



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 7, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Supelak, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 7, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Warren Fishman, Mark Supelak, Kim Way, Jane Fox, Leo Grimes, Lance Schneier
Commissioners absent: Rebecca Call
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge, Zak Hounshell, Sarah Holt, Michael Hendershot, Colleen Gilger

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Grimes seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the September 16 meeting minutes.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Supelak stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Mr. Supelak swore in those individuals intending to give testimony at the meeting.

TABLED CASE

- 1. Baltimore Corner Restaurant (Valentina's), 4595 Bridge Park Avenue, 21-017MPR, Minor Project Review**

A request for exterior and site modifications to accommodate a restaurant tenant including storefront alterations, an enclosed and covered patio, and associated design details located within Bridge Park, Block

B zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood District. The site is southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Riverside Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for Valentino's Restaurant, which is located within the Bridge Park development on the east side of Riverside Drive. This site is located at the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Riverside Drive within Building B2, also referred to as the Baltimore Building. The existing tenant space is located on the first floor of the building, facing the intersection. Block B was originally approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 2015. At that time, a shopping corridor was required to be designated. Shopping corridors are intended to provide for continuous pedestrian activity and have a minimum required width of 12 feet. The shopping corridor extends along the Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue frontages. A waiver to the shopping corridor requirement is requested along Riverside Drive. With the 2015 development approval, the applicant was required to provide open space, which was provided both on the block of development, as well as within Riverside Crossing Park. There was a condition that the applicant continue to work with the City and Dublin Arts Council to develop the final elements for the pocket plaza, which is located at the terminal vista of the pedestrian bridge. This condition has not yet been implemented. The 2015 conceptual design of the pocket plaza in this location contained a variety of paving materials, the building column, as well as an area for artwork opportunity. With this current proposal, staff recommends that the pocket plaza design and tenant space designs be separated. This is a result of the cooperation between the City, the Dublin Arts Council and Crawford Hoying that has occurred since the September 30 Commission meeting. David Guion, the executive director of Dublin Arts Council, recommends that these two projects be uncoupled in order to facilitate a design process between the property owner, Crawford Hoying and Dublin Arts Council, with the City's consideration, to transform the pocket plaza into a place. There are opportunities for placemaking as well as artistic elements. Staff has included a condition that the design for this pocket plaza be finalized by March 31, 2022, and that the final design be implemented no later than October 1, 2022. Based on this timeframe, the 2015 condition would be required to be implemented within one calendar year. This application has been before the Commission on several previous occasions, between April and September of this year. Since the September review, the pocket plaza design has been updated, withdrawing those elements from the application. Ms. Martin reviewed the updated site plan, noting that the enclosed patio space encroaches approximately six feet within the Riverside Drive right-of-way and approximately five feet within the pocket plaza, reducing the pocket plaza area by a total of 150 square feet. This minimal reduction will provide a clear area of three feet for circulation around the building pier, provided that the proposed seat wall is removed. The covered patio portion also will encroach six feet within the right-of-way. In order to accommodate the consistent six-foot encroachment and maintain eight feet of clear distance along Riverside Drive, the applicant is proposing to modify the streetscape planters by a variable width of two feet-four inches to 0 feet at the southernmost end, in order to accommodate additional pedestrian circulation. The tenant modifications are consistent with the September review, as are the furniture and lighting selections. Staff recommends approval of the two requested Waivers, as they are considered vital to activate the streetscape in a quality manner and facilitate intentional placemaking that blurs the line between public and private spaces, consistent with the goals and objectives of the Bridge Street District. Staff also recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with eight conditions.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the decision to decouple the plaza from the tenant application. Will the applicant be able to proceed with their project, and what occurs when the plaza design has been completed? Do the two components diverge or converge?

Ms. Martin responded that with approval of their application, the applicant would be able to proceed with their tenant modifications, including the storefront modifications, the encroachment into the Riverside Drive right-of-way, and the 150-foot encroachment into the pocket plaza. The pocket plaza will not be

changed by the tenant application. Crawford Hoying, the City and Dublin Arts Council will undertake a public design process to create a vision for the space. Staff will have the ability to approve that design, after which the design would be implemented. The Commission has also requested that the design be brought before the Commission for informational purposes.

Mr. Schneier stated that a dual track process would proceed, and regardless of the public plaza discussions, the applicant is permitted to proceed with their project.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. That is consistent with how tenant modifications work within the rest of Bridge Park.

Applicant Presentation

Randy Roberty, Design Collective Architecture, 151 East Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, OH, stated that the owner agrees with the eight conditions presented by staff. Based on the thorough discussion of the project that has occurred previously, they have no additional presentation.

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman stated that two waivers are requested. If this restaurant should cease to exist in this location in the future, would the two waivers remain in place for the next tenant in the space?

Ms. Martin responded that from the Waiver conditions would be retained unless the tenant space was altered in any way. If a new tenant wanted to make alterations, the waivers would need to be reconsidered in conjunction with their proposal. In the unlikely scenario that a new tenant wished to make no alternations, the waivers would remain in place.

Mr. Fishman inquired if they were ever to make alterations in the elevation of the restaurant, the waivers would need to be reconsidered.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak stated that the two waivers are specific to this design. Is the concern that the waivers would allow future design changes?

Mr. Fishman responded that, in the past, a second tenant in a space has made changes based on the waivers that had been previously granted. Is it staff's assurance that, without exception, any future alterations proposed would require reconsideration of the waivers?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way commended staff for uncoupling the pocket plaza from everything else. He believes that was the correct step to allow the application to proceed on its own. He has been very consistent throughout all of the previous reviews that he does not support reduction of the width of the key shopping corridor. He remains consistent in his view that the width should be 12 feet. He does not believe any alteration of the width is acceptable.

Mr. Supelak inquired if it was the City's request to reduce the width to eight feet or is the applicant requesting the adjustment?

Mr. Way responded that the proposal is to expand the restaurant into the public right-of-way and to move the planter over two feet to accommodate a minimum of 8 feet, which is far less than 12 feet. He believes

that 12 feet is necessary in this particular area of Bridge Park due to the circulation that occurs along the street and the connections to the hotel and other uses. He has observed the difficulty for people to pass on six and 8-foot wide sidewalks. With the addition of strollers and children, he believes the 12-foot width is appropriate and necessary -- a dimension that was established with all the development guidelines. It is an appropriate standard; he supports it and does not want to see it reduced in this particular area.

Mr. Supelak stated that the landscape beds in this particular area are generous. Are there other areas where they are far less generous?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Immediately north of the intersection of Riverside Drive and Bridge Park Avenue, the street section changes. There is actually on-street parking, which provides a buffer from Riverside Drive, along with significantly narrower planter beds. Due to the volume of traffic and speeds existing from the roundabout, the area south of Bridge Park Avenue includes no on-street parking and a more generous, 12-foot wide planter has been provided.

Mr. Supelak inquired what would be the significance of narrowing that planter more.

Mr. Way responded that in his professional opinion, the width of the planters was designated to encourage the landscape within it to thrive. If the available area for air and water were to be reduced, it would impact the plants. That planter bed dimension is necessary for the health of the landscape materials.

Mr. Grimes stated that with the nearby hotels, perhaps there is less shopping traffic here. If that is the case, the pedestrian traffic flow would not be negatively impacted by reducing the planter widths slightly. While this is a very important corner adjacent to the pedestrian bridge landing, given the factors involved, he would not be opposed to granting that waiver.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees this sidewalk does not carry a high level of pedestrian activity from the south. The Code permits a 6-foot encroachment into a sidewalk for patio use. Is it correct that this encroachment is permitted in Bridge Park?

Ms. Martin responded that it is permitted based on the development agreement between the developer and City Council.

Ms. Fox stated that the difference here, however, is that the encroachment is from the building footprint. However, it will be an indoor-outdoor tenant space with a consistent six-foot encroachment. She agrees that the applicant's proposal should be separated from the pocket plaza, as was the original intention. The proposed coordination of the parties on the design will be a good process for identifying interesting placemaking elements. She would recommend that when that design is completed, it returns to the Commission, not as a condition, but for the Commission to learn more unique ways in which to create placemaking in conjunction with Dublin Arts Council and the developer. As a result of the previous discussions, we have achieved a really elevated design and the opportunity to work with the Dublin Arts Council to create a more interesting pocket plaza. She has no objection to permitting the encroachment, because it is a gateway area and there is an elevated design. The pocket plaza also will receive a more extensive and professional development. She believes the innovative design will activate the space. However, she is concerned about setting a precedent. If needed, perhaps the planter could be shortened to accommodate the tables at the corner. She believes the elevated design, in return for the reduction of width, is an equitable compromise. Additionally, she believes the artificial greenery would enhance the appearance. Architects use artificial greenery in rooftop gardens, due to their associated ease of care. She believes it would add to the Italian character the architect is attempting to create on this corner. She requested clarification of the proposed window film.

