

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 17, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 17, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome, both from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. Remote viewers could submit questions or comments during the meeting by using the form under the streaming video at the website. Their comments would be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City is interested in accommodating 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, Leo Grimes

Commissioners excused: Warren Fishman

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nicole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Zak Hounshell, Taylor Mullinax, J.M. Rayburn, Michael Hendershot.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the January 6 and January 20 meeting minutes and acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, 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. She stated that there is one case eligible for the Consent Agenda, DCRC Mobility Hub, 22-014AFDP. She inquired if any Commissioner member would like to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion.

Mr. Schneier stated that he does not necessarily want to move it to the regular agenda, but he would like to make a comment regarding the proposed chalkboard. He would suggest that a chalkboard is not the correct communication device. Perhaps a more permanent method, less susceptible to defacement, could be identified.

Mr. Way requested that the case be moved from the Consent Agenda to the regular agenda.
Ms. Call responded that the case would be included on the regular agenda.

Ms. Call swore in those present who planned to testify on any of the agenda cases.

4. DCRC Mobility Hub at 5600 Post Road, 22-014AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for the construction of a mobility hub at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. The 57.81-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Coffman Park and is located north of the intersection of Post Road with Coffman Park Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this a request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan with a Minor Text Modification for a proposed Mobility Hub located at the Dublin Community Recreations Center. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Coffman Park. The project area is located adjacent to the Dublin Senior Lounge in the Recreation Center. Since 1995, there have been multiple Amended Final Development Plans for modifications the site, including a Dublin Community Recreation Center expansion and addition of the bocce ball courts, which are anticipated to become an outdoor space for group activity. The Commission provided Informal Review feedback on the proposed Mobility Hub on December 8, 2021. The proposed Mobility Hub is 1,858 square feet, including three canopies, one over a seating area; one over bicycle parking; and another over a CoGo station. The hub will also include a variety of seating, a bicycle repair station, mobility kiosk and new landscaping. A Minor Text Modification is required for the kiosk to permit a digital, changeable copy sign. [Rendering shown of the proposed project.] Seating options include picnic tables and benches. Canopy colors and materials include wood cladding and gray steel framing. The colors of items in the hub will be gray or other muted colors, with the exception of a green picnic table. The application has been reviewed against applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval of the Minor Text Modification and of the Amended Final Development Plan with six conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way stated that the proposed shelters are facing north and therefore, would be subject to wind and rain intrusion. Was consideration given for creating a refuge from the elements within the pedestrian shelter?

Ms. Mullinax responded that the glass partitions included with the main mobility hub would provide some protection; however, if desired, staff could work with the applicant to consider a different orientation.

Mr. Way stated that these shelters will be used all year, and the proposed level of protection seems insufficient. The renderings provided portray the bicycles as not actually being covered by a canopy. He requested confirmation that the bicycles would be covered by the canopy.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired about the location of the ADA ramp. As proposed, it will be located in the center of the circulation area. Although this location may provide a direct route for passenger pickup, the

ramp will be uneven and disruptive to the sidewalk. He would encourage consideration be given to locating the ramp further to the west.

Ms. Mullinax responded that the intent of the design was to place it in the closest proximity to the seating, providing ease of access to those in need.

Applicant Presentation

Justin Robbins, HDR Engineering, 428 W. College Street, Granville, OH 43023, stated that the location of the ADA curb ramp could not be moved to the right, due to the speed hump in the middle of the road. The proposed location is the closest connection for the pedestrian shelter. They explored other options, including a larger curb ramp, but the amount of concrete and roadway involved would be prohibitive. They were attempting to minimize the overall impact on the site.

Mr. Way stated that he could understand the reasoning. His concern is that the four bollards and ramp will be a barrier to the existing through movement between the Recreation Center and the park.

Mr. Robbins stated that there is insufficient space in which to fit a curb ramp that would meet all the requirements, both in terms of the cross movement and the desired grade to the street. After considering several options, the proposed ramp was the best balance between cost, proximity and disruptions. However, he understands the concern, and they will take an additional look at the site to determine if there might be another location less intrusive to the pedestrian flow.

Mr. Way stated that the Dublin Connector would be using this ramp. How does that vehicle accommodate wheelchair access?

J.M. Rayburn, staff planner, responded that the shuttle has an ADA wheelchair ramp that lowers to allow wheelchair access, and the desire is that the vehicle ramp be accessed from the road level, not the curb.

Mr. Way stated that while he understands the reasoning, because locating the ramp to the side of the shelter would be less disruptive, he encourages them to look into that possibility.

Ms. Call referred to Mr. Schneier's earlier question about the chalkboard -- what is the purpose and intent of the chalkboard?

Ms. Mullinax stated that the intent of the chalkboard was to provide an interactive, placemaking element; however, if the Commission would prefer, staff and the consultant could consider other options.

Ms. Call inquired what content was envisioned for the chalkboard.

Mr. Rayburn responded that the intent was to provide an opportunity for public engagement. This could be a flexible space. Informational options could be considered as an alternative.

