



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:

3. All R Friends at PID 273012214 21-024FDP

Final Development Plan

Proposal: Construction of an approximately 8,000-square-foot building with associated site improvements on a 3.3-acre site.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of Parkwood Place with Emerald Parkway and zoned Planned Unit Development District, Thomas Kohler, Subarea B-1.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Chris Jolley, Architect; and Ken Cook, All R Friends

Planning Contact: Nichole Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-024

MOTION 1: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve three Minor Text Modifications:

1. To permit a roof pitch of 5:12, where 6:12 is required;
2. To remove the requirement for a landscape mound on the west portion of the site; and
3. To permit LED site lighting, where high pressure sodium lighting is required.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Minor Text Modifications 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 the Final Development Plan with eight conditions:

- 1) That the architectural elevations be revised, reducing the height of the stone accent walls to be even with the roof eaves, prior to building permitting and subject to Staff approval:



**3. All R Friends at PID 273012214
21-024FDP**

Final Development Plan

- 2) That the applicant apply for and receive approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for signs before applying for Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards;
- 3) That the plans be revised to remove the landscape mound, subject to Staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with Staff to address outstanding landscape concerns prior to building permitting, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) That 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) That 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) That 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; and
- 8) That 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: 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:

 294AB0E6363F490...
 Nichole Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



NEW CASES

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

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

Staff Presentation

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

Proposal

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

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

Applicant Presentation

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

Commission Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the entryways. There are two equal entryways, but is one primary?

Mr. Jolley responded that the facility operates with two teams based upon the needs of the individuals. Each group enters through a different set of doors to access their primary space within the building.

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

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

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

Commission Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commission members were supportive of the additional conditions.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant would have any objection to the additional conditions suggested.

The applicant indicated they had no objection.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Presentation

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

Site

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

Proposal

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



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 7, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. All R Friends
20-195INF**

**PID: 273-012214
Informal Review**

Proposal: Informal review and feedback for a ±8,100-square-foot building zoned Planned Commerce District (Thomas-Kohler, Subarea B1).

Location: West of Emerald Parkway, ±450 feet northwest from the intersection with Parkwood Place

Request: Informal review with non-binding feedback of a future development application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Chris Jolley, Project Manager; and Darin Ranker Architect

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/20-195

RESULT: The Commission provided informal review and feedback on the proposal for an approximately 8,100-square-foot building. Commission members were generally supportive of the site layout, although they expressed a desire for increased connectivity through the extension of shared-use paths and sidewalks. Members discussed the required split-rail fence at the rear of the property and encouraged that it be included in plans for formal review, rather than wait for development to the west to occur. The Commission generally agreed that the architecture should be revised to better conform to the styles of surrounding structures, with more primary materials utilized throughout. The Commission also suggested revising the entry, indicating that it was not obvious where the entry was located. Members were supportive of the proposed use.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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



CONSENT CASE

2. ~~Brazilianology, 6065 Frantz Road, 20-169CU, Conditional Use~~

~~A request for a personal service use for an existing ±1,150-square-foot tenant space in the Millennium Office Complex zoned Planned Unit Development District, on a 7.84-acre site located west of Frantz Road, ±900 feet north of the intersection with Blazer Parkway.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 7-0.]~~

NEW CASES

1. All R Friends, PID: 273-012214, 20-195INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback for a ±8,100-square-foot building zoned Planned Commerce District (ThomasKohler, Subarea B1) on a 3.32-acre located west of Emerald Parkway, ±450 feet northwest of the intersection with Parkwood Place.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for an ±8,100-square-foot building on a 3.32-acre site located within the Thomas-Kohler Planned Commerce District. The Preliminary Development Plan for this Planned Commerce District was approved in 1996 without a preliminary site plan. The Thomas-Kohler Planned District encompasses approximately 120 acres, and the subject site is at the northern boundary of the district. The Planning and Zoning Commission approved the Final Development Plan for the Gardner School daycare facility immediately to the east of this site in May 2007 and an expansion in April 2010. A Final Development Plan for a banking and office operations center, BMI Federal Credit Union, on the parcel to the south was approved in February 2006. The Camden Professional Office Complex, approved in two phases in 2004 and 2006, is located farther to the south on the west side of Emerald. The land to the north is zoned SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District and includes the Trinity Green development, which was approved for three one-story office buildings, one of which has been built and occupied. The remaining acreage is vacant. The land to the west is zoned PLR, Planned Low-Density Residential District as part of Heather Glen Subdivision and Heather Glen Park. This particular parcel includes the access drive off Emerald Parkway for the daycare and the credit union and has 60 feet of frontage along Emerald Parkway. The land is undeveloped and flat with a partial tree row along the northern boundary. The site includes a consolidated stormwater management pond shared with the daycare. To the rear of the site, a 75-foot wide landscape buffer has been established as required by the development text. It includes a multi-use path. [Images shown of the surrounding architecture.] This is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for a new building to provide service to train adults with disabilities. The Code does not specifically address this service, but staff has determined that either adult day care (permitted) or vocational school (conditional use) are appropriate use categories for this proposal. The 8,000-square-foot building would be located toward the western portion of the site, and 60 parking spaces would be located east of the building. The Code requires one parking space per six students and one space per teacher for daycare facilities. Currently, no connection to the existing path to the rear is indicated on the site plan. In addition, the applicant has noted that a split rail fence, which is required by the development text along the boundary with Heather Glen, has not been installed in the 10 years that development has occurred in the Thomas-Kohler Planned District. Staff is not aware of any issues or complains due to the lack of this fence and is supportive of the deletion of the requirement; however, that would require a Minor Text Modification. While no details are provided at this informal stage, should the applicant pursue a ground sign, the placement would be challenging due to the limited frontage and the fact that, currently, both BMI and The Gardner School have ground signs near the entry drive. Daycare uses are limited to wall signs that are eight feet in height and ground signs that