Ms. Martin responded that a condition has been added that additional details be provided on the window film, which will be along the east, Longshore Street elevation, where the service entrance to the tenant space is located. If a reduction in transparency to an elevation is proposed, the applicant is required to provide calculations demonstrating that the minimum Code requirement is met.

Ms. Fox stated that she understands the need to screen the view into service areas. However, there are opportunities to use a more decorative screening element, perhaps with an image, that would be more interesting than just a covering of the glass.

Mr. Fishman stated typically, he is not in favor of reducing sidewalk widths, but if part of a trade-off, it can be acceptable. Previously, he was opposed to the use of artificial plants, but within the last week, he has visited some areas and observed that if well maintained and replaced when needed, its use can be acceptable. He assumes there is a set budget for the anticipated artwork in the plaza. Will this item be returning to the Commission for approval?

Ms. Martin responded that it is not anticipated to return to the Commission. The intent is to facilitate the design process to expedite the design and implementation. It is essential that the plaza be completed when the restaurant opens.

Ms. Fox stated that Mr. Fishman has raised a valid point regarding the expectations and the budget.

Mr. Fishman stated that the budget often can restrict creativity. In the past, an assurance for a beautiful piece of artwork provided very disappointing results -- essentially, a sign. Can the City provide some oversight on the design?

Ms. Martin responded that the three entities coordinating on the effort will provide the oversight. The 2015 condition did not require the final pocket plaza design to come back to the Planning Commission, and that condition is now being extended into 2021. She is confident the design process will not result in a sign in the plaza.

Mr. Fishman stated that he understands the restrictions of a budget. However, the City's expectations for this plaza are quite high and the point of considering the waivers.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant is the tenant, Valentina's. The plaza project discussion, however, will be with the developer, Crawford Hoying.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. If the proposal that not involved the open space, the pocket plaza conversation would not have occurred. The initial proposal for a building addition to occupy part of the pocket plaza has been replaced with the original intent to preserve the pocket plaza.

Mr. Supelak noted that any budget stipulations would not be associated with this applicant.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the applicant/tenant would provide any funds for the construction of the plaza.

Ms. Martin responded that she is not familiar with the terms of the lease agreement between the applicant and the property owner; however, no funds are being provided to the City. This is a private open space.

Mr. Schneier observed that with the previous application, there was an incentive for the applicant to cooperate with the plans for the pocket plaza. The proposed decoupling of the application with the pocket plaza will eliminate that incentive. The direction now suggested would not impact the applicant's ability to construct, occupy and conduct business in the tenant space. Are input, approval or funds expected from the applicant?

Ms. Martin deferred questions regarding the lease conditions and financial contributions to Crawford Hoying, noting any failure to meet the conditions of the required timeframe would become a violation that can be enforced.

Mr. Schneier stated that the defined responsibility and enforcement ability were reassuring.

Mr. Fishman stated that it has not yet been defined who would be responsible for the financing of the plaza and what motivation they would have to make this the spectacular place that the City has envisioned. He is concerned that the developer could lose interest in the anticipated result, and set a firm budget that could not be exceeded. When the application and plaza design were coupled together, there was more motivation to achieve what was desired. He requested clarification of the responsible financial party and the existing motivation to make the space spectacular.

Ms. Martin agreed that in the initial proposal, there was a nexus between the two components; with the revision of the application, that no longer exists. Instead, the City is enacting the 2015 condition. She will defer to Crawford Hoying to address the financing question.

Mr. Boggs noted that the 2015 Conditions contained no particular financial criteria.

Nelson Yoder, Principal, Development Partners, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Dr, Ste 500, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, stated that he would comment on the issues that have been raised. He participated in the development process in 2012 through 2015. In regard to the encroachment of the sidewalk into the planter, initially, the plans provided for on-street parking on Riverside Drive heading north out of the roundabout. At that time, all the planters were much narrower. However, Engineering indicated that it was not safe for vehicles exiting the roundabout to contend with parallel parking. It was eliminated within this area, and the sidewalk gained 8-9 feet, which was then absorbed into the planters. That is the reason the planters to the north are narrower than the wider planters to the south. He agrees with Mr. Way that the wider planters are better for the health of the plants, and he also would have assumed that the wider planters were for that purpose, if he had not been part of the earlier discussions. If some encroachment into the planters would facilitate the wider sidewalks that Mr. Way is requesting, that would be possible, at least with the planters to the north of Bridge Park Avenue. In regard to the pocket plaza financing, they had anticipated working with Cameron Mitchell on financing the improvements to that open space. With the removal of that item from the CMR application, a \$25,000 allowance for the public art in the plaza has been set aside. This is a very small space, so he anticipates that \$25,000 will be sufficient. He is willing to go on the record to state that is the amount set aside for this purpose. If the City wants to put something above and beyond that, they would be willing to contribute toward that, as well, in order to create something even more spectacular. They will be investing just as much into the public space as they would have to the private space for the CMR project. Hopefully, the Commission agrees that is adequate.

Mr. Schneier stated that the coupling of the public plaza with the tenant application probably should never have occurred. In his opinion, the applicant should be able to proceed without reference to the pocket plaza. The pocket plaza design can happen separately.

Mr. Fishman inquired who is responsible for the piece of artwork. It will not be the Dublin Arts Council, although they may participate in the design. Is it Cameron Mitchell or the City?

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is the artist or placemaker that is engaged in creating the space. The intent is to allow sufficient latitude for creativity and not regulate that aspect. The hope is that will result in the type of place the public wants to visit and will highlight this corner, as well as the tenant space. The conditions, timetable and participating parties are anticipated to execute a project that will meet the City's expectations.

Mr. Fishman inquired if Dublin Arts Council would be the responsible entity.

Ms. Martin responded that the property owner, Crawford Hoying, will be responsible for implementing the condition; the City will be responsible for enforcing the condition; and the Dublin Arts Council will be responsible for facilitating a creative conversation about the placemaking design.

Mr. Supelak stated that when this building was developed, the City and Crawford Hoying agreed on the open spaces within the block with the understanding that this particular space would be designed and occur when there was a tenant in the corner space. That responsibility has always been Crawford Hoying's.

Mr. Boggs agreed that it has always been Crawford Hoying's responsibility, and had the initial proposal for this tenant space not included the partial elimination of the pocket plaza, the pocket plaza would never have been under the Commission's purview. It would have been developed as it will now with the

decoupling. The revised application is now limited to the scope of tenant improvements in the building and does not include the open space. Development of the open space will proceed as originally intended.

Mr. Fishman stated that when the Bridge Street Code was being developed, the consultant cautioned the importance of not letting development eliminate any of the open spaces, as the proposed Code was defining the minimum open space needed. Yet, we are now considering eliminating some of it to achieve this project. Would it be possible to require the design, when completed, to come back to the Commission to review before they proceed with implementation? He does not want the Commission to be in the position of finding fully implemented artwork that is very disappointing. He can support the waivers, if overall, he has the confidence the result will be spectacular. This corner, which is immediately across from the pedestrian bridge, is a real focal point in Bridge Street.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the plaza had never been part of a development application but been handled as an independent project, what would have been the review process. Would it have come before the Planning Commission?

Ms. Martin responded that it would not have. The Planning Commission approved this pocket plaza in 2015.

Mr. Schneier stated that it would seem that only the application is within the Planning Commission's authority to review. The pocket plaza review is not within our authority.

Mr. Fishman stated the plaza became connected with this application, when the Commission was requested to make a concession to reduce the plaza space to permit the building to be extended further.

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission could decide not to approve that.

Mr. Fishman stated that is true, but it would be difficult at this point of the project. The plaza has become a significant part of the application based upon the promise of a spectacular entrance. In these circumstances, we would be granting a waiver to create a dominant place including the entrance of the restaurant. The remaining piece of land has become the issue of debate

Mr. Supelak inquired if, at this point, the restaurant as designed would be encroaching into the pocket plaza space.

Ms. Martin responded that it is encroaching by 150 feet square feet.

Ms. Fox stated that the decision regarding the plaza occurred in 2015. The concern is that it did not get finished at that point. There must be an element of trust and cooperation that it will happen. She also would like the plaza design to come back to the Commission, but not as a condition. It would provide an opportunity for the Commission to learn how to create placemaking spaces in collaboration with the Dublin Arts Council. She agrees with decoupling the plaza from the application, with the Commission now trusting the process in place to complete the plaza.

Mr. Fishman stated that he could agree with that compromise.

Mr. Schneier stated that he also would have no objection, if it is clearly stated that the plaza design will return to the Planning Commission as education.

