noticed that the use of these very small pocket parks is not supporting gathering spaces and the community feel that was desired.
- She reviewed the plan for the District, and the third sentence indicates the City is seeking developments that create economic vitality and a livable, walkable community. With this plan and the amenities in the building – such as a pub, restaurant – and limited parking spaces, she is not certain how this meets the character of the creation of economic vitality and a livable, walkable community in its definition. This proposed development is not in the spirit of what the City's desires for the District.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held _____

August 13, 2018

Page 19 of 26

- The sheer massing of the building is of concern at this gateway location. As currently presented, it does not fit the criteria for a gateway facility.
- To summarize, she is not certain how this particular development would create economic vitality and a livable, walkable community.

Mayor Peterson asked her to summarize.

Ms. De Rosa responded that the pocket parks is a concern, as she has indicated, but more importantly, does this proposal meet what the City is trying to accomplish in the environment and the building.

Mr. Reiner commented:

- He agrees with his colleagues' comments. He understands the applicant is trying to propose a senior retirement facility, and breaking up the building could impact that concept.
- As far as orientation, he believes the building is oriented correctly.
- He agrees this may not be the best use for this site, as it does not meet the criteria already mentioned of a walkable community, etc.
- On the landscaped side of the building, the hitching and pilaster should probably be continued and tighten up the space, closing it off so that access is provided without viewing into the subspace.
- The pocket park issue is a problem, unless the City in the future develops a park environment for residents.

Mr. Keenan commented:

- He is interested in hearing about the demographics in terms of age in some of this applicant's other projects.
- These units appear to be 1,000 square feet or less and what level of rents are suggested? This may be relevant in view of the discussion over the years about the need for affordable housing for seniors in this community.

Ms. Alutto commented:

- She echoes some of the same sentiments in terms of site use, placemaking, etc.
- Her other concern is with the nature of the tax increment financing proposed for this project. Although this is technically a commercial use – not residential – it appears as a residential development and this gives her pause. This is not related to the design of the project, but more with the logistics of the development and financing.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes commented:

- She echoes the comments about engagement. People sitting on the outside of the fenced-in area of a building does not mean engagement in the street network.
- This is far too lengthy of a building and provides no interaction to the street network in two key places where connection is desired.
- The number of parking spaces being requested is a concern, as it indicates that they don't want to park cars and don't want too many bike stations – meaning that people will not come and go frequently.
- The goal is for an actively engaged street network and vibrancy. A building that offers all of its services on the interior as shown on the plans – bistro, café, dining, pub, fitness area, gardening area, market, lounge, billiard area, salon, library and business center, multi-function theater and lounge -- indicates people will not come and go from this building frequently. All the services for the people who reside in the facility will be in the building.
- The concept behind Bridge Park and the vibrancy is to have people engaged on the sidewalks, engaged in the street network, etc. This development will detract from the vibrancy of the District, with all of the activities housed in a single building.
- In terms of the finished floor elevation, if they want to include a retaining wall so that they are never more than 2.5 feet above the adjacent sidewalk elevation, this does not translate to a pedestrian-friendly environment. If they desire a flat surface, they need to find a flat parcel of land. If an interior step is problematic, then they need a flat piece of ground. The buildings should reflect the topography of the area.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

August 13, 2018

Page 20 of 26

- The one retaining wall in Bridge Park in front of The Exchange robs the street network of vibrancy. She is therefore not in favor of that waiver.
- In regard to the vehicular parking waiver requested, it is concerning as it indicates the lack of activity as does the bicycle parking waiver requested.
- The exterior louvers will provide a hotel feel. Many of the units are 400 square feet, and they have individually controlled climate per unit versus having a roof mounted system with interior vents. This would be far more cost effective. The claim that the louver will create an architectural feature is not something she supports. She is therefore not supportive of this waiver.
- A change in roof plane or height waiver is being requested. There is little fenestration on this building. It appears to be of two feet at most – not enough to provide a shadow line. With the change in roof plane, they are trying to accomplish a faux look of a fenestration change by changing the parapet heights. She does not believe this is an effective way to make that look attractive.
- The façade is nearly flat along John Shields Parkway. There are two sections, and if the scale is as she believes it is, the bump-outs are perhaps two feet. Aside from that, different colors of brick and siding are being put on a flat surface to make it appear as though there is some fenestration or relief. In reality, there is not.
- In regard to façade materials, there are six different colors of brick on one building. The effort seems to be on making a fake building – one building appearing as several buildings. It is not – it is one building. She would prefer to have an authentic, good building on this site.
- Regarding the open space, in her experience in visiting Florida where there are many 55 plus communities in the vicinity, the pet owner percentage is very high for this demographic. She does not know what the rules or restrictions may be, but putting this burden on Tuller Square is problematic. The open spaces provided for in this proposal are residual rectangles that could not be utilized. The City desires well thought out locations for people to gather – not what is left over on the site. The quality of the open space is lacking. While there is some open space, it is along the street. There are no areas of respite.
- There is only a cornice on the one corner of the tallest tower. A building like this should have a cornice that is inclusive versus these panel parapets to make it attractive.
- Regarding tree removal, there are over 300 caliper inches of oak trees to be removed. None of them indicate they will be relocated; they all indicate removal. These are part of the street tree network and the City has invested many years in their growth.
- She has concerns with the next step, which would be a development agreement request. It appears that the City investment in the transportation network for this would be approximately \$3.5 million. She understands a TIF could be utilized to generate revenue for a portion of these improvements, but after that, there is little in this for the City.
- She does not believe this meets the bar for this great piece of property on a great corner that is an interesting entryway into this District.