Mr. Schneier responded that a chalkboard would not seem to be the most appropriate option, and would appreciate further consideration on the option to be used.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Ms. Call noted that it was not made a condition for approval, but a request was made for further consideration by staff and the consultant regarding the bollards and ADA ramp. With the inclusion of the chalkboard replacement, there are now six conditions for AFDP approval.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) with the following six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with staff on all canopy lighting to meet the flush mounting requirement or the lighting be positioned behind the purlins to minimize glare, subject to staff review and approval;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with staff on finalizing all three canopy locations and the relocation of the existing utilities within the disturbed area to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize all plant species and submit a finalized landscape plan, subject to staff review and approval;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff to finalize all mobility hub sign-like features regarding design and colors;
- 5) That the applicant and consultant apply for Building Permits and Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards prior to construction.
- 6) That the chalkboard be eliminated and replaced with a suitable alternative, subject to staff approval.

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

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the following Minor Text Modification: Modification of the Development Text of the Coffman Park Master Development Plan; Subsection Coffman Park Master Plan Elements: Community Recreation Center Element to permit one digital changeable copy sign for the Dublin Community Recreation Center Mobility Hub as follows:

- 1) That the sign be located on the property to which it refers;
- 2) The sign is not visible from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties; and
- 3) The sign does not exceed 8 square feet in size.

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

INFORMAL REVIEW

1. Nutex Micro-Hospital, at 3800 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 22-016INF, Informal Review

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the construction of a two-story emergency hospital on a 1.58-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that the Informal Review is not a required step in the development review process, but it gives the applicant an opportunity to receive non-binding feedback on the use, site layout, architecture and sign design. Should the applicant decide to move forward with the proposed project, the Concept Plan would be the next step in the process. The site is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. The entire Fifth Third site is 6.7 acres. It includes a 30,000 square foot office building and parking lot. In October 2021, City Council approved a Final

Plat for the site, which created two separate lots, one containing the existing office building, and also an additional lot. Although approved, the Final Plat has not yet been recorded. The proposed development the Commission is reviewing tonight would be located on this future parcel. The Sawmill Center Neighborhood is one of the few neighborhoods within the Bridge Street District that has its own set of requirements. Some of the conditions for this District include: encouraging active, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development, and encouraging interconnected site layouts for pedestrian access. The neighborhood map indicates areas where a shopping corridor is considered and where specific building types are permitted, as well as potential gateway locations. This site would be considered a potential gateway location. Gateway locations are points of identification and introduction to a specific area of the City. The identification can be achieved by architecture, landscape, or public open spaces. The adjacent Chase Bank development on Banker Drive also was responsible for providing a gateway feature. The site is located at the intersection of West Dublin Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive, both of which are considered principal frontage streets. West Dublin Granville Road is a corridor connector, and Dublin Center Drive is a district connector. Banker Drive to the north is an established neighborhood street. Principal frontage streets require the most emphasis within the District. When there are two principal frontage streets located adjacent to a site, the higher designated street would require more emphasis. In this case, that would be Dublin Granville Road, because it a corridor connector.

Proposal:

The applicant is requesting Informal Review of their use, architecture, conceptual signage and site layout. The applicant is proposing a micro emergency hospital, which would fall within the hospital designation within the BSD, which is considered a Conditional Use in this zoning. There is one use-specific standard regarding the gross floor area, but this proposal would not exceed that standard. Future approval of the Conditional Use with the Preliminary Development Plan will be necessary. The use is intended to be a 24/7 inpatient and emergency operation. The facility would include a number of private beds, treatment rooms, imaging rooms and a central pharmacy. The 22,000-square-foot building would be partially two-story and partially one story. Site access would be from Banker Drive leading to a 53-space surface parking lot extending along the rear of the property. There will be a parking wing between the building and Banker Drive. The site includes three potential open space areas, two south and southeast of the building and one near the intersection of Banker Drive and Dublin Center Drive. The gateway opportunity would be located at the southeast corner of the site and building. The applicant has proposed the Loft Building type. This building type has a required build zone; a 75% front property line coverage along both road frontages; and a minimum of two stories along the street frontage. Many of these items would receive more thorough review in the Concept Plan stage. Waivers may be required. Conceptual architecture has been shown. The south elevation would be on West Dublin Granville Road, the most emphasized elevation. The primary building materials would be stone and brick; the secondary material will be cementitious panels. There would also be aluminum store front windows and a metal canopy on the east elevation. [conceptual massing shown.] Three wall signs and a potential monument sign at the site entrance are proposed. A Master Sign Plan will be required.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Commission conceptually support a Conditional Use for a Hospital use?
- 2) Is the building siting appropriate given that W. Dublin-Granville Road is the highest priority street from a Planning and Engineering perspective?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed parking lot layout?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual massing and building materials?

- 5) Would the Board support the conceptual height, size, and design of the signage for the site?

Applicant Presentation

John Mills, Architect, JTM Architects, Denver, Colorado, stated that staff provided an excellent presentation. He would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Commission Questions

Mr. Grimes inquired what impact the parking would have on the use of the adjoining property. Is the proposed parking appropriate with the adjoining bank property?