Mr. Supelak stated that there would no need to add a condition for that. The City and Crawford Hoying have a good working relationship, and we can simply request Crawford Hoying to do so. This process, however, has exposed a gap related to review of the designing of pocket parks.

Mr. Yoder stated that the plaza art component would be a public process involving Mr. Guion. Commissioners are familiar with Mr. Guion and the Dublin Arts Council. They can contact Mr. Guion directly and meet with him individually to share their thoughts regarding the plaza. There will be full transparency, although sometimes items can be overlooked during major developments; that is what occurred here. This plaza presents a great opportunity to improve the front door of Bridge Park, and nobody cares more about than Cameron Mitchell and the private developers of the adjacent project. All interests are in total alignment.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the statement that the Code permits the proposed 6-foot encroachment into the right-of-way.

Ms. Martin responded that the provision is not in the Zoning Code. It is part of the development agreement that the City executed for the Bridge Park development. That agreement accommodates certain things that are not permitted elsewhere, such as encroachment into the right-of-way for specific purposes, including outdoor dining. However, in areas of conflict between a Code requirement and a development agreement allowance, the Code prevails. For that reason, a Code waiver has been requested.

Mr. Way stated that the clarification indicates that a waiver could be made for patio space; however, part of the proposed encroachment area would not be for patio space but for enclosed building space. Would it still meet the criteria?

Ms. Martin responded that there was significant discussion on that concern, but the Law Director determined that the enclosed portion would be an enclosed patio, due to its indoor-outdoor element.

Mr. Way inquired if that space would not be considered a permanent structure.

Ms. Martin responded that it would not, per the Law Director's determination.

Mr. Way stated that another tenant to the south, Z Cucina, has an outdoor space that is within the building line. Will this set a precedent for that tenant also to request an encroachment into the right-of-way?

Mr. Boggs responded that nothing would prevent them from submitting a Minor Project Review request, which could include such a waiver. He does not believe that granting this waiver would set a binding precedent, because the geographic and traffic conditions are different. What is decided here should not be a determinant for future tenant requests.

Mr. Way stated that he appreciates Mr. Yoder's comment about the width of the planter. However, his observation of the area indicates that the planters here needed to be wider because this area has no on-street parking buffer, and it is located near the roundabout where vehicle speeds are increasing. Where there is on-street parking, that element will slow the traffic. He believes the planters were made wider to provide the needed buffer at the gateway into this area.

Mr. Supelak stated that he has no objection to either reduction of the sidewalk width or to reduction of the planter width in order to make the sidewalk wider. There is a value judgment at play. He is in agreement with the proposed decoupling and is excited about the inclusion of the Dublin Arts Council in the design process. The three parties can work together on a mutually vested interest. Staff has indicated that they have concerns about potential future issues with the proposed artificial plants; however, he is confident neither Cameron Mitchell nor Crawford Hoying would permit any deterioration to occur. Perhaps a condition concerning the maintenance thereof could be added. He inquired if Commissioners were in agreement regarding the requested sidewalk width waiver. There might be an opportunity to gain a foot of width for the sidewalk through reduction of the planter width.

Mr. Way pointed out that the rendering of the proposed sidewalk could be misleading, as the image depicts a 12-foot width.

Ms. Fox requested that the condition regarding the artificial plants be eliminated or revised.

Ms. Martin responded that the condition could be eliminated or altered to require that if the City determined at any point the maintenance of the artificial plants was an issue, the applicant would be required to either remove/replace or request Commission review to identify an alternative.

Mr. Way stated that he would not be supportive of any artificial greenery. It was his understanding that a future landscape plan would be submitted, where the Commission would have further input.

Ms. Martin responded that landscape plan is a required condition of this application and is an item that staff would review. Staff would accept artificial plant materials in a very limited capacity, particularly on the main entrance to the building. All other plant materials would be required to be real. Staff also

objected to artificial greening along the awning, given its high visibility from Riverside Drive and Riverside Crossing Park.

Mr. Supelak stated that he believes the Commission is not objecting to the use of artificial plants along the awning.

Mr. Roberty clarified that all vegetation that is not above the awning is real. The only artificial vegetation is on the awning, including the canopy of the entrance.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on this application.

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

- 1) Section 153.063(E)(5)(c) — Neighborhood Standards, Pedestrian-Oriented Streetscape:
Requirement: A minimum of 12 feet of clear sidewalk width shall be provided along designated shopping corridors through the combination of public right-of-way and required building zone area with public access easements. Outdoor dining and seating areas shall not be permitted within this clear area.
Request: To reduce the clear sidewalk width along Riverside Drive to a minimum of 8 feet-2 inches permitting outdoor seating and dining within a required Shopping Corridor.
- 2) Section 153.064(C) – Open Space Types, Provision of Open Space:
Requirement: To provide 200 square feet of open space per residential unit and 1 square foot per 50 square feet of commercial space. Bridge Park, Block B was required to provide a total of 1.08 acres of publically accessible open space of which 0.33 acre was provided onsite and 0.75 acre was provided off-site.
Request: To reduce the total required open space for Bridge Park, Block B by approximately 150 square feet.

Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion carried 4-2]

The Commission reviewed the revised conditions.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with following conditions:

- 1) All pocket plaza elements including seat wall, dining tables, and ancillary furniture and amenities be withdrawn from this proposal and the pocket plaza design be separated from this application.
- 2) The property owner work with the Dublin Arts Council to identify a final design for the pocket plaza no later than March 31, 2022 and implement the final design no later than October 1, 2022, subject to staff approval.
- 3) For all alterations and additions located within the right-of-way, full civil engineering drawings be submitted as part of the building permit.
- 4) The applicant provide a full landscape plan detailing the use of artificial and live vegetation, prior to permitting, subject to staff approval.
- 5) The applicant provide a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with the Code, prior to permitting, subject to staff approval.
- 6) All artificial plant material shall be maintained in good condition as assessed from the public right of way. Should the City determine at any time the condition of the artificial material be deteriorated, the applicant shall repair and replace immediately, or remove, or come before the Commission with a suitable alternative.

- 7) The applicant provide the window film color and calculations, at permitting, to confirm transparency requirements are met along the east façade.
- 8) The applicant submit for sign permits, with a landlord approval letter, for review of the proposed signs relative to the adopted regulations.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes.

[Motion carried 5-1]

NEW CASES

2. 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-128CP, Concept Plan

A request for the construction of a ±6,900-square-foot, one-story, multi-tenant commercial building with drive-thru restaurant. The 1.98-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located ±500 feet northwest of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and determination of a Concept Plan for 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road. The Concept Plan is the first of three review stages for new developments within the Bridge Street District. The next two steps are the Preliminary and Final Development Plans. There is an opportunity to combine those last two steps, if the Concept Plan is approved. The applicant is requesting that those reviews be combined, should the Concept Plan be approved. The 1.98-acre site is located in the Sawmill Center neighborhood within the Bridge Street District. This vacant site is located south of the Lowe's development and has a number of mature trees along the west property line. In the southeast corner of the site is a low-lying entry feature, which currently does not serve a purpose or function for this or surrounding sites. There is also a decorative wall and monument sign for the Lowe's development. With this development, that sign would remain in place for the Lowe's development. When Lowe's was developed, a number of outparcels was created. This site is one of those, similar to the former Mellow Mushroom site immediately to the east. Because these are Lowe's outparcels, there are a number of deed restrictions, which include limitations on height, size and uses within proposed buildings. Deed restrictions are private agreements between the property owners and tenants, and the City is not involved in implementation of these agreements because they are negotiated between private entities. There is a 50-foot electric easement along the west property line. This proposal also includes the future development of Village Parkway, which is considered a District connector and principal frontage street within the Bridge Street District. The construction of this future extension is not included with the development; it is only accounted for in the site layout and design. The 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, pedestrian-oriented environment through unique shopping, service and entertainment uses with supporting residential and office uses. The site is not subject to potential gateway requirements or shopping corridor requirements, and prohibits commercial center building types. Commercial center building types are not permitted on this site; they are permitted on select corridors, specifically along Bridge Park Avenue and Sawmill Road. This site is located at intersection of the potential Village Parkway extension and West Dublin-Granville Road. Both streets are designated as principal frontage streets. Banker Drives lies to the northeast and an access drive, both of which are potential neighborhood streets. Currently located on the Lowe's parcel to the north, they are designed as private access drives and are not built to public street standards. This proposal for an approximately 6,900-square-foot, multi-tenant commercial building, which will include uses such as restaurants and office. For one of the restaurants, a quick-serve drive-thru accessory use on the east is proposed. The building will be a Loft Building Type. [Site plan was reviewed.] Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and because

the criteria are not met, recommends disapproval of the Concept Plan. Staff also recommends disapproval of the request to combine the Preliminary and Final Development Plan reviews.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes requested clarification of the access to the private drive. Will an agreement with the property owner be required to have access to that drive? How can that private drive be required as the only permitted entrance/exit, as it is not a public right-of-way.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the site currently has access off the private section of Banker Drive. There are two access points, which will be consolidated into one. They are maintaining their current access. In the BSD, site access is not typically off principal frontage streets, such as the extension of Village Parkway or West Dublin Granville Road. Because access is off a future neighborhood street, it would meet the requirements of the BSD street network.