Mayor Peterson asked Ms. Shelly to address the concerns expressed by Council, namely the 500-foot blocks, 250-foot standards – and the fact that this proposal is 400 plus feet in length.

Ms. Shelly responded she does not have the drawings in front of her, but the Planning report indicates the building is 420 feet. She noted that the building meets the Code requirement of not needing a mid-building pedestrian way, but it is allowed to have a mid-block pedestrian way. What the applicant has provided is a pass through, similar to several buildings in the B and C blocks. The building is not broken into two parts, but there is a pedestrian way through the building itself at the first floor. In this case, it has been provided.

Ms. Fox noted that the Bridge Street Code requires that this would need to be open all the time.

Ms. Shelly responded that the Bridge Street Code does not require it be open all the time.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

August 13, 2018

Page 21 of 26

Ms. Fox commented that if defaulting to this section of the Code, it must meet the requirements of a mid-block size and be open all the time.

Ms. Shelly responded that it is actually the reverse.

Ms. Fox stated that it needs to be separated and have the ability for the public to go back and forth.

Ms. Shelly clarified it is not a mid-block pedestrian way – it is a mid-building pedestrian way.

Ms. Fox stated that the intent is for the public to walk through and not have to walk all the way around the building.

Ms. Shelly agreed that is the intent. She does not have the Code in front of her, but there are two different criteria. One is for the public to be constantly moving back and forth, and the other is more for the users of the building – visitors, staff and residents. There is a difference in the purpose of the two criteria, and that is why one is mid-building and the other is mid-block. She will check on this and provide details tomorrow.

Mayor Peterson asked for clarification about the orientation of the building. The face of the building is looking to the north?

Ms. Shelly responded that the building is oriented with its public face to John Shields Parkway, and the parking lot is behind the building. That is actually a Code requirement for multi-family that the parking be located in the back of the building. John Shields Parkway is considered the principal frontage street and the parking is on the back side of the proposed Neighborhood Street B.

Mayor Peterson asked about staff's understanding of the open space and pocket parks.

Ms. Shelly responded it is important to recognize that tonight's consideration relates to lots and blocks – are they the right size and the right shape, is it what has been prescribed in the Bridge Street Code? Many of the items discussed tonight are items to be addressed during Site Plan review. They are important elements to be reviewed, and staff is very interested in having those addressed. Staff wants to take all of those items into consideration, including how does a seat wall address the street and whether the open spaces are appropriately located and sized. The request tonight is only for lots and blocks and not for details of the Site Plan – not building massing, not materials -- but the input provided on these items will be conveyed to the applicant and they can make adjustments to their plans.

Mayor Peterson noted that, given this site is an open field, is there a reason why the requirements cannot be met and waivers are requested?

Ms. Shelly responded that there may be some site placement for the building adjusted, or the layout of parking adjusted so that the open spaces could be configured to be more of a public amenity – and not feel that they are simply a leftover corner piece. In regard to the number of trees being removed, most are actually occurring with the straightening of Tuller Road and Village Parkway. That must be considered as part of the streetscape improvements and is not really related to the placement of the building.

Mayor Peterson asked if there is anything that would prohibit the applicant from providing the required open space if they had fewer units or a smaller building.

Ms. Shelly responded that a reconfiguration of the building could result in more open space. It is a Site Plan issue, and if Council wants to direct the applicant to address this versus granting a fee-in-lieu-of at this time that can certainly be done at the Final Development Plan and the Site Plan reviews.

Mayor Peterson noted the following:

- He agrees with Mr. Keenan that Council has long talked about the need for an "empty-nester" product in the Dublin community. This use has fewer cars, and does not generate students for the Schools. It is a product that the City does not have.
- Mr. Underhill was right in addressing the concern with the assisted living facilities and the impact on EMS services. He appreciates the clarification offered.
- In his view, this proposal is somewhat of a mall environment, where all of the needs are met on the interior. Council had hoped these developments would be more interactive with the District.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

August 13, 2018

Page 22 of 26

- It seems that the open space issues are a product of what is built. If the building is so large that open space cannot be accommodated, the building should be modified. Council's desire is not to have a fee paid in-lieu-of open space provided. Council would prefer to have the open space.
- He understands that this is the first step in the review process, but this step sets the expectations. If Council approves this Basic Plan, the applicant would assume that what is proposed meets Council's expectations. Some of the concerns raised tonight relate directly to the lots and blocks that are part of tonight's review. He offered Mr. Underhill an opportunity to respond.