are 6 feet in height. The development text requires a four-sided, high quality architectural design that maintains an overall coordinated architectural style for the district. Roof pitches are required to be 6/12, and stucco is not permitted as a primary building material. Buildings approved along Emerald Parkway use a dry stacked stone, painted wood panels, and details that portray a warm tone. The proposed architecture for this building lacks certain elements, so does not meet the text requirements. The applicant should consider the surrounding buildings to ensure that the text requirements are met and the architectural detailing is consistent along this important business corridor of the City. [images of elevations shown.] The development text also requires high-pressure sodium lighting for parking lots; therefore, the Commission would need to approve a Minor Text Modification with the Final Development Plan to allow modern lighting. The following questions are provided to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed adult daycare within Subarea B1 of the ThomasKohler Planned District?
- 2) Is the Commission inclined to allow the applicant to deviate from the lighting requirements as long as Code is met for lighting levels?
- 3) Does the Commission support eliminating the fencing requirements along the rear of the site and allowing access to the walking path?
- 4) What architectural elements should the applicant include to create consistency with the existing character on the west side of Emerald Parkway?

Applicant Presentation

Ken Cook, applicant, 5950 Wilcox Place, Dublin, OH 43016, inquired if staff had been given the most recent layout for the parking lot, which would have reflected that the number of parking spaces was reduced.

Chris Jolley, Project Manager, 5925 Wilcox Place, Suite E, Dublin, OH 43016, [displayed site plan], stated that the revised configuration is similar to the first plan provided. However, the parking spaces in the center and a few other spaces were eliminated.

Mr. Cook stated that it is unlikely that the facility would ever need to accommodate more than 60 individuals. Most clients would arrive by shuttle buses and vans. Other than staff, very few clients would use the parking lot. [images shown of surrounding buildings and surrounding architecture for context.]

Commission Questions/Discussion

Ms. Call inquired about the estimated number of staff at this facility.

Mr. Cook responded that there would be approximately 10 staff and 50 clients, a ratio of 1 to 5.

Mr. Fishman inquired if this would qualify as a Conditional Use, due to the limited number of people and parking spaces. If the use changes, there would need to be changes in the building and parking.

Ms. Martin responded that this use could be considered as an adult daycare or a vocational use. The designation of this use as a vocational school was based upon precedent; however, this use will provide some adult daycare services for their clients. Staff will resolve this with the applicant prior to their Final Development Plan (FDP). A conditional use with the FDP is anticipated.

Mr. Fishman stated that identifying this as a Conditional Use makes more sense, because if the use were to change in the future, there could be a need for many alterations.

Mr. Cook stated that their intent is to build another facility several miles to the south in the Arlingate Plaza area, and that site has been designated as a vocational training center. The Dublin facility will be the adult daycare center; it will not have a mixed use. The use here will be similar to their Wilcox Place facility. He does not foresee any possibility for change of use in the future. At the time of their initial discussion with Dublin, the specific use had not yet been determined.

Ms. Call inquired about the difference in parking requirements for the two potential uses.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code does not provide specific parking requirements for vocational schools. They do exist for trade schools, but they would be a little high for this site. The most accurate calculation would be the daycare parking calculation, which is one parking space per six students and one space per teacher.