Mr. Grimes inquired if Lowe's, the owner of that street could eliminate it, if they so desired.

Mr. Hounshell deferred to the applicant to address the private access conditions.

Mr. Way noted that he has a similar question. In terms of Thoroughfare Plan, is Banker Drive designated as a future public street.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it is designated as a future neighborhood street. The section adjacent to this site is currently on the Lowe's parcel and is built to private access drive standards. Should Lowe's decide to develop that portion in the future and it became public right-of-way, the City would require reconstruction of that drive to public standards.

Mr. Way inquired if the City would take it over and handle that reconstruction.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it would be part of the negotiations at the time of the development of that site.

Ms. Rauch responded that, typically, the developer is responsible for the street reconstruction. Up to the time that Lowes would re-develop their site, Banker Drive would remain a private drive.

Mr. Way noted that to extend Village Parkway, much of the Lowe's site would be impacted. Currently, that road alignment cannot occur.

Ms. Rauch responded that there are pieces of future roadways that exist, but if Lowe's were to redevelop, Village Parkway from Banker north to Bridge Park would also need to be constructed.

Mr. Way stated it would have to be a right in/right out only, because it is not a full intersection; a median is currently there. Would it make sense to consider that as a future access point with this application and to plan the development with an access from that street?

Ms. Rauch stated that she is not aware of anything precluding it, but Engineering may have some input.

Mike Hendershot stated that Village Parkway is a principal frontage street, so the City would restrict access off that street. City Engineering has the ability to waive that requirement, but that typically does not occur. It is unlikely it would ever be the access point for this or the adjacent parcel. As clarification, the portion of Banker Drive from Shamrock Blvd to David Road is within public right-of-way. It is a public street within public right-of-way; it is an existing condition and would remain so.

Nelson Yoder, Principal, Development Partners, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Dr, Ste 500, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, stated that the development process with this site was initiated in September 2020. What is proposed is a drive-thru on the end cap of the building. There are two access points off Banker Drive. The Mellow Mushroom building located to the east does not interact with Dublin-Granville Road. There is parking between the building and the street. That is the more traditional urban form. In comparison, they have attempted to incorporate walkable, urbanism concepts into this site plan. In November 2020, they provided requested revisions to staff. The building has been elongated to occupy more of the frontage. The drive-thru has also been relocated behind the building; it can no longer be seen from West Dublin-Granville Drive, only from the Lowes driveway and the service driveway to the rear. Engineering has

requested that the two curbcuts be consolidated into one and be pulled to the center of the site. This land was an outparcel created in 2000 before the Bridge Street District was envisioned. At that time, Lowes imposed deed restrictions on this site limiting any buildings to 6000 square feet. They have approached Lowes more than once requesting them to drop the deed restrictions, as they would like to develop more square footage on the site. They have consistently refused. Even though the Bridge Street Code looks for something different than the earlier zoning code permitted, the deed restrictions remain in place. As a result, they must try to create a project on the site that allows for walkable urbanism concepts. Perhaps 30 years from now, the Lowes site will cease to exist, and the deed restrictions might be lifted by the future owner. At this point, it is important to ensure we are allowing ourselves the ability to address both Village Parkway and West Dublin Granville Road, should that future opportunity occur. They have attempted to create the best project they can now within the current restrictions. A tenant already has been identified that is interested in the site, who would be a great addition to Bridge Street. However, without a drive-thru, the tenant is not interested and this project will not happen. [described the details of the site report.] He noted that there is a mature tree line where the drive-thru stacking area would be. There is 24 feet between the curb and the edge of the proposed pavement. The proposed drive-thru will be obscured by the tree line. There is plenty of room to add any additional landscaping for buffering, as required. [reviewed the proposed one-story massing.] The project is facilitating a transfer of land to the City for the future roadway. It also provides patios and open space on SR161 and will create a buffer between SR 161 and Lowes. Additional pedestrian facilities will be necessary, particularly along the Lowe's access drive. The report unintentionally presents the Lowe's access drive as both a public street and as a private access drive; it is either one or the other. They have attempted to arrive at the best project for a very challenging site. This site will not set a precedent for other sites, because other sites along SR161 do not have the deed restrictions that this site has. If they did not exist, they would be happy to construct a taller building here. In comparison, the next case on the agenda is for a two-story, 12,000-square-foot building for the site immediately to the west of this site. They are able to construct that building because the site has no deed restrictions. They would not be appealing the Commission to permit a one-story building on this site, if it were not required.

Brian McNally, Myers & Associates, 232 N. Third Street, Columbus, OH stated that typically, this level of detail is not shown with a Concept Plan. Usually, lots, blocks and massing are shown. There were several site constraints that were dealt with; much time and effort has been invested in the Concept Plan in the placement of this building. On the west side of this site is a large, electrical easement. On the east side of the lot is the Lowes pedestal sign. The 7,000 square feet deed restriction incorporates the total building square footage. The longer, one-story design was created to take up more of the site along SR161 and create more interest. They have broken up the mass into 3-4 main heights, included a large amount of storefront, and attempted to create verticality into the design with the façade materials. Overhead canopies, horizontal elements and large patios activate the SR161 frontage.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox stated that the applicant is caught between a deed restriction and the BSD Code. They have identified some creative uses in an attempt to navigate that situation. The applicant indicates they have discussed the situation with Lowes; is there a record of that discussion.

Mr. Yoder responded that the recorded deed restrictions dictate 6,000-7,000 square feet; the height; and parking requirements. Lowes has indicated that unequivocally, they will not go back on such past decisions. Apparently, with the number of Lowes units throughout the world, once they make a decision, they are not altered.

Ms. Fox inquired if Lowes realizes that this is an undevelopable lot within the City's Zoning Code.

Mr. Yoder responded that Lowes is not concerned as it is not their problem; it is a problem for the property owner and the City. The site can either remain vacant, or it can be activated with another

restaurant. As the owners, they would like to do that. If that cannot happen, the site will continue to sit vacant, as it has the past 20 years.

Mr. Schneier inquired if there is an overlap between the Code and the deed restrictions, is there a place the two could work together?

Mr. Yoder responded that there is not. A two-story building, as the Code requires, will not work. A 3,500-square-foot footprint would result in a very short building, which would not occupy a sufficient amount of the frontage. The best solution for meeting the Code requirements regarding the street frontage is what they have proposed.

Mr. Schneier inquired if there is any ability to change this from a drive-thru with vehicle queue line to an app-based order process.

Mr. Yoder responded that the most adjacent restaurant tenant has that type of setup. This tenant is a coffee-related business. He noted that Fifth Third put a deed restriction on this parcel when they sold it to Lowes in 2000 that no financial institution could be located on this site, nor any competing ATMs.

Ms. Fox stated that Lowes permits a building height of up to 28 feet, but this proposal has a height of 22 feet. She understands the purpose for spreading out the massing, but it would be possible to add some additional height.

Mr. Yoder responded that it would cost money to add height; therefore, it would be necessary to remove something elsewhere to make the project viable. They have invested the money at the level where there is the most benefit. There is a height restriction, not a stories restriction, and a 7,000-square foot restriction. The latter restricts the number of stories. If the building were made smaller, there would be a view of the parking lot and Lowes at the rear.

Mr. Supelak stated that because more height would be permitted, the concept of mezzanines occurs. Mezzanine are interesting in how they are used and how they apply toward building square feet. A double-height coffee house or restaurant could be compelling with a little mezzanine feature added, if the Code permits.

Mr. O'Malley responded that the Code permits mezzanines and are frequently used. They are not difficult, but the deed restrictions would count that mezzanine toward the usable building interior. The Building Code permits mezzanine to overlook 10 percent of the floor area. If they were to add mezzanine space, it would be necessary to eliminate some building length to meet the 7000 square foot restriction.

Mr. Yoder stated that if a mezzanine is open to the floor below, it is not counted as a story. It counts toward square footage but is a one-story building, according to Code. Because the Code permits a two-story building, a mezzanine would not be a benefit.

Mr. Way stated that in regard to the right-of-way for the future Village Parkway, perhaps it would be possible to change the drive-thru to that side and use that right-of-way as an easement. In the short term, it could provide access to the drive-thru and not involve the Lowes access drive.