Aaron Underhill, representing the applicant stated that they believe many of these issues can be addressed at a later date, but they will request Council table this matter tonight. His involvement in this project has been since the review at the Planning and Zoning Commission. This proposal represents significant investment of time and money to get to this point. The interesting aspect of the Bridge Street process is that at the outset, it was intended to provide a much quicker review than the preliminary development and final development plan reviews. In terms of deviations from the Bridge Street Code, while some Council members view these deviations as substantial, they are not numerous. The question is if the applicant can adjust the plans so that the deviations needed are not viewed as substantial, but acceptable. As far as the parking, they believe that more parking can be facilitated on ground they control.

Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes commented that she is not indicating that the applicant should have more parking – the client knows their needs best. If that small amount is what is needed, it reflects the expected amount of comings and goings of the residents. That was her point.

Mr. Underhill commented regarding the TIF. Inevitably, in the Bridge Street District, because of the nature of the infrastructure required, nearly every development will need some assistance. They are not quite there yet, and will continue to work with staff. There is a broader, community-wide improvement to be made as a result of this project – the Tuller Road-Village Parkway straightening. A good portion of the TIF monies will go toward reimbursing that cost. This is not simply an ask of the developer, but is a broader community purpose to be served by this development. They will work on the plans and will try to address the concerns. He requested that Council table this item.

Mayor Peterson responded that he appreciates this response. He recalls in the past the cases where the developer and the City were far apart, yet the attorney – Ben Hale, Jr. – found that middle ground. With the respect to the TIF, there are many policy issues to be discussed and he believes they are resolvable. Council is mindful of the length of time and money needed to get to this point, but that does not detract from what Council believes is its obligation.

Mr. Underhill added that Dublin's process is difficult, but no one can argue with the results. They will try to address the concerns as best they can.

Mr. McDaniel added that the memo regarding the potential for a development agreement was included in the packet in order to lay the groundwork early. He also encouraged the applicant to have discussion with Washington Township, and they have done so. He appreciates their willingness to discuss the TIF issues.

Ms. Fox noted that having a 55 and older community is a good thing for Dublin. An item raised at PZC was that this is an opportunity to create a new kind of living style for an older population. A smaller building would prompt them to be outside and to walk. If the mixed-use portion could be open to the public – pub, small shops, etc. – and the residents could be outside in pocket parks, that kind of interaction is what is desired in Bridge Park.

Mr. Keenan moved to table the Basic Plan Review for the Residences at Tuller Heights. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keenan, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Peterson, yes; Vice Mayor Amorose Groomes, yes.



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, July 19, 2018

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

**1. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review**

Proposal: A four-story, 147,000-square-foot, 132-unit residential facility and associated site improvements for a 2.48-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Bridge Park Retirement Living Properties, represented by Julie Polletta, Radelet McCarthy Polletta Incorporated.

Planning Contact: Joanne L. Shelly, AICP, RLA, LEED BD+C, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect.

Contact Information: 614.410.4677, jshelly@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-021

REQUEST 1: FEE-IN-LIEU

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for Fee-In-Lieu as the proposed plan has a missing 0.47 acres being supplemented through existing off-site open space.


Determination: The Fee-In-Lieu was recommended for approval to City Council.

REQUEST 2: BASIC PLAN REVIEW

Request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review with no conditions.

Determination: The Basic Plan was recommended for approval to City Council.

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Vince Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, July 19, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Julie Polletta, Radelet, McCarthy Polletta Incorporated; Denise Pampena and Chris Jaeger, Graziano Construction; and James Peltier, EMH& T (Case 1); and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 2 and 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 21, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

Mr. Papsidero noted the Minor Modifications that were deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

1. Leo Alfred Jewelers – Site improvements for existing structures to complete ordinary maintenance.
2. Bridge Park, Block H – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights 18-021BPR

PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review

Joanne Shelly said this application is a proposal for a four-story, 147,000-square-foot, 132-unit residential facility, and associated site improvements for a 2.48-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Shelly explained the Bridge Street District (BSD) process whereas the Basic Plan is being reviewed by the ART to ensure block layout, street location and design, and open space locations meet the intent of the BSD Code and standards of walkability. She said the Basic Plan will be reviewed by City Council next with an Economic Development Agreement to be determined at a later date. The next step in the process, she said, would be the Site Plan Review to ensure the development is in compliance with the BSD Code for use, building type, architectural and site design, parking, and open space requirements.

Ms. Shelly presented an aerial view of the site as well as the existing conditions which are of an empty lot with a tree row running through the center. She presented the Street Network Grid Map and pointed out that as part of this development, two new neighborhood streets are proposed and the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway will be realigned to create a “T” intersection.



Ms. Shelly presented the site data on the proposed development plan and noted 0.62-acres of open space are required for this proposal based on the Code requirement for every residential dwelling unit. She said a pocket park of approximately 0.15 acres is proposed at the intersection of Village Parkway and the proposed neighborhood street on the north side of the development. She said the remaining 0.47 acres not located on-site are met by the proximity to Tuller Square Park, Cooperstone Park, John Shields Parkway Greenway, and Riverside Crossing Park, which are all within 0.6 miles of the development. She explained that a Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space will be required to meet the open space standards for the 0.47 acres of off-site open space.

Ms. Shelly said the proposed multiple-family, residential apartment building is a permitted use in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District and the proposed on-site amenities also meet the Code standards.