Mr. Hounshell responded that it is his understanding that the bank currently has more parking than was permitted within the Bridge Street District. Therefore, the parking wing on the west side of that lot would be stubbed off. The parking for the bank and the proposed site would be separate. The loss of those parking spaces would not impact the bank use.

Mr. Way stated that when this property was subdivided, there was an issue of a cross lot easement, but this proposal is not using a cross lot easement. What is the status on that item? The packet information reflects that stormwater management would be provided on this site. Is that intended to be provided underground, and would it support this site only or the bank site, as well?

Mr. Hendershot stated that stormwater management must be separate for each parcel, so the proposed development would need to provide their own stormwater management on this site. The existing stormwater management on the site to the east would be maintained.

Mr. Way stated that the cross lot easement was mentioned in the materials. Was that granted, and was it considered with the proposed site layout?

Mr. Mills responded that the cross access was considered, and several potential layouts with that access were considered. However, staff's feedback was, per discussions with the property owner, that option no longer was possible. Consequently, it has been eliminated from their layout; only a single access remains.

Ms. Rauch responded that the approved plat was not recorded, due to some concerns of the property owner regarding safety and cut-throughs. Staff, the property owner and the applicant discussed the concerns and determined a configuration that would limit access on Dublin Center Drive and SR 161, moving all the access to Banker Drive, so that the parcels operate independently. The potential for cross access could be re-visited, should the Fifth Third Bank site be redeveloped in the future.

Mr. Schneier inquired about the emergency vehicle access for this emergency hospital. Although there is a dock for an ambulance, the staff memo indicates the ambulance would be used infrequently, only for an occasional transport. Would it be used to transport patients to or from the hospital?

Mr. Mills responded that this would be a community hospital. It will not be part of the EMS network. Incoming patients would be transported to existing providers. The ambulance dock would be used only for transporting a stabilized patient to another facility for a higher level of care.

Mr. Schneier inquired if, although it is described as an emergency hospital, patients would arrive by private vehicle.

Mr. Mills responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier inquired what would be the highest/best use for this site, which has SR161 frontage. Because this is considered as a secondary, Conditional Use, what is considered the best use?

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff would be looking for a use that is aligned with the Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. That would be a development promoting pedestrian connections throughout the area, not just along the street, but through the site. It is difficult to state a preferred use, as the list of Permitted Uses is extensive. The ideal use would align with the Code requirements.

Ms. Call recited Code Section 153.058, Section 5: "This District applies to the majority of the commercial area located in the east of the District. The standards of the BSD, Sawmill Center Neighborhood create an active, walkable destination through integration of a strong mix of uses. Development within this District relies on the provision of physical and visual connections....and creates a walkable, mixed-use core as the east anchor of the District."

Mr. Schneier responded that it would appear that the primary concern is not the use, per se, but the fact that the use is not pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the purpose of this Informal Review is to acquire the Commission's thoughts concerning the use. However, should the proposal move forward, the application would need to meet the standards of the Neighborhood District and for the Conditional Use, as well. The review will concern whether the use is consistent with the existing uses and the intent of the District.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the proposed signage and the Sign Code requirements.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the proposed signage could change. The Code permits a single tenant building to have a wall sign on each street frontage, up to a maximum of 50 square feet per wall sign. The signage must be on the first story of the building. The square footage is based on the linear square footage of an elevation. To meet the Code requirements, some changes would be required.

Mr. Supelak inquired the scale of these signs.

Mr. Mills responded that on the west elevation, the proposed wall sign would exceed the 50-square-foot maximum. It is important for people in need of emergency treatment to be able to identify the building easily. The wall signs are important, but can be scaled to whatever size the City requires.

Mr. Way stated that he is confused regarding the type of facility that is proposed. It is described both as an emergency hospital, but also as a community hospital. No patients would arrive by ambulance, however.

Mr. Mills responded that there are different magnitudes of emergency needs. This will not be a trauma center. Non-life threatening injuries and respiratory and heart issues would be handled here, ensuring that the patient is stabilized.

Mr. Way inquired who would make the decision regarding the type of emergency facility needed.

Mr. Mills responded the physician would make that determination. Because beds are included, there is ability to monitor a patient longer than the typical 23-hour stay. A patient can stay for several days, if necessary.

Mike Borland, 4318 Lyon Drive, Upper Arlington, 43220, stated that he is part of the operating group of Nutex Hospital.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the role of the proposed facility. It is identified as an emergency hospital. Does that differ from a regular emergency room?

Mr. Borland responded that it is technically an emergency hospital. It will be staffed by Board-certified emergency physicians. The facility has all the technical capabilities of a typical emergency department, including diagnostic and imaging services. The facility will care for patients in need of a high level of emergency care without the unfortunate waits associated with very large emergency departments in more complicated medical systems. The reason these type of emergency facilities are springing up is due to the concierge type of care and quick turnaround. Within 30 minutes, a patient can be seen by experienced emergency staff overseen by a board-certified emergency physician. Patients are seen here that are not in need of surgery or referral into a more-complicated emergency care. The majority of patients will be seen on an outpatient basis, but certain types of services could be provided by the facility overnight or short-term. Typically, stays will not be longer than two-three days. This is actually typical of most admissions and stays today.