Mr. Yoder responded that initially, the drive-thru was on that side of the building, as it improves the circulation. However, there was concern about having a drive-thru close to a future public street versus next to the driveway.

Mr. Way stated that there is no need for that road in the foreseeable future. All of that real estate will sit empty on the anticipation that some point in the future, there will be a road there – that seems short-sighted.

Mr. Yoder stated that because it is shown on the City's Thoroughfare Plan, it is required to be set aside to allow for that future roadway development.

Mr. Way stated that he would assume a limited easement could permit it to happen.

Mr. Yoder responded that City Engineering and Economic Development have indicated the City's desire that, at some point, the road would be built as part of this project. However, as the applicant, they do not see that as an asset to this particular project at this time.

Mr. Way responded that from a site-planning perspective, that would be a preferable location for the drive-thru, as it would remove it from the corridor and level of visibility.

Mr. Hounshell clarified that the Code's Specific Use requirements for drive-thrus dictate that, although Village Parkway is only potential, drive-thrus are not permitted to front principal frontage streets. They are required to plan the site accordingly. That is the reason the site is oriented toward the potential neighborhood streets rather than the principal frontage streets.

Mr. Way inquired if there is any opportunity for the Commission to express a recommendation for something different.

Ms. Rauch stated that there is an existing street network map and Code Specific Use requirements that limit where drive-thrus are permitted. Locating the street access on SR161 would be more concerning and visible than where it is currently proposed.

Mr. Way responded that it would not be visible, but there would be a right in/right out driveway that would permit access to the site. The exit could be on Banker Drive, not SR161.

Ms. Rauch responded that the greater issue is the drive-thru in general – the tone it sets for the corridor. The layout, design and use does not comply with what the Bridge Street District encourages.

Mr. Way stated that if the drive-thru location were altered, it would remove the circulation from that corner. The building then could anchor that corner differently.

Mr. Yoder stated that there is one advantage with the existing driveway alignment. It is effectively the front of the Lowe's building. The other location has the potential to be a road that does not align with the shopping center. In addition, the existing mature trees at that corner would provide screening. Mature evergreen trees provide excellent screening. There may also be room to add pedestrian facilities to connect SR161 to the front of the Lowe's site.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Fox stated that this Concept does not improve pedestrian friendliness of the street. It is auto-oriented. She would not object to a portion of the front of the building being one-story; however, there is a need to add some height. Rather than one long building, a pedestrian tunnel could allow people to walk through the building from the parking lot. The hope is that, one day, the pedestrian traffic along SR161 will be similar to that in Bridge Park. That will not happen here if the orientation is to the rear of the site. There is an opportunity to have one-story wings on the end, add height in the middle, and take advantage of the streetscape and patios. The Plan currently does not provide a sufficient number of pedestrian-friendly elements. She understands the deed restrictions but believes there is potential to create more pedestrian-friendliness. Using up all the space for buffering does not permit pedestrian facilities.

Mr. Yoder responded that he likes the idea of the tunnel connection through the building from SR 161 to the parking area, similar to the restaurants in Clintonville. Two buildings would not be permitted here, but one building with a tunnel could be a possibility. Such a change could improve the pedestrian friendliness, creating places for people to walk to. Adding a sidewalk between SR161 and the front of Lowes could improve pedestrian friendliness. It would not be crossing the proposed drive-thru on the other side of the hedgerow. He appreciates the Commission's comments and ideas.

Mr. Schneier reiterated Ms. Fox's comments regarding the need to create pedestrian-friendliness. A drive-thru and pedestrian friendliness seem to be mutually exclusive, but perhaps they need not be. He also likes the cut-through idea, which is common on Grandview Avenue and in Clintonville. He is not opposed to this being a one-story building on a unique site and unique circumstances. The goal is to create the best project possible along SR161, and he remains open-minded.

Mr. Fishman stated that the goal of the Bridge Street Corridor is to create a walkable community, and every application in this area has been expected to encourage that. That is the challenge for this site.

Mr. Grimes stated that he appreciates all the work invested on this site during the past year. It is a great plan, but in order to be true to the vision for that corridor, it does not yet "fit." There are many other parcels in this corridor yet to be developed. It is important to be consistent with the successful projects than making exceptions.

Mr. Way stated that there appears to be a vision that is ahead of itself. There are so many pieces along this corridor that are fighting against that vision that we cannot change. He does not believe having property sit vacant, making no contribution at all, is the right approach. The challenge is SR 161, a 45-mph roadway and no on-street parking. What the applicant is attempting to do to animate the existing walkway and add frontage to the street is very valid. Until Lowes goes away at some distant point in the future, the vision cannot be achieved. The applicant has come up with a good way to place an active use here at this point in time. Although he would like to see the drive-thru done differently, he supports the applicant's direction within the existing conditions of the corridor. The walkable street that is desired is a long-term vision. This is a short-term solution for achieving some activity on the site.

Mr. Supelak stated that Commission members recognize the difficult situation for the applicant. We keep referencing places like Grandview Avenue and Clintonville. Are pedestrian friendliness and vehicle drive-thrus mutually exclusive? Every example that we can recall confirm that they are, do that is the issue that needs to be resolved first. At present, it seems that this is not the right location for the proposed drive-thru. While he agrees that at this point, we are a long distance from the vision for this corridor, we do want this eventually to become like Grandview Avenue; that will take some time. It would be good to start with something to prime the energy, but he is skeptical that the energy should come from a drive-thru. The design and material palette are attractive. The idea about creating a pedestrian pass-through could be appropriate. The deed restrictions are an interesting problem, and the applicant has been trying to work out a solution with Lowes and the City. Lowes is a large corporation, but money can be convincing. It is the economics that matter, and he believes Lowes will budge, if the conversation is right.

Mr. Yoder responded that the issue is that Lowes sold this outparcel 20 years ago. They have obtained their money from it and have no incentive to re-negotiate any past decisions to benefit little outparcel in Dublin. Working with those restriction, they now must find a way of making the most they can from this vacant site, which is an eyesore in the middle of an important corridor. He will challenge his group to go back and identify how to satisfy all the requirements expressed by the Commission tonight. Although Commissioners may not have an experience with a drive-thru that is part of a pedestrian-friendly project, he is confident that his talented team can do that. They built Bridge Park – certainly, they can figure out a way to incorporate a drive-thru in a project that has enough other pedestrian connectivity to make it a successful project. If the Commission agrees, he would like to go back to the drawing board and identify a concept that reinforces the priority of the pedestrian element within the project.

Mr. Supelak responded that he has no objection to their making that attempt, but it would be a tall hurdle. The Commission has concerns, but would be happy to see a concept that accommodates those concerns. He clarified that he was not advocating for the applicant to invest more money or make additional purchases here; it is, of course, up to the applicant to do the cost-benefit analysis. In most cases, a check to waive some deed restrictions will be convincing.

Mr. Yoder responded that most people will accept a check, if it is large enough. However, they also need to be financially able to construct a building. Purchasing more square footage for the project would also mean investing and constructing more parking. It can become more complicated.

Public Comments

No public comments on the case were received.

Mr. Boggs inquired if the applicant had indicated that he wished to table the case.
Mr. Yoder responded affirmatively.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the Concept Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the request for combination of the review and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

3. 4012 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-129CP, Concept Plan

A request for the construction of a 14,600-square-foot, two-story, mixed-use building. The 1.08-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Office and is located northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with David Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Concept Plan for the construction of a two-story, mixed-use building in the Bridge Street District. The applicant is proposing an approximate 14,600-square-foot loft type building, sited in the southern one-third of the site. Approximately 400 square feet of open space is proposed on the west edge of the proposed building, where 290 square feet is required. 53 parking spaces will be located centrally on the site, where 54 spaces are required. Access to the site is provided on the north side of the site from Banker Drive. Two patios are proposed adjacent to the building, and sidewalks are proposed along the David Road and Banker Drive frontages. Some of the infrastructure improvements will be on a City-owned parcel; therefore, the applicant will need to work with staff to determine the most appropriate siting. There is a portion of an existing overhead utility easement on the east side of the site, which constricts the site of the building and the parking. The proposed Loft Building Type is a permitted building type in the Office District. The building is required to be sited within 0-15 feet of the right-of-way line and to occupy 75% of the front property line width. With the Preliminary Development Plan, a full building type analysis will be required. The applicant has provided rendering of the proposed building massing. It is a primarily a 2-story massing with a 1.5-story element and rooftop amenities. The primary entry from the parking lot is on the north elevation. Architectural inspiration images were also provided. The buildings will be contemporary in design with straight lines and flat roofs. The buildings utilize glazing, transparency, wood, metal and masonry elements. The proposed open space will be comprised of hardscape with vegetation and seating elements provided. The Concept Plan was reviewed against applicable criteria and staff recommends approval with two conditions, as well as approval of the request to combine the Preliminary and Final Development Plan reviews.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox that the building is required to be 0-15 feet from the right-of-way. In addition to the building footprint, that could also be either patio or an outdoor structure. With those spaces, the building itself could be located further back from the property line.