Julie Polletta, Radelet, McCarthy Polletta Incorporated, provided revised elevations, which described the scale and massing of the building using various materials and textures as the height varies from three to four stories and includes large storefront windows on a majority of the first floor. Ms. Polletta pointed out the tower feature at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway as well as a drop-off area canopy facing the interior parking area to the north. Ms. Shelly added there is a rooftop terrace but the open space is only available to the residents, not accessible to the public. She described the materials as primarily brick with metal panels in various configurations to break the massing and with glass used for the storefront windows for the patio and bistro on John Shields Parkway.

Ms. Shelly presented the proposed Basic Development Plan layout that included 135 residential units, a total of four floors, pocket park, parking area, and associated residential amenities and stated all applicable review criteria had been met with the request of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space. She said the ART can make the determination of whether the goals and objectives of the BSD Vision Report, Community Plan, and Parks and Recreation's Master Plan have been met and if the proximity or potential connectivity to other open space types are appropriate.

Ms. Shelly said staff supports a recommendation for approval by the ART to City Council for a Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space as the proposed plan is missing 0.47 acres being supplemented through existing off-site open space.

Ms. Shelly said staff supports a recommendation for approval by the ART to City Council for the Basic Plan Review with no conditions.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the parking lot on the northern property. Ms. Shelly explained that with the Mobility Study, there is a good chance part of the circulator for senior/disabled will include a stop in this area so it is possible that the need for a Parking Plan that would be submitted with the Site Plan could allow for the elimination of this parking lot. She indicated the Mobility Study - Phase III implementation is scheduled to be initiated in September or October of this year and at that time, circulation routes and stops will be identified.

Mr. Stanford addressed the right-of-way widths and talked about on-street parking. He said the right-of-way widths are appropriate and align with the BSD Street Network Map but the applicant would need to further refine driveway locations for the neighborhood streets. He indicated the access drive spacing is tough with a proposed parking lot to the north. He stated, when this is submitted for Site Plan Review, they will need to discuss alignment to provide better driveway spacing and overall function. Ms. Shelly indicated the sight north of this site will get developed in the future, and his comments would be taken into consideration for design of the driveway locations.

Ms. Polletta said they gave a presentation to the Greystone Mews HOA and thought it went well. Vince Papsidero asked if that group had any questions regarding this proposal. Chris Jaeger, Graziano Construction said they had questions about a schedule and when this development would happen. Ms. Polletta said the HOA consisted of eight people and they were all happy and interested in the development. Mr. Jaeger and James Peltier, EMH&T, showed new renderings of the building and streetscape to the ART.

Denise Pampena, Graziano Construction, explained how the porches had been pulled out further from the face of the building and some would be accessible to the public realm as others will be considered common areas. Mr. Papsidero asked how deep the porches were now. Ms. Pampena answered approximately 20 feet deep. Mr. Stanford asked if any porches connected directly to the street. Ms. Pampena answered affirmatively and clarified the common area porches connect to the sidewalk to entrances on both sides, which are at grade and also connect into the outdoor seating for the cafe.

Mr. Papsidero noted the increased glass on the corner tower gave more presence and will enable more activity to be visible, which is a great design feature. Ms. Pampena pointed out they revised the floor plan for the common areas on each floor to be located at this tower. She said additionally, they view other open spaces are provided with the oval at the entrance of the building and common green on the north side of the parking lot. Mr. Stanford asked how they envisioned the interior parking lot connection being used. Ms. Pampena answered it will be permeable pavement and is provided to simplify internal circulation to prevent someone from having to exit onto the street to return to the parking.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote for a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Basic Plan Review with no conditions. Shawn Krawetzki motioned, Ray Harpham seconded, and the Basic Plan Review was recommended for approval. Mr. Papsidero called for a vote for a recommendation of approval for the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space to City Council. Shawn Krawetzki motioned, Rachel Ray seconded, and the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space was recommended for approval.

2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C Amendment **6515 Longshore Loop**
18-043MSP **Master Sign Plan**

~~Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for amendments to the Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C, specific to the A1 office building zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout with SR 161 and West Dublin Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.~~

~~Ms. Martin said this application was introduced to the ART on July 19, 2018, and explained the Master Sign Plan (MSP) review process. She said the MSP allows for flexibility to sign regulations based on cohesive sign design for a single building or group of buildings. She said it also encourages creative sign design to warrant deviation from the Code. In the case of Bridge Park, she said the MSP provides a framework for tenants to work by providing clear expectations and guidance on the character, types, number, and location of appropriate signs throughout the development. She added any future modifications to the plan or request of a tenant unable to meet the MSP is required to come before the Commission with a new application for review and approval. She said the ART will make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission and they are scheduled to review this application August 9, 2018. She said once approved, the applicant may apply for sign permits.~~



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 17, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Informal Review**

Proposal: A four-story, 147,000-square-foot, 132-unit residential facility and associated site improvements for a 2.48-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway.

Request: Informal review and feedback on a Basic Plan Review application prior to formal review by City Council.

Applicant: Bridge Park Retirement Living Properties, represented by Julie Polletta, Radelet McCarthy Polletta Incorporated.

