

# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 16, 2021

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November 16, 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

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman

Commissioners excused: Leo Grimes, Jane Fox

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Chase Ridge, Zachary Hounshell, Michael Hendershot, Heidi Rose

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

### APPROVAL 2022-2023 MEETING DATES

Ms. Call noted that the proposed July meeting date is July 7, 2022 and inquired if Commission members were aware of any schedule conflicts they might have with the proposed meeting dates. The Commission can periodically modify meeting dates, if necessary.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the proposed 2022-2023 Commission meeting dates.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. There are two cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. Case 2 – Towns on the Parkway

Terraces, and Case 3 – Jerome High School Classroom. She inquired if any Commission member requests to have one of the cases moved to the regular agenda for discussion purposes. [No member requested that a Consent Case be moved to the regular agenda.]

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **2. Towns on the Parkway at PID: 273-008811, Amended Final Development Plan, 21-160AFDP**

Amendment to permit terraces on select front-facing, end units for a recently approved attached, single-family development. The 11.61-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

### **3. Jerome High School at 8320 Hyland-Croy Road, Amended Final Development Plan, 21-162AFDP**

Allowance for a ±11,550-square-foot modular classroom building. The 88.17-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District and is located northeast of the roundabout of Hyland-Croy Road and Brand Road.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Agenda cases.

Vote: Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Ms. Call swore in those individuals intending to give testimony at the meeting.

## **NEW CASES**

### **1. Three Metro Center at PID: 273-010449, Informal Review, 21-156INF**

Informal review and feedback for construction of two, four-story, multi-family buildings that are cumulatively 258,000 square feet in size consisting of 265 units, amenity spaces, and associated site improvements. The 12.75-acre site is zoned Office, Laboratory and Research District and Planned Unit Development District. The site is southwest of Metro Place South ±2,400 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an Informal Review and nonbinding feedback on a proposal to construct two, four-story, multi-family buildings on a 12.5-acre site located on Metro Place South. The northern portion of the site is heavily wooded and sparse vegetation exists on the southern portion. Cosgray Creek runs along the southern property line, and I-270 is located immediately to the west. The site encompasses two zoning districts: Office, Laboratory and Research District and the Waterford Village Planned Unit Development District. The entirety of the site is within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP), which calls for a mix of uses, including Residential, up to 30 dwelling units/acre. Additionally, it promotes walkability and increased amenities and vibrancy outside of typical office hours. This particular site is identified as Site 7 in the DCAP Plan, which calls for four to eight-story buildings as well as higher density, multifamily and hospitality uses. The site is surrounded by office buildings and, to the north, hospitality uses. The buildings within that area

range from four to nine stories in height and are typically constructed of glass, stone and concrete. There is a significant amount of surface parking immediately adjacent to the site.

The proposal is for construction of two, four-story buildings: Building A (159,084 square feet) and Building B (98,775 square feet) containing 265 dwelling units (1, 2, and 3-bedroom units), a centrally located courtyard, a pool, 387 parking spaces, and public open space on the southern third of the site. Access will be retained from Metro Place South. Conceptual architecture has been provided for the Commission's consideration. The four-story buildings will have a fifth floor amenity space on select corners. The buildings will be contemporary in design, utilizing dark, earth-tone colors, with a number of balconies on each elevation. The first-floor amenities include a lobby, fitness center and lounge area. Conceptual materials include a charcoal color fiber cement panel and Nichiha vintage wood cement panel. The DCAP recommends high quality materials, including but not limited to brick, stone, glass, metal, concrete and wood. Inspirational images of the open space and courtyard area were provided in the meeting packet. The following questions are provided for discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use based on the Community Plan and surrounding context?
- 2) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support the conceptual site layout including building, parking, and open space locations?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual mass, scale and height of the building?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed architectural character and building materials?

### **Applicant Presentation**

Lori Bongiorno, Director of Mixed Use, M+A Architects, 775 Yard Street, Columbus, Ohio 43212, stated that due to the long entry drive into the site, the overall site design is that of a secret garden that is connected to the leisure trails and outdoor space. The creek will be made a feature surrounded by various amenities, including a dog park and pickle ball court.

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Schneier inquired how the public would access the greenspace.

Ms. Bongiorno responded that there would be a walk from the drive to that area. Connections to the trails may be provided in a potential second phase.

Mr. Schneier noted that the area is not known for its walkability. A line on the site plan apparently denotes the pedestrian access, and presumably, people could also drive to that point. Will public parking be provided there?