Ms. Call stated that per Code Section 153.063, subsection 5.2, in this District at least one continuous shopping corridor located along at least one principal frontage street is required. How would this meet that requirement?

Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes that would apply to the current shopping center, which extends along Dublin Village Center Drive. Better identification can be provided as the project proceeds.

Ms. Rauch responded that the shopping corridor is identified on the graphic provided in the packet materials. That would not be applicable to this particular site.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided on this case.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested that the Commissioners provide responses to the five discussion questions.

Mr. Schneier stated that West Dublin Granville Street ranks as a high priority street. Accordingly, if not this use, what use would be optimal in this location? Should a hospital use be located here? Unless another pedestrian-oriented use could occur here, he would be supportive of a Conditional Use as a hospital. The business model is difficult to understand. It would be necessary to educate the community on what issues would be addressed at this site versus the Dublin Methodist Hospital. He assumes the applicant can address the need for that delineation. He is not opposed to the proposed Conditional Use, unless there is a reason a hospital is not desired at this location. At this point, not much detail has been provided. He does not object to the general height or size, but is not comfortable opining further in regard to massing and materials.

Mr. Way stated that he has concerns with the proposed use in the Bridge Street District, along SR 161 specifically. The Commission has discussed the types of uses we would like to see here to make this a very walkable environment. This use would not contribute to that character. He does not believe dead-end parking lots are particularly functional; that is the reason he inquired about

a cross-lot easement. From a functionality standpoint, emergency hospital parking lots should be easy to navigate. He also does not think that this use gives the desired priority to the Dublin Granville Road key frontage. He would like to see more emphasis placed on that frontage. Perhaps the entire building could be located closer to the street, providing more parking at the rear. He has no objection to the conceptual massing and materials. However, a hospital in this area does not contribute to the spirit of the Bridge Street District and its walkable, active environment. A hospital is a very destination-oriented use.

Mr. Grimes expressed agreement. He is unsure that this is the best use for this location, and the proposed parking lot would not permit good vehicle access and circulation. The signage would need to be very specific. How will the frontage of this facility blend with the adjacent building? The site plan is not yet well developed, and he is unable to comment further due to the limited information.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees with fellow Commissioners. The use is a concern. It is not a pedestrian-oriented destination; therefore, it is inconsistent with the District's intent. The siting and massing are appropriate, and the materials are acceptable. The signs seem to exceed the sign requirements. However, those concerns are overshadowed by the question as to whether the use is appropriate here.

Ms. Call stated that we are discussing this use in this particular location. If it were proposed in a different location, the discussion would be very different. Dublin residents would have need of this type of facility. However, as a Conditional Use in this District, it must be harmonious with the general objectives of the Community Plan. It would appear that Commissioners do not believe it is harmonious with the Community Plan and the zoning in this area. There are concerns, as well, about its compliance with the Development Standards, specifically internal circulation and scale of the signage. Condition 3 for Conditional Use qualifications require that the use be harmonious with the existing and intended character. Condition 4 requires that the use does not have a negative impact on existing or future facilities and neighborhood structure. There is a condition about hours of operation. A hospital is not harmonious with the character sought in this District. However, Dublin is a large city. She would encourage the applicant to look at other location options within the City.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant requested any further input from the Commission.

Mr. Mills stated that the use is an important factor. Perhaps how the use will perform for the consumer is where the Commission has questions, as well as the character of the District. Medical services, particularly emergency services are changing. Consumers are seeking a different type of facility. While very serious emergencies need another type of facility than what is proposed, consumers desire to be treated quickly for unidentified problems. Typically, they are not in need of an EMS transport to a larger hospital facility for surgery. The proposed type of emergency facility provides ability to be seen quickly. Patients would arrive by private vehicle or ambulance. The visitors associated with these patients would interact with the surrounding commercial neighborhood. He believes it is a compatible neighborhood use.

Mr. Way stated that he understands the role of a micro hospital or freestanding emergency department. These type of facilities provide an opportunity to care for patients not in need of acute care. The issue for him is that this is the wrong location for the facility, due to the intent of the

Bridge Street District. These type of facilities need convenient access; they are automobile-oriented, not pedestrian-oriented. Perhaps the applicant could find another more appropriate site in Dublin. He understands the need for this type of emergency service, and it is not his intent to discourage the applicant from pursuing it in another location. However, significant effort has been expended by the City and the Commission in the goal to make this particular district unique and different.

Ms. Call stated the use is valuable; she also encourages the applicant to seek another location within the City. The Commission appreciates the time and effort the applicant has expended.