Planning Contact: Joanne L. Shelly, AICP, RLA, LEED BD+C, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect.

Contact Information: 614.410.4677, jshelley@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/18-021

RESULT: The Commission conducted an informal review on the proposed residential facility with associated site improvements. Commission members discussed the proposed use and operational details, opening up the amenities to the public, and providing more open space. The Commission also discussed the parking provisions for the site. The members requested to see more correlation between the inspiration images and the proposed architectural character of the building.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Absent
Jane Fox	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Absent
William Wilson	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Current Planning Manager





MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 17, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. PUD, Perimeter Center, Subarea C – Schoedinger Funeral Home** PID: 273-010149
18-019INF Informal Review (Discussion only)
- 2. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights** PID: 273-008811
18-021BPR Informal Review (Discussion only)
- 3. BSD-SRN – Fado Irish Pub** 6652 Riverside Drive
18-026WR Waiver Review (Approved 5 – 0)
- 4. Dublin Corporate Area Plan** Administrative Request
17-093ADM Introduction (Discussion only)
- 5. PUD, Autumn Rose Woods** 7540 & 7660 Hyland Croy Road
18-023Z-PDP-FDP Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)
Final Development Plan (Approved 5 – 0)
- 6. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign** 6659 Coffman Road
18-024ARB-AFDP Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 4 – 0 – 1)

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Jane Fox, Council Representative; Bob Miller, Warren Fishman, and William Wilson. Kristina Kennedy and Steve Stidhem were absent. City representatives present were: Claudia Husak, Vince Papsidero, Phillip Hartmann, Lori Burchett, Devayani Puranik, Tammy Noble, Rachel Ray, Nichole Martin, Cathy DeRosa and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from April 5, 2018. The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Wilson, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)



~~Mr. Schoedinger said he can talk to adjacent businesses and ask for areas to be used for overflow parking; there are a number of neighbors they do that with in other locations.~~

~~Mr. Wilson emphasized the need for overflow parking as well as pedestrian access. He said it would be nice to provide seating for the pedestrians as they come in, especially when it gets busy, because this is a large property and a large number of people arriving will be elderly. He said he does not see the need for required mounding but it is nice to see some movement of the earth so maybe there is undulation in the landscape here and there.~~

~~Ms. Newell said she believes this proposal is compatible with existing development. She said she has no objection to the funeral home being here. She said generally a mound is used in landscaping when there is something to hide or not to be visible directly. She confirmed this is a retention pond of which she would be supportive of with good landscaping and a mound is not necessary. She said Mr. Ford said “flat roof” but maybe “low slope” is more what the architect meant like a quarter-inch per foot. She suggested the side elevations could use more attention and to soften the structure. She recommended overflow drainage with the scuppers that are on the outside of the building so this could be unsightly unless they are architecturally well planned into the building. She said the overhead door would have to be screened so she is anticipating additional landscaping on the site.~~

~~The Chair asked the applicant if he received enough feedback from the Commission to which he answered affirmatively.~~

**2. BSD SCN – Residences at Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a four-story and 132-unit residential facility with associated site improvements for a 2.48-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for an informal review and feedback on a Basic Plan Review application, prior to formal review by City Council.

Claudia Husak said she was filling in for the case manager, Joanne Shelly who is traveling.

Ms. Husak said since new Commission members have come onboard, staff is reviewing the process and she explained the process contained in the Bridge Street Code. Ultimately, she said, City Council will receive a formal recommendation from the ART and then Council is the reviewing and approval body for this application and would select a reviewing body for any future applications.

Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of the site and explained it is not a parcel but it is portions of land leftover from the old Buyer’s site as well as land that Casto currently owns and it is just east of Tuller Flats and west of the AMC Theatre in Dublin Village Center. Therefore, she said, this would be situated on a very prominent corner of the two rights-of-way. She added that the City has the John Shields Parkway Greenway planned. She mentioned that the Greystone Mews residential development is to the south and the City has reached out to those residents and there have been no requests for a meeting or any kind of negative feedback or concerns expressed.

Ms. Husak presented photographs of the existing conditions and noted the vacant lot and the sidewalk that is within John Shields Parkway – the brick pavers are what is being used throughout the district.

Ms. Husak presented the proposed site plan with the schematic footprint on the aerial view. She said this is a proposal for a Senior Living Apartment complex, which is permitted in the district as a multi-family

use. With this proposal, she explained, there will be a street connection from John Shields Parkway going north toward Tuller Road; an east/west street connection would connect Village Parkway through to Tuller Flats; and the intention is to straighten out the existing curve to a 90-degree intersection at Village Parkway and Tuller Road. She indicated this proposal could be a catalyst to get the street changes started.

Ms. Husak restated this is a facility intended for seniors to live independently within fully functional apartment units with additional services being provided on the first floor at street level and highly visible facing the public street that include: outdoor patio seating for the café and bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower; a pub-style recreation area, planting area, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center all at the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said these are amenities these residents can take part but are not required. She pointed out the residential units are on the opposite corner, which is John Shields Parkway and a future street.

