



# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, February 17, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: Construction of a mobility hub at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. The 57.81-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Coffman Park.  
Location: North of the intersection of Post Road with Coffman Park Drive  
Request: Review and approval of the Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.  
Applicant: Justin Robbins, HDR Engineering  
Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I  
Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us  
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-014

**MOTION 1:** Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve the Minor Text Modification:

1. To modify the Development Text; under Coffman Park Master Development Plan, subsection Coffman Park Master Plan Elements: Community Recreation Center Element shall be permitted one digital changeable copy sign for the Dublin Community Recreation Center Mobility Hub in accordance with the following:
  - a) That the sign be located on the property to which it refers;
  - b) That the sign is not visible from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties; and
  - c) That the sign does not exceed 8 square feet in size.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Minor Text Modification was approved.

**MOTION 2:** Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with six 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;



**4. DCRC Mobility Hub at 5600 Post Road  
22-014AFDP**

**Amended Final Development Plan**

- 3) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to finalize all plant species and submit a finalized landscape plan, subject to Staff 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; and
- 6) That the chalkboard be eliminated and replaced with a suitable alternative, subject to Staff approval.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Amended Final Development Plan was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

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

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
  
D9CF1A1C484149E...  
Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



~~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~~



# RECORD OF DISCUSSION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Tuesday, December 8, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**4. Mobility Hub, Dublin Recreation Center at 5600 Post Road 21-181INF** **Informal Review**

Proposal: Informal review and non-binding feedback for the construction of a Mobility Hub located at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. The 56.81-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Coffman Park.

Location: North of the intersection of Coffman Park Drive with Post Road.

Applicant: J.M. Rayburn, City of Dublin

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-181

**RESULT:** The Commission supported the proposed installation of a mobility hub, as it furthers the implementation of mobility needs now and into the future. Each hub should speak to the context of the area of which it is located and be unique in character. The Commission shared a preference for a contemporary aesthetic that does not mimic the architecture of the Dublin Community Recreation Center, but rather enhances it. The Commission added that the mobility hub should not read as a bus stop and instead should be a public space with mobility components that speak to the site context. Finally, the Commission was supportive of a cantilevered, steal canopy shelter structure with a wood underdeck reminiscent of the East Plaza Pavilion at Riverside Crossing Park. The Commission would like sustainable components incorporated into the mobility hub, such as a solar array on the canopy structures.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
*Taylor Mullinax*  
B9CF1A1C484149E...  
Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



~~There were no public comments.~~

### **Commission Discussion**

~~Mr. Supelak requested confirmation that everything has been satisfied as agreed upon.  
Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively.~~

~~Ms. Fox stated that the residents brought forth their concerns, and the developer worked very hard to address those concerns and reduce the costs of maintaining the roadways in this development. It has been a long process, which has now been completed.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant continue to work with staff to ensure the Combined Mail Unit box is appropriately located.~~
- ~~2) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with stormwater management requirements as defined in Chapter 53.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 6-0]~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Way seconded a recommendation for Council approval of the Final Plat with one (1) condition:~~

- ~~1) Any minor technical modifications be made prior to submittal to City Council for final approval.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 6-0]~~

## **4. Mobility Hub, Dublin Recreation Center at 5600 Post Road, 21-181INF, Informal Review**

A request for an informal review and non-binding feedback for the construction of a Mobility Hub located at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. The 56.81-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Coffman Park and is located north of the intersection of Coffman Park Drive with Post Road.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of a proposed mobility hub to be located at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. Mr. Rayburn will be presenting an overview of the mobility hub implementation within the City.

Mr. Rayburn stated that this is a multi-year, multi-phase effort that began in 2017 with a public workshop that gathered public feedback from residents regarding where they would like the City to focus on expanding mobility and support the community's evolving mobility needs. In the first phase, priority areas were carved out. Those priorities included:

- (1) Micro transit (Shuttle and circulators);
- (2) Shared Micro Mobility (Bike share and scooters);
- (3) Mobility Hub Concepts;
- (4) Secondary wayfinding on shared use paths;
- (5) Complete and smart streets, vision zero

Mobility hubs are still conceptual in this region. They designate a space to co-locate at least two modes of transportation. They serve as a transfer point between the mobility options. They function separately but they can be connected. The intent is improve the quality of life by providing mobility independence for those who cannot drive vehicles and also to support the work force. The hubs can serve as landmarks for orientation within the community. If the mobility hubs are located and programmed appropriately, it is anticipated that the mobility hubs will lead to a reduced dependence on the automobile. In regard to locating a hub at the DCRC, they have met with the Public Services Committee and provided information indicating that this site is appropriate for a shuttle shelter as well as a docked bike share and micro mobility parking. The community is supportive of mobility hubs at the proposed pilot locations.

Dublin Staff has identified approximately 15 to 20 proposed locations for mobility hubs in Dublin. Four locations are being prioritized in ideal areas to introduce the concept to Dublin. Such places will combine significant opportunity to attract user activity with proximity to City or community facilities. Phase 1 included the following sites: DCRC, CML - Dublin branch, North Market Bridge Park, Frantz Road & Metro Place North. In August 2021, an AARP Community Challenge Grant for \$20,000 was awarded to the City. This grant program is part of a larger national effort known as "AARP Livable Communities," which aids local communities with quick-action projects that help make communities more livable for people of all ages. The grant award is for a project to provide an accessible shelter at the DCRC adjacent to the senior lounge, incorporating an ADA compliant ramp, as well as other enhancements. AARP Ohio has specified a project completion date of July 30, 2022, and the project timeline includes deadlines that must be met to meet that completion date. Construction on the mobility hub is projected to start in late spring. The Commission's feedback from this Informal Review will be provided to the Public Services Committee in January 2022 for their consideration; subsequently, this application will be scheduled for Commission review and approval in February 2022. The intent is to complete final designs, solicit bids and award a construction contract thereafter as quickly as possible. The goal is to begin construction in May to be completed by July 2022.