2. 5055 Upper Metro Place, 21-094INF, Informal Review

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the construction of a four-story, mixed-use building containing residential units and a commercial tenant space. The 2.55-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial and is located southwest of the intersection of Upper Metro Place with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble stated that this case originally was presented to the Commission on July 8, 2021. Tonight, nonbinding feedback from the Commission is sought on a revised proposal. Should this application advance, it would return as a Concept Plan request. The 2.5-acre vacant site is located south of Upper Metro Place and west of Frantz Road. The site has frontage on Upper Metro Place to the north. There are pedestrian facilities on both Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. The site is zoned Bridge Street Commercial and is surrounded primarily by hotel uses, including Embassy Suites and Home2 Suites to the north; Town Place Suites to the west; to the south, an office and bank use; to the east, other hotel uses. Although the site is included in the Bridge Street Commercial District, it is also located within the Dublin Corporate Area Plan (DCAP). The concepts of both areas are similar, specifically, a walkable and mixed-use urban environment. In this location, there is a need to attract amenities for workers, including usable open space. DCAP is a fully developed area, and the focus is now on additional infill development. When the Commission reviewed the case in July, they were generally supportive of the use but expressed concerns about the massing, which was essentially a 4-story linear wall located very close to the Upper Metro Place roadway. There also was concern that the open space located to the rear of the building would be perceived as private space, not usable public open space.

The revised proposal essentially bisects the building, placing the two sections on the Upper Metro Place frontage and Frantz Road frontage, with a connector between the two. The open space includes a private pool for the building tenants; it also includes an outdoor patio space for use by the commercial uses on the first floor of the Frantz Road building. The building is proposed to be a Mixed-Use Building Type containing 175 residential units and 7,700-square-feet of commercial space. The commercial uses include a restaurant user, a fitness facility and conference space, available for use by the nearby hotels. Open space was a concern, as there is none in close proximity to the site. The Bridge Street District requires open space for both commercial and residential uses. This application proposes 35,000 square feet of open space, nearly an acre, but slightly under the amount required. The open space includes the inner corridor of greenspace, the area around the pool, landscaping along Upper Metro Place, and a patio. There will be a need to activate that space. The primary access to the site is from Upper Metro Place. The parking includes

53 surface parking spaces; 138 underground parking spaces; and 17 on-street parking spaces. It is anticipated the residential units will be studio apartments. If the residential component is comprised entirely of studio units, 33 of the proposed parking spaces would remain for the restaurant. The material selections will be natural materials with some modern elements.

The following questions are provided for the Commission's discussion.

- 1) Does the Planning and Zoning Commission support the modified site design?
- 2) Does the Commission support a Parking Plan that would not meet the minimum requirements of the Code?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the open space design, location, and layout?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the conceptual mass, scale, and height of the building?
- 5) Any other considerations.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Schneier inquired if the open space and public space are calculated separately, and the public space portion would be a subset of the open space.

Ms. Call clarified that the open space calculation is public open space.

Mr. Noble noted that there is a numeric value to that.

Mr. Schneier inquired if all 35,000 square feet of open space would be accessible to the public.

Ms. Rauch responded that the required open space must be publicly accessible. All 35,152 square feet is required public open space.

Mr. Schneier stated that the application lacks 9% of the required amount. He inquired if the open space calculation does not include the pool, because it is not accessible to the public.

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of which portions of the site plan are not publicly accessible.

Ms. Call inquired if there is an overlay that would delineate the private open space and the public open space.

[Mr. Supelak referred to a drawing in the meeting materials that provided that information.]

Mr. Supelak requested clarification regarding how the number of residential units determines the required open space.

Ms. Noble responded that 200 square feet of open space is required per unit. The required open space for a commercial use is based on its square footage; accordingly, 154 square feet of open space is required for the proposed commercial space.

Mr. Supelak inquired the amount of commercial space.

Ms. Noble responded that the commercial space is 7,700 square feet, incorporating the restaurant, fitness center and conference rooms.

Ms. Call noted that excluding the required residential parking spaces, 33 spaces remain. Therefore, could only 3/7ths of the commercial space be designated for restaurant use?

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired if the small notch out of the property along Frantz Road were related to a utility area.

Ms. Noble deferred the question to the applicant for a response.

Mr. Supelak stated that the proposed residential property is located in close proximity to the parcel to the south, 409 North Metro Place. If the adjacent building property owner should desire to redevelop in the future, what sensitivity would there be regarding the side setback between the buildings?

Ms. Noble responded that the intent is to consider these sites in an integrated manner. Any future proposed redevelopment would come before the Planning Commission for consideration.