Ms. Bongiorno responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired if there were any limitations to developing the site to the south.

Ms. Bongiorno responded that she is aware of none.

Mr. Way inquired the reason that more of the available site was not used.

Ms. Bongiorno responded that area contains Cosgray Creek, a power line easement, and area for stormwater retention and a dog park.

Mr. Way stated that there is opportunity on the site for 380 units, but only 265 units are proposed. They appear to be leaving opportunity for further density/intensity to be added to the site.

Ms. Bongiorno responded that their intent is to develop only 265 units at this time and preserve the open space.

Mr. Ridge stated that there is also floodplain associated with Cosgray Creek, which limits the building area somewhat. It is not a significant area and was not designated on the site plan.

### **Commission Discussion**

Ms. Call requested Commission members to comment on the discussion questions, which include:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use based on the Community Plan and surrounding context?
- 2) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support the conceptual site layout including building, parking, and open space locations?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual mass, scale and height of the building?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed architectural character and building materials?

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of residential use in the Metro Center area but is not sure this is the correct place for residential at this time. It seems to be an island, not connected to any other residential areas. Along the entire I-270 frontage from Tuttle Crossing to Sawmill Road, there is no other residential development. This portion of Dublin has a strong emphasis on commercial, hotel and office uses. Introducing residential development here is inconsistent. However, if there were a larger emphasis of residential in Metro Center, this would be consistent with that larger plan, which he would support. If there is a Phase 2 to this development, it could influence his view. However, a solitary island of residential development does not fit with the surrounding area. A hotel or offices would be more consistent with what exists in Metro Center. The DCAP indicates that Office Use is the preferred use. Concerning the conceptual layout -- he believes there is opportunity for more density and intensity on the site. The additional questions regarding architectural character and massing are secondary, as he does not believe this is the right use for the site.

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a challenging site tucked back in the corner. Essentially, he agrees with Mr. Way. In general, residential development is good, but it must be done carefully. There are some good ideas for the site design, including the secret garden; however, it does not connect to the existing fabric of the area. Density and intensity could affect how the site is laid out, as well as the mass, scale and height of the buildings. Any residential development near I-270 would need to be done with sensitivity. He is supportive of residential use here, but not with the proposed plan. Increasing its density and intensity would make the development more in context with its setting.

Mr. Fishman stated that he does not believe residential use is appropriate along I-270. As previous meeting minutes reflect, the intended uses are Office, Laboratory and Research. Typically, people do not want to live in areas that back up to a freeway. He is also concerned about the entry through Metro Center. As indicated in the meeting materials, the proposed multifamily is estimated to have 2.5 parking spaces per unit. If this development is approved, these will not be the only units developed there; there will be a subsequent phase, which will result in the need for many vehicles to access the site. The conceptual architecture has a commercial appearance. The units are clad in fiber cement board, and do not reflect the Dublin character. In summary, he does not believe this is the proper use for this area.

Mr. Schneier stated that the Commission has expressed the desire for mixed use, greenspace and density, but at some point, those become mutually exclusive. He is supportive of the proposed residential use here. He had an office in Metro Center for many years and would rather see some

residential here than another office building. It would provide more interest in the community. There is a form of residential here – hotels, so not everything in Metro Center is office. Although he is supportive of adding a residential use, this is a difficult site to develop. The applicant has made a good attempt at that. The proposed height is less than the Metro V building, in which he had an office. He would support a residential use in this area. Whether we prefer to have a large portion of open space or density in this area needs to be addressed.

Ms. Call stated that she concurs with Mr. Supelak's comments. There could be a Phase 2, which would add more units. She believes that it should be possible for staff and the applicant to work together and arrive at a satisfactory plan for the applicant and the City. If the units were to be consolidated into a single building, it could allow for future expansion, consolidation of the open space, and the secret garden focus. She could be supportive of a residential use here, but the Commission would look at it critically, understanding that it is surrounded by Class A office space. That character must be retained, as it is the long-range plan of an anticipated Metro Place redevelopment. There is opportunity with the proposed massing. The Commission would review the architectural character in detail. She would recommend that the applicant pay careful consideration to Code-approved primary and secondary materials. She inquired if additional direction is sought from the Commission at this time.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Commission's input is helpful. The DCAP land use provisions include an opportunity for residential use on that site, and careful consideration will be given as to how that might be best achieved. It might need to be included holistically in a larger plan. Should the project move forward, a Preliminary Development Plan would be the next step.