Mr. Ridge responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that the City owns a section of land along Banker Drive. He is not sure what the City could do with that, unless it is intended for a future realignment of Banker Drive. If lying unused, it would be preferable incorporate the land into this project.

Mr. Ridge responded that at some point in the future, that section of roadway would likely be improved to a Bridge Street District roadway. The City would ensure that the appropriate right-of-way is provided in said parcel. Because that is identified as a Neighborhood Street, it makes sense to front this building along the West Dublin-Granville Road frontage.

Mr. Way stated that as Banker Drive extends to the west, it is a City street and is likely to remain so. What is the intent with the leftover piece of land? If Banker Drive remains where it is, it may become wider, but it will not use all that land.

Mr. Henderson responded that Engineering would have further discussions regarding Banker Drive on that parcel, but likely, the existing section to the west, which is a public street within right-of-way, would be improved to be a similar condition on the City-owned property. Staff would work with the developer regarding location of the sidewalk, should it be placed on the City-owned property.

Mr. Grimes inquired if this part of Banker Drive was private. It has not been dedicated and accepted. It appears to extend to the future Village Parkway, and after that, becomes private.

Mr. Hendershot responded that Banker Drive has an unusual configuration from west to east. Shamrock Drive on the west boundary is an existing public street within the public right-of-way. Moving from there along Banker Drive to the east, David Road marks the limits of the public-right-of-way. Further to the east is a City-owned parcel, which contains a street. If this project moves forward, there would be discussions about the character of the street and location of the sidewalk, which likely will be on the City-owned parcel.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification that this section of Banker Drive is on a City-owned parcel.

Mr. Hendershot responded that it is on a City-owned parcel but is not currently right-of-way. Moving east from there, it becomes a private drive on the Lowe's parcel.

Applicant Presentation

Brian McNally, Myers & Associates, 232 N. Third Street, Columbus, OH stated that the two-story building would be comprised of two separate tenant spaces, one larger than the other. Rooftop terraces will be provided off the second-floor space. The smaller tenant space will be utilized a retail, food and beverage use. A sidewalk along the front façade will provide pedestrian engagement. [Provided description of the proposed building layout/design.]

Commission Questions

Mr. Way observed that the proposed location of the open space on a side street is not a place where people would logically gather – there is nothing happening there. The open space should be where there will be activity. In addition, the SR161 entrance to the office tenant space seems to be underplayed, not welcoming. There appears to be an opportunity there to do something more special.

Ms. Fox stated that the inspiration images are great, and she believes this will be an exciting addition here. However, she also agrees with Mr. Way's observation. It still appears to be an office building located on SR61. There is a great opportunity to add the same energy to the restaurant that there is on rooftop and the side patios to the front of the building. People will not stop here, if there appears to be nothing to stop for; so she would like to see the inviting energy moved to the front of the building. Looking at the inspiration images, she believes the wall of glass has too strong of an impression; it is not pedestrian friendly. It is similar to a downtown office building. Although the transparency presents a view inside, it

does not include the viewer. A desire should be created to linger. She would encourage them to look at the glass element, moving the open spaces to the front façade, and possibly inviting evening lighting. If more effort were invested in creating a warm feeling to the front façade, with the materials being used, she believes they will achieve what is desired.

Mr. Yoder stated that he believes it may be possible to swap some of the 49-foot grass strip at the rear of the property to the SR161 front of the building, and the building could be moved back from SR161 somewhat. There would still be plenty of room remaining for the required 60 to 65-foot right-of-way. Swapping .25-acre of open space with the City could make this happen.

Ms. Fox stated that as Mr. Way has pointed out previously, there are better ways to address parking lots. It should be possible to create pedestrian friendliness from Banker Drive with sidewalks that extend to the rear of the building, eliminating the small tree islands. Adding a garden of trees with a pedestrian-friendly extension would be more inviting. Along with the attractive building and wonderful spaces, make it walkable all the way around it. She would add a condition relocating the patio spaces, and developing the middle of the building to be more inviting and pedestrian friendly at the streetscape. She also would encourage a different design for the parking and pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Yoder responded that if the City would be willing to give away some City land, the parking lot could be re-oriented. Currently, they are short one parking space.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the City had plans for the greenspace at the rear of the site.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there were no current plans for improvements on Banker Drive. Staff would have to take a look at what a future section of Banker Drive would look like there, and what space might be left over for any potential development opportunities. It would be necessary to consider those details.

Ms. Rauch responded that any land donation would require City Council action, so this project would need to be elevated to City Council in some aspect.

Mr. Supelak stated that it might not be necessary. If the Commission had a better understanding of future plans there, we might be able to identify an opportunity to waive a five-foot minimum rear-yard setback.

Ms. Rauch responded that if there is a zoning requirement on the parcel that the applicant owns, then modifications could be made. Staff can investigate if there is an opportunity to do something with the City-owned parcel.

Mr. Way stated that it would be necessary to change the property line so that the applicant would have the ability to shift the elements back.

Mr. Supelak moving five feet to the other side of the building might not solve the parking issue, but it would be adding some space to the other side of the building, where it is wanted, in lieu of adding on to a 50-foot greenbelt.

Mr. Yoder responded that the best solution would be to have the ability to cross behind, but even the partial solution of adding 5 feet along SR161 would be important. They would be willing to either request a sideyard setback or trade some land with the City.

Mr. Boggs inquired, given this conversation, if the applicant was hoping to obtain a vote on the Concept Plan this evening, or table it.

Mr. Yoder responded that he would prefer for it to proceed to vote tonight, if the Commission believes it can write conditions that would encapsulate their desires. However, if that would be difficult for the Commission or staff, it can be tabled.

Mr. Boggs responded that he asks because, if a land swap versus waiver of setback are contemplated, he would prefer that those conditions not be written without appropriate consideration.

Ms. Rauch responded that it would also alter the review process, as well. If a development agreement is required, City Council must approve the Concept Plan.

Mr. Boggs stated that his preference is not to attempt to write conditions tonight, but give the applicant all the feedback needed and to table the case tonight. That would allow time for a conversation regarding whether this should involve a development agreement and ultimately an application to be decided by City Council.

Mr. Way stated that Engineering also needs time to identify the right-of-way needs, so we can know how much space remains with which to work.

Mr. Hendershot confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Supelak requested any remaining Commission comments to be shared.

Mr. Schneier echoed other Commissioners' comments regarding the public space. Although the amount of that space exceeds what is required, it has been placed in the least attractive part of the property with a large wall behind it. He would recommend that space be relocated in a more desirable portion of the plan and as close to SR161 as possible.

Mr. Fishman stated that when he reviewed the renderings, his impression was that the architecture has drifted from the Dublin look. Perhaps the restaurant tacked onto the side of the building could be integrated more into the façade. In regard to the parking lot, Dublin has seas of parking lots. Rather than incorporating clumps of trees, it might be possible to incorporate a tree-lined path from the back street to the front. He would also like to see the façade made more interesting and welcoming.

Ms. Fox stated that the renderings were interesting, but there are a couple of elements she would like clarified. While large amount of intersection between horizontal awnings against strong vertical elements of glass and entryways, she does not see that happening in the plan. The vertical element is apparent, but the horizontal elements are not strong. Perhaps those are not shown on a Concept Plan, but texture changes and open lattice spaces within the large canopies can soften the appearance. She would encourage inclusion of such elements.

Mr. Myers responded that such features typically are not shown with the Concept Plan. They are finishing materials.

Ms. Fox stated that, at this point, the plan shows primarily verticality, glass and solid mass and lacks an intersection with horizontal features.

Mr. Fishman stated that the overhang and porch elements appear thin. They do not look as though they would stand a test of time. The main horizontal line running through the front of the building appears to be approximately 8 inches thick. A three-foot thickness would give an impression of longevity. Even if the elements were hollow, they would provide a more substantial look. As he has already noted, the restaurant looks like an afterthought.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the 37-foot easement on the east side is a utility easement, or would encroachment be permitted.

Mr. Hendershot responded that it is a private utility easement. The developer will need to work with the utility company to learn the stipulations of the easement and if encroachment might be allowed. There was a similar condition on the other side of the property line with the previous case heard this evening.

Mr. Way requested clarification that the 37 feet is not an easement; it is the dimension from the proposed road to the parking lot.

Mr. Hendershot affirmatively. However, there is also a utility easement for the overhead electric line.

Mr. Way noted that the utility easement is not 37 feet wide.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there is more space, then, on that side of the parcel.