Applicant Presentation

Dwight McCabe, McCabe Properties, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, OH 43064, stated that they have provided due diligence to the Commission's comments at their earlier review, and they believe the revised plan is a better solution. Previously, the issue was the dichotomy between the various overlays and zoning conditions in place on the site. They had attempted to meet Code, but agreed with the Commission's comments. Subsequent to submission of their application, there have been ongoing discussions with staff and the fire marshal; the need for emergency access has been resolved. The plan submitted included a full 20-foot fire lane easement on the south side of the building, but that is no longer a requirement. Consequently, the offset of the building will shift on the south side to align with the rest of the building. When that occurs, the green space will move to the front of the building. As a result, the amount of public space will exceed the minimum requirement. That amount is exclusive of the pool area and pool deck. The residential units will be approximately 670 – 690-square foot, one-bedroom units, not studio apartments. Two-bedroom units could be included at the building ends, and that would reduce the required parking spaces. They do not anticipate including a 7,700-square-foot restaurant in this location. The restaurant probably would be limited to a 3,200-3,500 square feet bar/restaurant, similar to The Goat in Hilliard. The other two commercial uses -- fitness center and conference rooms, are provided for users within the community. There have been some recent conversations regarding the possibility of having on-street parking on both sides of the street, consistent with the Bridge Street District. Regarding the possibility of redevelopment of the adjacent property, the bank intends to retain their current location long-term. They are interested in having the Commission's feedback on their proposal.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Way inquired if underground parking would be provided only under the Frantz Road wing of the building.

Mr. McCabe responded that it would be provided under the entire building.

Mr. Way referred to his earlier question about the small notch on Frantz Road that is not part of this property.

Mr. McCabe responded that it is not part of their property, although they are not sure of the purpose of the notch.

Mr. Hendershot stated the right-of-way notch accommodates private utilities within that area, either electric or telephone. It would be very challenging to relocate those facilities.

Mr. McCabe stated that the stonewall runs through that area, which provides a consistent appearance.

Mr. Way noted that the stonewall actually presents a barrier to achieving the desired activation along the Frantz Road frontage. In regard to the private swimming pool, has consideration been given to locating the pool in a different location?

Mr. McCabe responded that extensive consideration has been given to location. Unfortunately, locating it on the southwest side would have a significant impact on the surface parking and access to the underground parking. They are willing to work on the correct solution regarding opacity and separation. If needed, a wall could be added.

Mr. Way stated that the proposed location is disruptive; it fragments the open space. Moving it closer to the building on the west would free up more of that open space.

Mr. McCabe indicated that would be a possibility.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Grimes stated the revised proposal is far superior to the earlier version. He is impressed with the changes to the layout. His earlier concerns regarding parking have been alleviated.

Mr. Supelak stated that the mass has not been reduced, but it has been broken up in an interesting manner. He applauds their efforts with the open space. The corner is inviting. The opportunity for The Goat-type facility to spill out onto the plaza is attractive. This type of facility would become the local cantina for the area, a self-sustaining facility. It would not necessarily need to depend upon vehicular traffic. His concern is the quality of the public open space. Would the greater public actually participate here? He would be interested in having the outside public drawn into the open space. As proposed, the public space is encased in the site; it reflects a private-public character. In regard to parking, could angled parking be an option? The street does not have a high level of traffic. The wall of residential units is not a particular issue for this project, although it may be for the next series of projects. The rear lot appears to be very tight and uncomfortable. In regard to the architecture, he has no objection to the proposed direction. There is one totem on the corner, could there be a series of totems that would draw the greater public into that space?

Mr. Way stated that breaking up the massing and placing the open space on the key corner was a good direction. That corner space and courtyard area present a good opportunity. More design detail is needed. This project has the ability to set the tone for the future of the Frantz Road frontage as it extends towards Tuttle Road. The individual steps are wasted, unusable space. He would encourage them to put in a retaining wall that extends backward, creating a usable space along Upper Metro Place. That would leave a separate public space for the restaurant. He would encourage the applicant to consider some options for the pool. It is difficult to differentiate the private versus the public open space. Increasing the amount of connected, obvious public space would improve that distinction. Locating the pool nearer the building on the west, would achieve more contiguous open space. He would encourage the applicant to work with the Dublin Arts Council regarding a corner piece. He is not supportive of diagonal parking. He would encourage that the color of the massing fit with the family of colors that exist within Upper Metro Place. He would like to see a footprint for the underground parking; perhaps there would be opportunity to extend that footprint and gain more parking spaces.

Mr. Schneier stated that is this a great project. The changes made in response to the Commission's earlier comments were positive. There is concern about the amount of usable public space. The small orphan public spaces are not inviting to the public. The buffer between the private pool and the public open space is a concern; again, the public open space does not invite use by the greater public. Aside from that element, he likes the proposed project.

Ms. Call stated that the articulation of the building is good. The fact that every unit will have a balcony is not only attractive architecturally, but it will enhance the street activation. The activation

along Frantz Road is good, and addition of the plaza is a positive element. If the fire lane is deleted on the south side, it will achieve the additional 9% of needed open space. Due to the desire to activate the street frontage, she would not advocate for provision of fencing on the corner. She has a couple of concerns. She is not a fan of on-street parking here. This is a right-in, right-out street, and vehicles would be entering on the wrong side of the road. A potential restaurant client would not be aware that parking is available on the other side of the building, and accessing those public spaces would not be easy. While she really likes the plaza, which activates the corner, she does not like the required step up into that space; that step up is another barrier for the public. She likes the suggestion to rotate the pool location back into the green space, which would improve the amount of usable and inviting public space. She reiterated the suggestion made to work with the Dublin Arts Council on a corner piece.

She inquired if the applicant desired any additional clarification.