Ms. Husak pointed out the drop off area and internal parking that is proposed for the north side of the site, off the (future) public street. She said the need for parking spaces is fairly low so the applicant is likely to request a Waiver for parking. She said the number of spaces required for a multi-family building is not appropriate in this instance. She pointed out the open spaces around the building on all sides that include foundation plantings, streetscape created, formal open spaces on the north ends of the wings. She added there is a rooftop terrace proposed.

Ms. Husak presented renderings of the proposed conceptual elevations that include a lot of brick and a variation in windows – some a storefront and some on the tower element. She reported the ART had suggested that perhaps the tower element could be enhanced to give more presence on this prominent corner. She noted there are balconies, windows, and many projections within the building.

Ms. Husak suggested discussion topics:

- Walkability
- Architectural style
- Open spaces
- Other considerations

Ms. Husak said there is a lot of open space required within the Zoning Code for this type of development. She said the applicant is proposing hardscapes and soft space, and getting close to meeting the open space requirement. She said the four-acre park at Tuller Flats that the City owns and will program, is less than a half mile away.

The Chair asked if there were questions for staff.

Bob Miller said if this project were to go forward, would it go 'hand and glove' with the street realignment to which Ms. Husak answered affirmatively.

William Wilson said he assumes that when people come to the area there will be pedestrian activity and Ms. Husak answered yes. He asked then if walkability will be ensured. Ms. Husak said, ultimately, John Shields Parkway is intended to go to the east, north of the movie theatre. She indicated the City is waiting for the owner of that shopping center to be ready to do that and she agreed there needs to be pedestrian accommodations to get to that area because there are attractions that these residents would use.

Warren Fishman said he was concerned about the street realignments happening in conjunction with this project as well. He asked how many units would be independent to which Ms. Husak explained that all of the units are for independent living. She noted that early in the discussions, the applicant had considered

assisted living units. She emphasized that in the Code, assisted living would not be permitted in this facility.

Mr. Fishman asked about parking. Ms. Husak answered there are on-street spaces as well as 39 interior spaces.

The Chair asked if there were any more questions for staff. [Hearing none.] She invited the applicant to speak.

Denise Pampena, Graziano Construction, 654 Alpha Drive, Pittsburgh, PA, 15238, said she is the president of the company. She said they have been working with Ms. Husak and the City for over two and a half years to get to this point. She said they believe this will be a great project for the retirees and the seniors in the City of Dublin. She stated that Graziano Construction Development Company, based in Pittsburgh, has been in operations for over 66 years. She said they started out as a general contracting firm and in the early 80s, phased into development of senior housing, skilled nursing facilities, assisted living, and independent living. She said not only did they construct these for themselves but also for national operators as well as institutional clients.

Ms. Pampena mentioned that in 2001, they had been 100% woman-owned and are nationally certified as a woman-business enterprise and also certified by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Their focus is independent living, which is mostly 55 and older but they have expertise in all senior communities.

Ms. Pampena said their communities are all rental, there are no buy-in fees, and they are month-to-month so the seniors are not forced to sign a long-term lease. She said their focus is on lifestyle and their typical seniors would be a widower or any elderly person living on their own that needs the socialization, the nutrition, and the support services and amenities. She emphasized they are not a healthcare community like assisted living would be or a skilled nursing facility; they are offering strictly independent living units. She said they offer 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and studio apartments that are full service units including kitchens with granite countertops, bathrooms with pull-cords for safety but they offer three meals a day, large dining room, café and bistro, pub, billiard rooms, lounges, a creative arts studio, fitness center and wellness studio, and movie theater. She said in this environment she found the seniors thrive because of the support services and activities that keep them vibrant.

Ms. Pampena said they like this area for the walkability and the opportunity for the residents of Dublin as they retire to be in an area with entertainment, shopping, and dining for when they want to be outside the community. She said community transportation will also be offered for excursions or doctor appointments as a lot of residents would no longer drive.

Mr. Wilson asked if the services would just be for the residents and not open to the public. Ms. Pampena answered they are private and they are focusing their amenities and services on the first floor; typically in their communities, they are peppered throughout the building. She said the result will be the visibility and interaction with John Shields and Village Parkways.

Mr. Fishman asked about private versus public areas. Ms. Pampena said they are private for safety reasons. Because they are now locating all the amenities on the first floor, there may be a way to engage the outside community into some of those amenities because they have a beauty parlor and a barber shop. She said they could also potentially have the outside community use the outdoor café and bistro or perhaps the fitness center.

Mr. Fishman asked how many employees will be at this facility. Ms. Pampena said there are shift employees and they also have live-in managers. Mr. Fishman asked how many employees total could be

on the property at one time. Her answer was about 12 employees. She said they also have overnight staff but they are not nurses that live there. She said they have housekeeping, dietary support, the chef, servers, and the activity director but some of the servers and those in housekeeping can serve other functions. She emphasized the impact on traffic and parking is very low. Ms. Pampena answered typically, when they have conducted parking demand studies, they have about 56 spaces. She said in some communities, they have been able to obtain a Variance or a Waiver for that because most of their residents do not drive and there has never been an issue.

Mr. Fishman said he owns a property across from an assisted living facility and the biggest problem they have is parking. Ms. Pampena pointed out that assisted living is a different concept than independent living. He clarified the facility he is referring to is mostly independent and some assisted living.