Mr. Hendershot displayed the site plan and clarified that the 37 feet encompasses the entirety of the 30-foot easement on the site. The additional 7 feet includes the space from the pavement to the property line.

Mr. Yoder stated that AEP recently had replaced the previous towers with monopoles. When that occurred, they too another 6-7 feet along that edge, so it might be part of the new AEP easement. When the case returns for review, they will be able to clarify that item.

Mr. Supelak stated that if the revised plan incorporates a different consideration on the back side of the site, he would be curious of any long-term expectations of greenspace and setbacks.

Mr. Way stated that he also does not see what public right-of-way would be reserved. There is no designation of a right-of-way line, only a proposed edge of curb. Along with the proposed clarification, those dimensions should be included.

Mr. Hendershot responded that Engineering would work with the applicant to ensure those are designated appropriately on the future submittal.

Mr. Supelak stated that the possibility of finding five additional feet to allocate somewhere around the building could be very beneficial. It presents options that could resolve the issue with the public space location. That five feet might also better activate the restaurant, as the patio would be able to wrap around the corner to the front. He agrees with the comments about the main entry of the larger tenant space. Most of the massing is appropriate, but the sequencing of the entry and/or the corner needs to be improved. He believes there is opportunity to utilize the mullions to activate the horizontal element. A mezzanine quality on the SR161 façade could be nice, unless there is a grade issue that could impact handicapped accessibility. If some space is gained, opportunities arise for a long open space with seating and planters in front of the glass façade. He agrees that the opportunity to view color inside the building also could add interest. Because this large mass will be prominent, lighting could soften it. He likes the material palette and the imagery is good. He anticipates the details that will be added in the next phase will alleviate the concerns expressed by Commissioner Fishman. He would be supportive of waiving the 5-yard setback and deploying that square footage elsewhere in a more meaningful way.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is discomfort with attempting to write conditions for approval without appropriate study beforehand.

Mr. Boggs reiterated that if there were to be a development agreement with respect to this property, the Concept Plan would fall under City Council's authority to approve. Engineering will have to identify the right-of-way space needed. He would recommend tabling the case tonight to allow the needed study to occur.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the applicant would agree with that direction.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the Concept Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded to table the request for combination of the review and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan.

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

[Motion carried 6-0]

Mr. Supelak stated that the next two cases concern the same property and would be heard together.

4. Wright Way Corporate Park at 4420 Emerald Parkway, 21-101Z Rezoning

A request for the Rezoning of two parcels from Restricted Suburban Residential District to Suburban Office and Institutional District. The 9.01-acre site is northwest of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Riverside Drive.

5. Wright Way Corporate Park at 4420 Emerald Parkway, 21-102PP/21-103FP, Preliminary/Final Plat

A request for a subdivision of a +/- 7.35-acre lot to establish two open space reserves and one public right-of-way. The site is northwest of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Riverside Drive

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this is a request for rezoning of two parcels from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential to SO, Suburban Office and Institutional District and subdivision of a +/- 7.35-acre lot to establish two open space reserves and one public right-of-way. The 9.01-acre site is located northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Riverside Drive. The applicant is the City of Dublin Economic Development Department. The intent of the rezoning and platting applications is to create one developable lot for economic development purposes. The two lots on the south side of the acreage are the lots intended for rezoning. Ferris Wright Park extends north to Bright Road. The current zoning is R1, Restricted Suburban Residential. The rezoning request is for the 9.016 acres to be rezoned to SO, Standard Office and Institutional District for the Wright Way Corporate Park. The rezoning request conforms with both the Future Land Use Map and the Thoroughfare Plan, components of the Community Plan. The rezoning application meets the criteria for a Standard Zoning District, and staff recommends the Commission provide a recommendation of approval to City Council. In addition to the area intended for development, also created will be Reserve A, a landscape easement, a cul-de-sac right-of-way, and Reserve B for Ferris Wright Park. Reserve A located on the western portion of the site will preserve woods and steep slopes. There is a no disturb area to accommodate a stream that runs immediately off site. The lot intended for development is in the center of the site. A cul-de-sac right-of-way will be created for Wright Way. On the east side of the site is a landscape easement, which will create a slight buffer between the residential area to the east. All Preliminary and Final Plat criteria have been met, and staff recommends approval with one condition.

Commission Questions

Ms. Fox requested clarification of the site width. The GIS map on Dubscovery does not depict Reserve A as encompassing most of the woods and slope. She would like clarification of the area of Reserve A and its width from Riverside Drive to the lot line. She is having difficulty comprehending the extent of the woods, specifically, where the tree line starts and stops and if it is part of Reserve A.

Ms. Holt stated that on the drawing, there is a distinct line 1/5th the distance of the southern portion anticipated to be rezoned, which coincides with Reserve A. It is approximately 230 feet wide.

Ms. Fox stated that she measures the widest width at approximately 280 feet. Is that is at the tree line?

Mr. Hendershot stated that the dimensions shown on the Plat are correct. The 96 feet listed is the bearing for the tangent along the right-of-way. In the table on the top left of the plat, in the curve, a length is added to the 96 feet; therefore, the length of Reserve A is wider than 96 feet.

Ms. Fox stated that if that is at the tree line, she is satisfied.

Mr. Hendershot clarified the Reserve boundary on the plat.

Mr. Way stated that he would like to pose a larger question: does the City really need to put office space on this site? There is an existing park here, which contains an element of historical significance. There is a residential subdivision to the east and an elementary school. On Emerald Parkway to the east, there is a significant amount of land, which is already zoned for Office.

Ms. Rauch stated that it is currently zoned Residential but the Future Land Use map shows it as Office, as it does for this site, as well.

Mr. Way inquired what the zoning is of the property north of the stream.

Ms. Holt responded that the area is zoned R-1, and it is identified as Parks and Open Space in the Community Plan.

Mr. Way stated that this corner of Emerald Parkway and Riverside is very precious, and he is happy that it will be reserved and not built upon. The stream is an interesting open space connection that leads to the river, and there are many important environmental components. There is also the historic park and the parking for the park. The investment for that park was relatively recent. This small piece of 7 acres seems to have become an island. Is that precious 7 acres really needed for additional Office Space, or could we preserve the entire site as open space based on the historic nature of the Indian Mounds at Ferris Wright Park?

Applicant Presentation

Colleen Gilger, City Economic Development Director, stated that the City does need office space. When the City purchased the land, it also considered the Future Land Use Plan. We were aware of the Indian Mounds located north of the stream and knew that maintaining that stream was very important to City Council. There are several caves and falls within that area. When the City purchased the site further to the west, it was with the intent for an office site. As a reminder, the purpose of the construction of Emerald Parkway was to create an artery for future office development.

Mr. Way pointed out that there are also 1,000 acres available within the West Innovation District. This area is a precious part of the City along the river, a gateway at Emerald Parkway and Riverside Drive. He is aware that Emerald Parkway was constructed to open up the area for development, but given all that exists here, including the school, he would like to ask his fellow Commissioners if what is proposed is the right thing to do.

Mr. Fishman stated that although Emerald Parkway was constructed in anticipation of future office, due to the proximity of I-270, it was intended to have limited access. The access to the proposed office development cannot be from the park or Riverside Drive, so the only access will have to be from Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Gilger clarified that the development would share the park driveway; there would not be another curbcut. Creating another curbcut would require extensive blasting, due to the slope of the land, which would sacrifice too much of the acreage. Because of the limited acreage, nothing exceeding 50,000 square feet will fit on the site. The site will be marketed to small office users requiring 50,000 square feet or less. This is consistent with the Community Plan, which indicates small office development here.

Mr. Fishman noted that factors have changed since the Community Plan was adopted. He is happy, however, that no additional access would be created.

Ms. Fox inquired the anticipated height of the buildings.

Ms. Gilger stated that the buildings would be no more than two stories.

Ms. Fox inquired what percent of the site a 50,000 square foot building would encompass.

Ms. Holt responded that the maximum lot coverage is 70 percent, including parking.

Ms. Fox stated that Mr. Way has posed some very important points. If there were to be any development here, it would need to be extremely sensitive to the stream, which has historical significance. The Community Plan's Future Land Use Plan calls for all of the area to the north to be preserved as park and open space and not be developed. The Community Plan also provides for pedestrian connectivity from Riverside Drive along that stream bed, throughout this area and to the historic park. If this site were to be rezoned, it would be extremely important to understand that the sensitivity of the site must be preserved. Typically, visibility of commercial properties is anticipated. However, instead of this site being a focal point, it should be cradled within the surrounding beautiful landscape. The surroundings should remain the focal point.

Ms. Gilger responded that, interestingly, previous projects that had some interest in this site desired that their buildings be located further to the west, tucked more into the landscaping. Because this property is City-owned, it would be necessary to seek an economic development agreement from City Council before selling, transferring or incentivizing the land.