Mr. McCabe requested clarification of the activation of the public space. Are there types of activities that the Commission believe should be considered?

Ms. Call responded that the Commission encourages applicant creativity.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission encourages placemaking and activities that draw the public, such as music.

Ms. Noble clarified that there have been conversations about on-street parking, but it would be developer-driven. The City is not proposing to add on-street parking.

Ms. Call thanked the applicant for their presentation.

NEW CASES

3. OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital at 6905, 6955, & 7450-7500 Hospital Drive, 21-190AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for sign modifications for an existing hospital on a 53.28-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Ohio Health, on a site located west of the intersection of Hospital Drive with Avery-Muirfield Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and determination of an Amended Final Development Plan for the OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital and an updated sign plan. OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital was developed following approval of a rezoning of the site in February 2005 to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, OhioHealth. The campus includes a 309,118-square-foot hospital building, a 99,280-square-foot Medical Office Building and additional ancillary office buildings throughout the campus. An overall sign package for the campus was approved with the hospital's Final Development Plan in May 2005 and was amended in both November 2006 and 2009. The applicant is proposing modifications of the existing sign plan to include two new wall signs, revise two existing ground signs and one existing wall sign, and revision of the address identification signage for the site. The remaining signage throughout the campus will not be impacted. Planning and Zoning Commission is the designated reviewing body for sign package modifications.

Mr. Hounshell reviewed the proposed revisions to existing signs, which include: replacing the 356-square-foot primary identification wall sign at the top of the south building elevation with a new 330-square foot wall sign. This sign is the largest sign on the building, and is constructed to be viewed clearly from US Route 33 to the south. The sign is approximately 61 feet from the top of the sign to grade, matching the height of the existing sign, and will be mounted to the brick façade. Both the logo and copy of the sign are constructed of 4-inch deep silver aluminum channel letters that will be internally illuminated with translucent white trim caps. The applicant is changing the illumination from blue to white for better visibility at night. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to modify two existing 62-square-foot ground monument signs located at the main entrance into the campus at the intersection of Hospital Drive and Dublin Methodist Lane. Both signs are identical in design, located north and south of the main entrance drive, and feature blue channel letters mounted to the brick base. The applicant is proposing two new 62-square-foot silver aluminum cabinets on the existing brick monument bases to replace the blue channel letters. The signs are proposed at 5 feet in height, and will include 3/16-inch translucent blue vinyl push-through letters on the cabinet. The sign copy will be internally illuminated, utilizing existing power for each sign base. Below the sign cabinets, the applicant has proposed one foot of recessed brick painted bronze. Staff recommends that the applicant finish the impacted base area with a brick to match or complement the existing brick on the sign base. Additionally, the applicant has not provided an updated landscape plan for the two monument signs. The applicant should work with staff to provide a foundation landscape plan for the two proposed ground signs to meet Code. The applicant is also proposing to update all six street address identification signage located on the north and south elevations of the hospital. The applicant is proposing to change the color of the signage from blue to white, to remain consistent with the newly proposed and revised signage, and for better visibility. The applicant will be replacing the internally illuminated signage with translucent white faces and matching silver trim caps, and will be painting the non-illuminated signage white. Each address sign is approximately 7 square feet in size, matching the existing size of the signage, and will maintain their existing locations. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Jim Lytle, Jim Lytle Consulting, 1665 West Case Rd. Columbus, OH 43235-7518, stated that he serves as the sign consultant for OhioHealth. There is a need for improved wayfinding within the campus, in particular to the hospital building. Visitors to the campus are having difficulty identifying the main entrance to the hospital. The logo provided at the top of the building is no longer a brand standard. The OhioHealth logo is currently the only identification used. The proposed revisions are consistent with the standards for other OhioHealth campuses. [reviewed the proposed changes]. Some of the signs are experiencing issues with their structural integrity. The first phase of revisions will address the most critical signs; future phases will propose additional revisions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way stated that the proposal would replace the brick foundation with stone. Is the intent to replace other sign foundations with stone?

Mr. Lytle responded the foundation materials are inconsistent on this campus. He would prefer to use brick. Lawn mowers tend to impact brick foundations less, and the stick-on stone material can become loose.

Mr. Way responded that some of the stone foundations are mortared and are less successful. The dry-laid stone, however, is consistent with the Dublin character. He believes the brick foundations are not aging well. Would he consider using stone consistently?

Mr. Lytle responded that they could do so. The foundations are not actually constructed. The unit is inserted over a steel pole.

Mr. Supelak stated that in addition to the signage, lighting the front canopy differently would identify the entrance more clearly.

Commission Discussion

Commission members were generally supportive of the proposed sign modifications, using stone as the foundation material. Mr. Supelak indicated that he had concerns about the WPI3 sign addition. He understands that because Dublin Methodist Hospital is being removed from the branding, there is the desire to add the Dublin Methodist Hospital identification in some manner.

Mr. Lytle stated that the identification is being removed from the top of the tower, but there is a need to provide it in some manner. The proposal is to add it lower and closer to the entrance.