Ms. Fox stated that when she visited the site, her initial impression was that the building was set so far back on the lot, so far away from any frontage in the approach, that the view of the site would be only of the parking. However, with the revised layout, the building has been moved forward and the parking reduced; that was important. She is concerned that the roof pitch is not consistent with neighboring buildings. She has no objection to the daycare use or newer lighting. Although no split rail fence exists in this area, there is a large site to the west that eventually could become a residential development. Her concern is that the split rail fence was required by the development text for the purpose of creating a boundary between residential and commercial uses. Therefore, some note should be made that if residential were ever to develop there, and the request of that development was to adhere to the development text requirement for construction of the split rail fence, that the burden would be on the commercial property owner to make sure that happens. There was a reason that requirement was included in the original development text, also a reason that it has not occurred to date, but she does not believe the protection should be removed permanently. In her review of the site, she noticed that more primary materials exist in the architecture of the adjacent buildings than are proposed in this building. The proposal is for split brick, which does not appear to have been used on the other buildings. In addition, there is more stucco in this proposal than is used on the other buildings. Her suggestion is to increase the articulation of the building elements. The architecture is so nondescript that she could identify no element of interest. When looking at the surrounding buildings, The Gardner School has a much more impressive front door. The front door on this building should be more impressive, particularly since it is set back from the roadway. She also would encourage the use of more natural materials and less manufactured products. Since the building has been moved forward, there is a large yard at the back, but a very small covered patio. As the Commission considers new developments, it is looking for central connection, mobility and connectivity. Although the clients of this facility may not use the walkways significantly, it is likely they would use a covered patio. Therefore, she would recommend that they improve or increase the amount of usable outdoor space. The primary materials, articulation, ensuring that the height does not exceed 35 feet, and adhering to the slope of the roof requirements are important.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she has no objection to the use of this property for this purpose and the parking. The split rail fence is a characteristic element in Dublin. She agrees that if it is not required at this time, that should there be a future need for it to provide a buffer between the commercial and a residential development occurring in the adjacent area, that it should be provided at that time. She agrees with Ms. Fox's comments regarding the proposed architecture. Although it is not a Code requirement, visually, she believes it is important to have colors that are consistent with the surrounding properties. She inquired about the sidewalk connection. Ms. Martin responded that the applicant is required by the Building Code to provide certain connections. Ms. Kennedy stated that the applicant's question was if it would be acceptable to have the sidewalk connection to the public way be placed within the parking setback. Ms. Martin responded that per Code, it would be permitted.

Mr. Grimes requested clarification of the lighting issue.

Ms. Martin responded that the development text was written in the late 1990s. At that time, sodium halide bulbs were the predominant choice. Due to advancements in technology, LED fixtures now are preferred, which would require Commission approval of a Minor Text Modification with the Final Development Plan. At this time, the applicant is inquiring if the Commission would be supportive of that request.

Mr. Grimes stated that he believes consistency with the surrounding buildings is necessary, as well. In regard to the fence -- when he visited the site, he observed many people on the path. Whether or not a residential development has occurred in the adjacent area, there are a large volume of people on the path. From the business's perspective, he would assume they would prefer an element that would discourage users of the path from entering their property. However, if the Commission were to require this development to install the fence, the same requirement would need to be made of the surrounding property owners. He believes this is a good location for the proposed type of business, although it may be a challenge to be tucked in at the back. While the clients of this facility would not have an issue with that, future uses might.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the proposed project and the location. It is an appropriate location for that development. He agrees that pedestrian connections are important. He is supportive of the proposed sidewalk that would provide a connection to Emerald Parkway. However, it could also connect to the trailway at the back. While this business may not need that connection, it would be beneficial for the community. He agrees that the proportion of primary materials is important. There is also a need for a front door that articulates the entry in a more natural and intuitive manner. He would recommend altering the front door placement to be more asymmetrical. Additionally, it will be important to add landscaping between the building and the sidewalk. It will be a challenge to get the signage to work well, but that can be worked out as the project proceeds. He has no issue with approving a Minor Text Modification regarding the lighting.

Mr. Fishman stated that the difference between regular and slim brick is distinguishable. He would encourage them to provide more real brick, less stucco and make the architecture more consistent with the surrounding buildings. In regard to the suggestion to add a sidewalk to the bikepath, perhaps a bikepath instead of a sidewalk could be extended to Emerald Parkway. A bikepath extension could be curved and landscaped and be less expensive than a sidewalk extension. He has concerns about the proposed building height being consistent with the other buildings. In regard to the fence, he does not understand the reason the fence was not installed with the other properties. If the adjacent land is developed residentially, it may be difficult to get that fence constructed. Perhaps it could be made a requirement with this development, and the City could require the other property owners to meet the fence requirement, as well.