Ms. Pampena said 55 and older are permitted in their community but their average age of residents are in their 70s.

Ms. Husak noted that in the district there are on-street parking spaces within all of the streets they are allowed to count. She said at this time, there are 23 on-street spaces that can be dedicated to this facility.

Julie Polletta, Radelet McCarthy Polletta, Architecture and Interior Design; 100 First Avenue, Suite 300, Pittsburgh, PA, 15222 said conceptual, preliminary renderings have been presented. She said the building is ±400 feet long – they broke it down into human scale volumes and also controlled the perception of a four-story mass by using different colors of brick different planes on that façade. Unfortunately, she said, the projections and recessions are not showing up clearly. She clarified, part of this structure is four stories and part of it is three stories. She said they are introducing a metal panel on the fourth floors. She said there is a lot more design detail to work out between now and the next time it is presented. She pointed out that the red metal roofs are over porches.

Ms. Polletta explained there is a five-foot grade from one end to the other and the three-story area is the lower area, and those porches are lined along there. She said even though the porches would be above grade level, people can see the residents and the residents can see what is happening on the street and that is part of the residential experience. She referred to the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway where all the amenities are, which are still serving the residents but residents have the opportunity to sit on a sidewalk café patio and there would be canopies covering these areas.

Ms. Polletta referred back to the tower they were articulating earlier in the conversation. She said there is an opportunity to create a public space on that corner because they would be coming right up to sidewalk and they have a placeholder in there for a piece of public art.

Ms. Polletta said they need to mitigate the grade difference in two places as far as exiting the building and getting down to grade. She described the footprint as a horseshoe and the grade difference is at the top of each horseshoe. She said she is going to work with a landscape architect to develop these two-tiered plazas where one would exit from the building at a higher level and go to the street level – a combination of an accessible route and stairs and that would be right on the sidewalk level, which makes it an outdoor plaza available to anyone in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wilson said he sees this as a lot of strong pieces together and more of a monumental residential building. He suggested if the applicant went more towards the inspiration pictures included in their packets, they would get a better result because now, it appears as an office building in some sections. He encouraged the applicant to frame windows and consider separating the buildings and making it more of a residential scale. He said he anticipates parking to really be an issue, especially when visitors come like for Mother's Day or Father's Day; he could not count on the on-street parking. He said maybe putting parking

underground could be a solution but parking really needs to be addressed. He said he visits his elderly family members in facilities such as this and there is never enough parking and he gets frustrated because he has to park several blocks away.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak on this application. [There were none.] She opened the meeting up for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Fishman agreed with what the other members said about the architecture. He asked if real brick was going to be used. Ms. Polletta answered affirmatively. She said they are considering load-bearing masonry as a structure. Mr. Fishman emphasized it is going to be an important corner so we want it to look rich and stunning.

Mr. Miller applauded the proposed metal panels for an alternative material. He said he was concerned that there is too much building on too little of a space. He said parking is an issue and more parking will need to be added to the site itself. He said he also considers this corner a gateway entry into Bridge Park and encouraged the applicant to do a lot with the tower itself or with a different design aspect that would need to pop. He said he liked the engaging porches. He said the public space will be behind the building so it is not going to add to the character of the building as there will be another building behind it. Ms. Polletta said her understanding is that those lots would become residential. Ms. Husak said a multitude of uses are permitted within the residential district.

Ms. Fox explained the intent in the Code is to create a sense of place and to engage pedestrians. She encouraged the applicant to give serious consideration about the intent of this space and structure the building to engage the pedestrian walking down the street. She agreed this is 400 feet of a huge mass. She repeated this corner is one of the main gateways and the tower is lacking interest. She said having to walk around a very large building to get to parking goes against walkable urbanism. She said in terms of the architectural style, there needs to be a lot more interest at the street level. However, she really liked the porch idea and thought that was wonderful. She said when she looked at the inspirational pictures in the back of the packet, she did not see any of that in the proposed renderings. She said she is over 55 and she would love to live in a building similar to this but does not want the building labeled '55 and over'. She encouraged the applicant to not design this like a '55 and over community' but just as an apartment building. She suggested opening up the pub and dining area to the street so the residents do not feel as they have left anything. She said she sees very little articulation to the stories and would also like to see the structure broken in half. She encouraged the applicant to have their green space on site because the residents may not want to walk to another space. She added the open spaces need to be interactive with the sidewalk. In conclusion, she said, the rooftop is wonderful but it needs a lot of shaded areas or it would not get used.

Victoria Newell said in terms of walkability and the open spaces, the Commission has been consistent with all of their applicants. She said all the pocket parks and plazas should be public spaces as that is the intent. She said she has designed and worked on assisted living facilities and nursing homes and the applicant gave the definition of an assisted living facility but would leave that up to staff's interpretation. She said she does not have an objection to this being in the district but that is something to be worked out with staff how they define this. She said the massing can be improved, finishes can be developed, greater attention should be paid to the corner, and she completely agrees with staff on the tower feature and with her fellow Commissioners about the lack of parking. She concluded by saying she liked the placeholder for the public art.