Mr. Supelak agreed that the signage on the tower was primarily a highway-oriented element. He would suggest hanging the sign from the bottom of the canopy.

Mr. Lytle stated that the brick area above the canopy is the only square footage opportunity on the building for a sign.

Mr. Supelak questioned the visibility of that location.

Mr. Way stated that he believes that breaking up the brick mass with a sign would be aesthetically pleasing. He is aware of another hospital that hung letter signage from its canopy. The letters are now rusting.

Mr. Lytle stated that their practice on all the hospitals is to add the hospital identification close to the logo and visible from all angles.

Mr. Supelak reiterated the suggestion to add illumination to the glass cube or canopy.

Mr. Lytle responded that they were supportive of that idea.

Ms. Call stated that she is uncomfortable with the proposed square footage, which, overall, is being increased 34%. The proposed percentage is not consistent with Code. She understands this use requires wayfinding. People must be able to identify the hospital entrance. The City's responsibility is to support wayfinding, but not particularly branding. There are opportunities for the branding, although the building has challenges. Currently, three signs appear to be proposed on one elevation. Providing three signs on one elevation and the increase of 34% in total square footage are issues.

Mr. Way noted that the percent of square footage is in proportion to the amount of square feet of façade that faces the highway. This is a very large building and can handle the proposed square footage.

Ms. Call stated that the permitted increase is inconsistent with what was permitted another applicant.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are actually multiple facades, not one.

Ms. Call stated that she is concerned about setting a precedent.

Mr. Schneier stated that he believes the precedent value has to be relative to the facts. If another large hospital or university campus presented a similar situation, he would probably be supportive

of the additional square footage. The intent to direct people to a hospital trumps most of the metrics, in his opinion.

The revised conditions were reviewed.

Ms. Rauch inquired if the intent is that the columns be stone, as well.

Mr. Way responded affirmatively; it would not be desirable to mix stone and brick.

Mr. Lytle inquired if the Commission had any objection to the existing curved entry feature signage, or is the direction to incorporate stone on the columns and the entire base?

Mr. Way responded that, preferably, all of it would be stone.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following two (2) conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with staff to modify the monument signs to have a stacked stone base and columns rather than brick, subject to staff approval; and
- 2) The applicant work with staff to provide a foundation landscape plan for the two proposed ground signs to meet Code, subject to staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 4-1.]

5. Rules and Regulations Update, 22-017ADMO, Administrative Review - Other

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for review and recommendation to City Council for proposed updates to the Planning and Zoning Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that the Rules and Regulations of each Board and Commission identify the powers and duties of the body, describe membership requirements and officer elections, set forth meeting procedures, and discuss ex-parte contact and conflicts of interest. The Rules and Regulations for the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) were last updated in 2010. The Rules and Regulations are being updated at the request of City Council to address changes to the format in which public meetings may occur in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as to address outdated nomenclature. As part of this update process, the City's Law Director has reviewed and commented upon the proposed changes, as well as provided the virtual meeting language based on the direction from City Council. Once PZC has had the opportunity to review, following their recommendation of approval, the updates would be forwarded to City Council for acceptance. ARB and BZA will be updating their Rules and Regulations, as well. As revised, Section II(C), Attendance of Members, states that City Council strongly prefers for all Board and Commission members to attend in person when meetings are being held at a physical location. Per this new language, it would be the Mayor's purview to determine whether or not a member could attend a meeting virtually, should an emergency arise. In this case, an emergency is understood to be related to the pandemic, rather than convenience.

Additionally, the Mayor may determine that a meeting shall be held virtually, when forty-eight hours' notice is given prior to the meeting. For any virtual meetings, the language states that technology shall be in place such that the public can observe and hear the meeting, and that instructions for participation are detailed on the City's website. Per Section VII, the Chairperson of a Board or Commission may permit an applicant or their representative to participate virtually, in the event of an emergency. In this case as well, an emergency is understood to be related to the pandemic, rather than convenience.

Commission Questions and Discussion

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of "applicable emergencies."

Ms. Rauch responded that, originally, the intent was that it would be Covid-based.

Mr. Boggs responded that while the revisions originated from the current pandemic situation, the recommended draft does not specify a pandemic-related emergency. No detail is provided as to what type of emergency would qualify. It would be left at the discretion of the Mayor. If the Commission believes further definition is needed, they can provide that recommendation.

Ms. Call stated that the only issue she identified was the need to identify participation. There is a difference in participating as a member of the public; as a Commission member who can vote, or a Commission member who cannot vote.

Ms. Rauch responded that per her earlier discussion with the Law Director, the intent is that it refers to Commission member participation in both the discussion and in the vote. That can be clarified, however.

Mr. Way stated that if a Commission member were unable to participate due to an emergency, he would assume that they would simply excuse themselves from the meeting.

Discussion continued regarding ability to participate virtually and need to define an emergency.

Following discussion, the Commission indicated support of the recommended changes with clarification of participation.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation of approval to City Council with clarification of the word, "participation."

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

[Motion carried 5-0.]

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for Thursday, March 3, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council