Jim Russell, Ex. Vice President, Pizutti Companies, 629 N. High Street, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that he appreciates the Commission's comments. He would like to provide additional background on this site. They agree with the Commission's recommendation for greater density, but there are some site challenges to the south, including power lines. They are under contract, however, for purchase of the Ashland property to the south. They anticipate presenting future concepts that will show connectivity, additional units and another access at Blazer Parkway. He has been with the Pizutti Company 24 years; they have owned this property longer than that and have been trying to market it as office for many years in partnership with the City of Dublin. During that timeframe, both the City and what is desired in developments has changed. People want to live closer to their work and take advantage of all the qualities incorporated into Metro Center. Those qualities, including the greenspace, make it a desirable area for residential. They constructed three of the office buildings in Metro Place, but their current intent is to create a mix of uses, which will provide the City an alternative to Bridge Park. They recognize the factors that the Commission has pointed out and have been working on ways to keep what is desired, including the greenspace and connectivity, and soften the views. They are excited about the opportunity to make something happen on this site, as vacant property is not beneficial for them or the City.

Mr. Way stated the City's vision plan is looking at options for Metro Center. It would be good to include mixed-use in that future thinking.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Rauch stated that no public comments were received on this case.

Mr. Russell indicated that they would work with staff on incorporating the Commission's comments into a revised plan. No additional input is sought.

Ms. Call stated that the next two cases would be heard together.

**4. Ayrshire Farms at PID: 274-012321, Final Development Plan, 21-114FDP**

Development of a 30-lot, single-family subdivision with 2.43 acres of open space and associated site improvements. The 11.37-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Ayrshire Farms and is located southeast of the intersection of Shier Rings Road with Cosgray Road.

**5. Ayrshire Farms at PID: 274-012321, Final Plat, 21-115FP**

Subdivision of an 11.37-acre parcel to establish 30 single-family lots, three open space reserves, and three public rights-of-way. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Ayrshire Farms and is located southeast of the intersection of Shier Rings Road with Cosgray Road.

**Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of the Final Development Plan and Final Plat for Ayrshire Farms. In March 2021, City Council reviewed and approved a Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Preliminary Plat application to rezone 11.37 acres Planned Unit Development (PUD) District – Ayrshire Farms for the development of 30 single-family lots, 2.62 acres of open space, and three public rights-of-way. The site is currently vacant. The request is for approval of multiple minor text modifications, and approval of the Final Development Plan and a recommendation for Final Plat approval to City Council. With Council's approval of the Preliminary Development Plan, they requested a number of updates to the development text. The Minor Text Modifications provide the clarification requested by Council. The site plan provided is for a 3.33-acre site, consistent with one of the Text Modifications. The revised density is 2.65 dwelling units/acre. Additionally, there are 2.39 acres of open space split between the three reserve areas. The modifications in acreage, density and reserve sizes are the result of additional right-of-way dedication, which is required along Shier Rings Road. It reflects no changes in the site plan; the lots and open space do not change. He reviewed the requested Minor Text Modifications. Staff recommends approval of the 14 Minor Text modifications, as they do not significantly alter the Preliminary Development Plan or rezoning, but provide only needed clarifications. Staff also recommends approval of the Final Development Plan with four conditions and a recommendation for Council approval of the Final Plat with two conditions.

**Applicant Presentation**

Michael King, 5884 Dunheath Loop, Dublin, OH, stated that he is the managing partner of MC Shier Rings, LLC. With him tonight are Joel Perry, Project Manager, American Structurepoint, and Gordon Berkebile, Landscape Architect, POD Design. He would like to thank staff, the Commission and Council for all their input over the past two years. They have invested much work, made many changes, and the result is a very nice product for the City of Dublin. This boutique development will be an addition to his community; he lives approximately .25 mile from this site within the Ballantrae community. He requests the Commission's final approval of the project.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Schneier inquired if the cluster mailboxes in Reserve C would serve all the proposed homes. Mr. King responded that the U.S. Postal Services requires CBUs for all current and future new projects. The Postal Service will have only one delivery point, although more than one would be provided in a larger development.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the expectation is that there will be no vehicle queue at the mailboxes. Mr. King responded that this is an ongoing issue for all new developments throughout the nation. Typically, the CBUs are located within an open area to minimize potential issues.