Ms. Polletta said she appreciated all the comments.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**3. BSD SCN – Tuller Heights
18-021BPR**

**PID: 273-008811
Basic Plan Review**

Sierra Saumenig said this proposal is for a four-story, approximately 140,000-square-foot retirement facility consisting of approximately 130 residential units - 20 of which may be allocated for personal care, two dining areas, two studio spaces, and a fitness center. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is northwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Saumenig said the official name for this facility is "Residences at Tuller Heights" and presented an aerial view of the site to support the 140,000-square-foot facility. Ms. Saumenig said she would turn over the presentation to the applicants and asked that they introduce themselves.

Julie Polletta, architect for Radelet McCarthy Polletta Architecture and Interior Design introduced herself; Denise Pompena, representative for Graziano, the developer and contractor introduced herself; and Chris Jaeger, with Graziano Construction introduced himself.

Ms. Polletta said the site for the new Retirement Living Facility is on the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. She said the residents' common areas will all be located at street level and highly visible facing the public street so the life of the residents can be seen. She said outdoor patio seating will be included for the Café and Bistro-style dining areas that wrap around the tower as to not show a cafeteria-style look traditionally found in retirement facilities. Other interior spaces clustered on the ground level, she said, include a pub-style recreation area, planting studio, art studio, library/lounge, salon, and fitness center. She said the apartment units are for residents living independently and for residents with personal care needs. She emphasized that this prominent location and scale of the proposed facility will provide both visual interest and opportunities for social interaction at the street level.

Ms. Polletta indicated they are still in the early stages of architectural design so they have not applied details to the building. She presented images to illustrate the types of design elements that will be incorporated. She stated they would use traditional materials such as brick as the primary material. She emphasized how they want to use porch elements to allow for more interaction between the residents and life on the street. She added a roof garden may also be incorporated.

Ms. Polletta said at the prominent intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway the facility will be set back 18 feet from the street. She said with a sidewalk and a patio there will be a fairly large paved area perceived as public space but in reality it would be their private space. She suggested this area would be good for public art installment and they would work with the Dublin Arts Council to determine what is most appropriate for this space.

Ms. Polletta stated many units will have porches and each will have a standing seam roof. On the west end of the site, she explained the slab level will be several feet above the sidewalk so the porch will be raised from street level. At the northwest corner, she said, they propose a two-tier, outdoor plaza with one level at grade and the other at floor level. She said both levels would be accessible to the public. At the northeast corner, she said, they are proposing a similar two-tier plaza that will be screened from the service area by hardscape.

Ms. Polletta said the main entrance is in the middle of the block with a slight grade change so stairs with a ramp will be incorporated. She said they would provide a decorative element to the wall that runs between the surface lot and the sidewalk. She said they are considering the traditional limestone walls like what is used all over the City but are open to ideas.

Ms. Polletta presented a diagram of the first floor to demonstrate how the facades for the residential units project and recede with the use of porches. She indicated the service areas will be screened with hardscape and some sort of plaza will be created for both front corners of the site. She noted parking and the pick-up/drop-off entrance for the residents.

Ms. Polletta indicated the structure will be predominantly brick but different colors of brick used in different areas for variety and only the fourth floor will use a metal panel.

Claudia Husak said staff has been meeting with this applicant for a span of two years to find the appropriate site. She indicated this team has taken serious effort in understanding the area and even reviewing the Zoning Code to aid in designing their proposal. Ms. Husak said this immense effort is greatly appreciated by staff.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the residual parcel and how it might be used in the future. Denise Pompena, representative for Graziano, indicated that parcel will be used for townhomes or some sort of residential but not for another retirement community and they will be on a much different scale.

Aaron Stanford stated Engineering is especially focused on the corner of Village Parkway and Tuller Road. He said where Village Parkway curves there are commitments for reconstruction to "T" this intersection that would be a joint venture between the City and the developer. Mr. Stanford said this will be a large undertaking but is something that has always been envisioned for this intersection.

Ms. Husak reported a Preliminary Plat is required to address many of the items Mr. Stanford highlighted and suggested they work to align that review with Council's review of the Basic Plan. Vince Papsidero asked if the right-of-way issue for this proposal has been ironed out. Mr. Stanford answered affirmatively and added that they have worked with the applicant on this matter. Ms. Husak indicated the plat would be fairly complex as there are many areas that would either be vacated or dedicated to create the proper street network. Mr. Stanford agreed and added the utilities would pose a challenge as well.

Ms. Husak said the Basic Plan Review could go to Council in June. She said this proposal would first go informally to the Planning and Zoning Commission and would then receive a recommendation from the Administrative Review Team (ART) before going to Council. She said the next steps are for a more detailed proposal to be discussed with the ART on April 19, and then for an informal with the PZC on May 3, and finally then the ART would have an opportunity to make a recommendation to Council for their first meeting in June.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**4. ~~BSD HC – Daso Custom Cabinetry – Signs~~
~~18-022ARB-MPR~~**

**13 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

~~Nichole Martin said this is a proposal for two, eight-square-foot wall signs and one, six-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space, zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. She said the site is west of South High Street, approximately 125 feet southwest of the intersection with Bridge Street. She said this is~~