Mr. Fishman stated that when Emerald Parkway was developed, other than Cardinal Health, the intent was that there would not be accesses off the roadway. Buildings would be located back from the roadway, but would be tall ensuring visibility from I-270. The land was considered very valuable due to its proximity to I-270. Now, factors are different and this area is very sensitive. He believes further study is warranted before making a decision.

Ms. Gilger stated that it was anticipated that building heights would gradually increase from Riverside Drive to Bright Road and toward Sawmill Road. The Community Plan shows small, one to two-story office next to residential, and this site and the school are the only uses adjacent to the residential neighborhood. Buildings constructed east of the school will be taller.

Ms. Fox inquired if Suburban Office Institutional zoning permitted no height greater than two stories or if it was designated by the Community Plan for this area.

Ms. Gilger responded that it reflects the City's agreement with the surrounding neighborhood. A 3-story project was previously approved, to which the neighborhood objected. Consequently, a decision was made that any future development proposals would not exceed two stories.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the development would be a PUD.

Ms. Rauch responded that, as currently proposed, it would be a standard district. Staff has engaged the neighborhood in discussions regarding the City's plans.

Ms. Gilger noted that because it is a City-owned site, the City has discretion concerning the end user.

Mr. Boggs stated that, as previously noted, any economic development agreement, whether it be for sale or lease of the property, must be considered by City Council. In that circumstance, Council would act as the property owner and be able to impose restrictions. There would not be the same due process considerations inherent with the City's zoning authority.

Ms. Fox inquired if the Commission has concerns due to the sensitivity of this site, what would be the appropriate method to ensure Council was made aware of those concerns.

Mr. Boggs responded that this discussion will be reflected in the history that Council will be provided with the application. There is a Commission member who also sits on Council, who can relay those concerns. The Commission is a recommending body for rezonings. If the Commission were to put conditions on its recommendation, and Council were to disagree with those conditions or consider them to be too restrictive, per the City Charter, five votes of Council would be required to remove the condition recommended by the Commission. A super majority vote of Council could overturn a condition.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is unease on the Commission with this application. However, there are future steps in the process, wherein this unease either can be assuaged or it be prohibited from going forward. Provided the Commission can articulate its unease, he is not adverse to moving forward with the recommendation. That would be with the understanding that the Commission will have future opportunities to address the concerns, if desired.

Mr. Way stated that he will argue that there is a higher community purpose for this piece of land than what has been proposed today. He would like this to be discussed and explored before moving forward with this application. Due to the proximity of the Dublin Arts Council, perhaps the site might have an arts-related focus in addition to its historic nature.

Mr. Supelak responded that he believes this site has the potential to be something remarkable for the City, and Suburban Office may not be it. He is unsure how that plays into the Commission's consideration tonight.

Mr. Boggs stated that he would presume that the reason the City is requesting to rezone the site to Suburban Office at this point is to aid the City in marketing this property. Suburban Office may not necessarily be its final zoning, once a suitor is selected by the City. Would that be a fair assumption?

Ms. Gilger responded that would be a fair assumption, although this use is considered the best fit.

Mr. Boggs stated that it is also entirely possible that, in addition to an economic development agreement, which could attach some conditions and which would be considered by City Council, the eventual user of this property could request a PUD approval from the Commission.

Ms. Gilger responded that is possible, also.

Mr. Boggs stated that the point is that this is not the last word on how this site will be used; it is the first step.

Mr. Way stated that if, however, the site were left in its current zoning, the Commission could receive a future application proposing a use other than Suburban Office.

Mr. Boggs responded that its current zoning is Residential; the Future Land Use Plan identifies it as Suburban Office. Other than re-opening the conversation concerning the Future Land Use for this site, which the Commission might be suggesting, the reason City administration has submitted this application is that they believed the use had already been determined.

Mr. Way responded that the reason for his suggestion that the Commission discuss the potential use of this area further is that he believes the Future Land Use map for this site might be incorrect and should be reconsidered.

Mr. Schneier stated that he has a process question. The City purchased this land and determined what the highest and best use would be for the City, no doubt with Economic Development's input. It is not necessarily the intent that the Commission rubberstamp that, but if we substitute our judgment, would it be possible for the City to request a zoning appeal, and ultimately take it to City Council? The end result could be the same because, presumably, this is what City Council wants.

Mr. Boggs responded that property rezonings and plat approvals are legislative decisions with the final decisions made by City Council. The Commission is a recommending body with respect to both rezonings and plats.

Mr. Schneier stated that in the end, this is not the Commission's decision; we provide only a recommendation. In view of that, he would favor making a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Fox stated that she would like to re-assure the Commissioners of an important point. The Planning and Zoning Commission is the citizens' commission, and provides the citizens' opinions as to what they would like to see developed. They recommend their opinions to City Council. If the Commission disagrees or agrees with a proposal, City Council considers that. They should not focus on Council's ultimate

decision. If the Commission does not express its opinion, Council would not be aware of it. The Commission does not serve as a rubber stamp. As representatives of the residents, their opinions make a difference. Their opinion may differ, but it is important for Council to hear the Commission's honest opinion.

Public Comment

Linda Paulsen, 4158 Bright Road, Dublin, OH, stated that she and her husband recently moved from Houston to Dublin, and are happy with that decision. She did not anticipate the late hour of this meeting, but she has learned a great deal in the process. One of the most significant things she has learned is that this Commission is very thorough and considers every detail. She is hopeful that they also look at the issue of greenspace with the same level of detail. It is easy to look at business and tax revenue as progress. It is, and she has no objection to business. She does not yet know Dublin as well as the Commission. Perhaps the City goes need more business space, but she would ask the Commission to consider very carefully what she heard Mr. Way, Ms. Fox and others say – that this parcel is very special. She requests that not only because she lives nearby, but because this site is special to the Dublin. She would urge the Commissioners to do as Ms. Fox encouraged -- give your voice to City Council. Let them know that this is a very special greenspace, and that there is ample space elsewhere for more business. It does not appear that this site offers much space for business, anyway. If you are familiar with this site at all, you are aware that the parking lot at Ferris Wright Park is very small, accommodating only 20 vehicles. If the City adds a business in there, people from that business will be using this parking lot, particularly if the access to the business is through the parking lot. She agrees that the best use of this land is not business. It provides a wonderful, beautiful greenspace for Dublin, and she requests the City to preserve it as such.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the approval of the plats is contingent upon the approval of the rezoning.

Mr. Boggs responded that the approval of the plats does not necessarily hinge upon the recommendation of approval for the rezoning.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded a recommendation of approval of the rezoning.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, no; Ms. Fox abstained, noting that this vote should be an opinion of the citizens, and she will have a final vote on the application.

[Motion failed 2-3 with 1 abstention.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded a recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Plat with one condition:

- 1) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Way, no; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Fox abstained.

[Motion passed 3-2 with 1 abstention.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded a recommendation of approval of the Final Plat with one condition:

- 1) The applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plat prior to submission for acceptance to City Council.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, no; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox abstained.

[Motion passed 3-2 with 1 abstention.]

Mr. Grimes noted that the current time is past 10:30 p.m. Does the Commission proceed with case reviews?

Mr. Boggs responded that, according to the Planning and Zoning Commission Rules of Order, no new items are to be heard after 10:30 pm. However, that rule can be waived by an affirmative vote of 5 to suspend the rules.

Consensus of the Commission was not to waive the rules. The additional case will be rescheduled to a future agenda.

OTHER ACTIONS

- Ms. Martin noted the need to schedule an additional meeting in November to accommodate the case load. Commission members were requested to consider the date of Tuesday, November 16, 2021.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded a motion to schedule a Special Meeting for Tuesday, November 16, at 6:30 p.m.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion passed 6-0.]

- Ms. Martin noted that there is a need to reschedule the Thursday, December 9 regular PZC meeting due to a special City event occurring on that date.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded a motion to re-schedule the Thursday, December 9 regular PZC meeting to Wednesday, December 8, at 6:30 p.m.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion passed 6-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Martin stated that the developer of the northeast corner of Bright Road/Emerald Parkway site has requested a Commission site review preceding the November 4 consideration of a revised Concept Plan for senior housing. This site has a number of natural features and is significantly wooded. Per the Commission's Rules of Order permitting a 24-hour Special Meeting notice, staff will contact Commissioners via email with an a proposed date within the upcoming week. The previous Concept Plan considered by the Commission in 2020 has been emailed to Commissioners to facilitate their site review. Although the revised Concept Plan for the November 4 meeting is not yet finalized, they anticipate providing it early next week. Printed copies will be provided to the members to have in hand when they tour the site.
- The next regular PZC meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, October 14, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Mark Supelak

Vice Chair

Judith Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council