### **Public Comment**

Ken Porter, 7090 Larne Drive, Dublin, OH 43016:

"We live in the last house west in Ballantrae. Tree number 7783 is on the corner of the new development and our back yard. If it had been in our yard, we would have had it removed some time ago. It is in very poor condition. We pick up numerous branches after every storm. Also, we would request that if the development is not going to get started this fall that someone please mow/bush hog the lot as it is a home for coyotes and other animals. We hear them just about every night. Thank you. We look forward to new neighbors."

### **Commission Questions**

Ms. Call stated that specific reference was made to Lots 23-30 having outdoor amenity space as part of the development plan. What is the reasoning?

Mr. Hounshell stated that Lots 23-30 are the smallest lots. There are additional provisions that allow 10 feet of encroachment into the rear yard setback for those lots. This provision was made to ensure that the homebuyers are aware of the space they will have and alleviate any future problems. They would be designing these patios with the development of the homes. Lots 1-22 have more space. There is a provision in the development text that the homebuyers be provided information regarding the amount of existing development space to the rear of their homes.

Ms. Call requested additional clarification regarding the available space for Lot 23 and Lot 10.

Mr. Hounshell responded that his understanding is that the footprints provided will be the final footprints for the lots. The Zoning Code permits an additional five feet for at-grade patios, although the exhibit does not reflect that. None of the lots will provide less than 350 square feet for patios.

Ms. Call requested clarification of the statement in the Planning Report regarding the removal of brick.

Ms. Hounshell responded that is a result of City Council discussion regarding the materials. They requested that brick be removed as a permitted material.

Ms. Call inquired if Engineering had any concerns about adequate turnaround space for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hendershot responded they have worked with the Washington Township Fire Department. An auto turn exhibit depicting the apparatus movements was provided in the meeting packet. They have no concerns with the proposed geometry.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Schneier stated that he has no concerns with the proposed changes and staff recommendations. Mr. Fishman inquired if the driveways would be concrete, brick or blacktop.

Mr. Boggs responded that the development text states that "Driveways shall meet all Dublin design standards and shall be constructed of concrete, stamped concrete or pavers. Asphalt is a prohibited material."

Mr. Fishman stated that he had no objections to the proposed Final Development Plan.

Mr. Supelak stated that, in general, he has no objections. He will advocate for the greenspace and placemaking on the site. Opportunity remains for some improvements, including some activities, such as a bocce ball court or a firepit.

Mr. Way stated that he is pleased with the project, a great result of the City and the developer working together on the plan. Placemaking is difficult with this site, as it is more vehicular oriented. However, there is opportunity for the homeowner association to build something around the small pavilion. This is a good project.

Ms. Call stated that as noted previously, there is the need to be mindful of a potential issue with headlight intrusion on Lot 10. Overall, this is a great project, which we welcome to the City. The positive comments received from the adjacent neighbors are indicative of the quality of the proposed project.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following 14 Minor Text Modifications:

- 1) Development text section (I)(A), Density
- 2) Development text section (I)(C)(1), Open Space Reserves Table
- 3) Development text section (I)(C)(2), Summary of Reserve Maintenance Acreage
- 4) Development text section (I)(C)(5), Reserve A
- 5) Development text section (I)(C)(6), Reserve B
- 6) Development text section (I)(C)(7), Reserve C
- 7) Development text section (II), Development Standards
- 8) Development text section (II)(C)(1), Setbacks
- 9) Development text section (II)(C)(2), Setbacks
- 10) Development text section (II)(D), Lot Width
- 11) Development text section (II)(F)(1), Traffic, Access, and Pedestrian Connectivity
- 12) Development text section (II)(G)(3)(b)(6), Exterior Materials
- 13) Development text section (II)(G)(3)(e), Garages
- 14) Development text section (II)(G)(3)(i)(3), Patios

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff to identify right-of-way needs to accommodate the Shier Rings Road widening associated with the westbound left turn lane as well as to identify the appropriate conveyance mechanism for any needed right-of-way prior submittal of the Final Plat to City Council;



- 3) The applicant reserve half of the trees not being replaced on the site to be planted during development to enhance landscape buffers and screening in coordination with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector; and,
- 4) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the landscape plan around the retention basins, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Final Plat with two conditions:


- 1) The applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) The applicant work with staff to provide additional right-of-way along Shier Rings Road in coordination with the Final Development Plan and update the plat prior to City Council submittal.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.  
[Motion approved 5-0.]

## COMMUNICATIONS

- The next PZC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 8, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Clerk of Council