Ms. Call stated that she would be supportive of requiring the fence with the initial application. It is more difficult to address later. She is supportive of the use and the location. In regard to the placement, it is important to make sure that there is visibility to the business. She would prefer the street view not be of parking. Perhaps there is a way to shift the parking to the rear and move the building forward or to provide berm around the parking and not around the building, thereby highlighting the positive features. Parking lots are not particularly attractive. She appreciates, however, that the number of parking spaces was reduced. She concurs with the need to meet the requirements regarding primary materials.

Ms. Fox expressed a similar concern regarding a street view of the parking lot. The view of the building should not be through vehicles and asphalt. The adjacent buildings have more architectural detail than is proposed here. It will be important to improve the details and front articulation on the building.

Ms. Call stated that most of the facility's patrons would be dropped off. Having a covered front entry would not only provide weather protection but also improve the articulation on the front of the building. She inquired if the applicant had any additional questions.

Mr. Cook responded that he believes there could be a point of confusion in regard to the split rail fence. No residential development can occur west of their building. That is a park, and the bikepath circumnavigates the park. Adding a fence would be cutting off access to that walkway. Additionally, he believes their back patio will be large, and tables for their patrons could be placed within their large greenspace. Erecting a fence between the building and that park walkway will be restricting the space for the developmentally disabled clients with whom they work. If the Commission is referring to development occurring to the north along Innovation Drive – there is a significant tree line providing separation between the sites.

Ms. Martin responded that the split rail fence would be required to provide separation between the commercial uses in the ThomasKohler PCD and potential surrounding residential uses. The area to the west is presently undeveloped. To the north, there likely will be commercial development.

Mr. Cook stated that is correct, but the area to the west is a park, which is unlikely ever to be developed as a residential property.

Ms. Fox stated that she was under the impression that it was zoned Low Density Residential.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. It is zoned as part of that neighborhood. While the intent is to preserve the trees long-term, the requirement for a split rail fence is in the development text. If there is not a consensus

among PZC members to approve a waiver of that requirement, the FDP would include the requirement to construct the fence.

Ms. Call requested that staff provide any information regarding long-term development plans on this site with the future application.

Mr. Cook stated that currently they are renting two 3,000-square foot buildings one half mile distant from this location. When this site is built, it will be 80-85% populated from the beginning. They anticipate being at capacity within a short period of time and, if there is sufficient need, they would build an additional facility in the Dublin area. In regard to the street view of this building, there would be only a couple of seconds to view the property when passing by. However, their intent is not to attract walk-up traffic to their building. Their business comes through the Department of Developmental Disabilities. In view of the health and safety issues of their clients, the setback position of the building is a benefit.

Ms. Fox recommended providing a front portico and the addition of landscaping within the area where the parking spaces have been eliminated.

Mr. Cook responded that their intent was to add landscaping. He thanked the Commission for their input.

NEW CASES

3. ~~Dublin Plaza, 225 W. Bridge Street, 20-178MSP, Master Sign Plan~~

~~A request for revisions to a previously approved Master Sign Plan for an existing shopping center zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial. The 9.17-acre site is southeast of the intersection of West Bridge Street with Frantz Road.~~

Staff Presentation

~~No staff presentation required.~~

Board Questions

~~Ms. Fox stated that the sign criteria addresses lighting, and the existing gooseneck lights should be maintained, including a coat of paint. At present, half of the fixtures are painted; on the other half, the paint is worn off. Additionally, the fixtures have differing types of light bulbs; some are LED and some are incandescent, which results in inconsistent lighting. She would recommend the landlord be asked to provide both the paint coating and consistent lighting. In addition, signage exists at the cart corral that is not part of the sign package. A commitment is needed that the signage in that location be removed at some point in the future.~~

~~Charles Fraas, Casto, Property Owner/Applicant representative, 250 Civic Center Drive, Suite 500, Columbus, Ohio 43215, stated that they would commit to painting the sign fixtures, informing Kroger of the need to remove their signs on the cart corrals, and formulating a plan for consistent lighting in the shopping plaza. He would provide a report to Ms. Martin on how that would be achieved.~~

~~Mr. Supelak stated that the plaza is a vibrant location within the City with two important anchor stores, Kroger and Roush Hardware. He is curious as to when an overall update to the plaza might occur.~~

~~Mr. Fraas responded that Casto does update their properties. A "facelift" for the Dublin Plaza occurred approximately 10 years ago. The current economic model is working, and their tenants have certain rights that they must honor. He has had conversations with City staff about the subject, however, and will share the Commission's comments with the owner.~~

~~Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission is interested in advocating for that.~~

~~Ms. Call stated that this site receives significant traffic at certain times, such as City parades, that is unrelated to the business activity. The Commission appreciates the excellent partnership they have enjoyed with Casto.~~