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the project site. Since 1995, there have been multiple AFDP's for site modifications including a DCRC expansion, which included the Senior Lounge (1998), and the addition of two bocce ball courts in 2005, which are located just south of the proposed project area. The bocce ball courts are anticipated to become an outdoor space for yoga and other group activity space. This location was selected as the inaugural mobility hub due to its proximity to the Senior Lounge, ridership data from the Dublin Connector Shuttle, and favorable feedback from the Public Services Committee. The Commission is requested to provide non-binding feedback for the conceptual design. Included in the meeting packet were inspirational images of mobility hub shelters. Staff is recommending materials, such as wood, glass or stone, because the materials closely align with those used for the DCRC building, and are the exterior materials designated in the Coffman Park Master Development Plan. The following discussion questions have been provided to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the mobility transportation modes proposed for the DCRC mobility hub?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed amenities the DCRC mobility hub will offer including a kiosk, heating/cooling, Wi-Fi, etc.?
- 3) What architectural style of the DCRC mobility hub shelter does the Commission support?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed shelter materials, which may include stone, wood, glass, etc.?
- 5) Does the Commission feel that the proposed mobility hub shelter design should take design cues from the existing DCRC building or stand out in its design and proposed materials?
- 6) Other considerations by the Commission.

### **Consultant Presentation**

Justin Robbins, Automated and Connected Vehicle Planner, HDR Design Services, 2800 Corporate Exchange Drive - Suite 100, Columbus, OH 43231, stated that they are working with staff on the concepts and final design for the mobility hub. In developing the design they considered three primary areas: the DCRC building, the parking area and the context of nearby the multi-use trail. The current location of the fire hydrant presents an issue, and the sidewalk within that area may need to be widened. Due to the compressed schedule and budget, the intent is to incorporate predesigned structural elements into a more customized approach. They looked for available commercial shelters that might be available within a short timeframe. The concern is that type of shelter may not be reflective of Dublin's preferred architectural character. They are focused on making the shelter less of a waiting area and more of a front porch to the building, which would also incorporate the mobility modes. It may be possible to make it a flexible public space that can include movable furniture, as well as the covered bicycle parking. [Conceptual images shown.]

### **Commission Questions/Discussion**

Mr. Schneier inquired if any consideration was given to incorporating a public restroom.

Ms. Mullinax responded that no restroom is being considered for the mobility hub. There are public restrooms in close proximity within the Dublin Community Recreation Center.

Mr. Schneier stated that he does not believe the design should mimic the existing building. He would prefer to see a more contemporary look, iconic but non-Irish.

Ms. Fox stated that it is important that this mobility hub address the needs of the users, many of whom will be seniors. Therefore, it must be sheltered and be comfortable. Although it will be a place to park bikes, this hub should address the overall vision that there will be many other ways seniors will use mobility. In regard to the architectural style, she likes the intent to make it a front porch to the Recreation Center. Because of its rear location, it does not have to look like the Recreation Center; however, its design must make the building look better. It must not look like a bus stop, but have a fresh look. It should provide a feeling of being embraced in the space and have a view of the greenspace in back; essentially, it should provide a safe, happy atmosphere. Each of the mobility hubs incorporated in the overall plan should reflect the context of their surrounding environments. These hubs should provide opportunities for seniors that they cannot obtain elsewhere. They should also include an informational component that is multi-user friendly,

and there will be an opportunity to provide wayfinding. There should be no "green roofs," as they are difficult to maintain.

Ms. Call stated this an opportunity to be creative in the manner in which the mobility hubs evolve throughout the City. The hubs could include placemaking elements and provide an eclectic character. They could take cues from the environment or stand out from it. Art elements do not need to be particularly costly. With this particular hub at the DCRC, there are opportunities that should reflect the needs of the clientele. Some suggestions could be incorporating a Little Free Library or a history-telling electronic device.

Mr. Supelak stated that his comments would be similar to those shared. This should not appear similar to a bus stop. The individual mobility hubs should all be different and provide a placemaking nature. Essentially, amenities should be included within an artistic architecture. There should be informational or museum-like elements.

Mr. Grimes stated that he loves the concept. Amenities should be included to the extent possible. If the architectural style of the mobility hubs will be thematic, the City already has a principal hub or node at the terminus of the pedestrian bridge that provides elements that could be incorporated into the design of the hubs. He is supportive of the concept.

Mr. Way stated that this area is part of his daily morning walk. If they can relocate the fire hydrant and the light and clean up the space, it would be an improvement. He believes this is the right place for the mobility hub; the space needed something. However, they should have a vision for all of the space. This could become an exciting space. He believes the proposed elements that will be included are correct. This is an opportunity to brand mobility in Dublin, although it does not need to be repetitive throughout the City. From a sustainability aspect, perhaps solar elements could be incorporated in the canopy. This site is located next to a fitness center; perhaps the fitness element could be extended into the hub. Perhaps a treadmill could be included, which could be utilized while watching information provided electronically. Currently, this corner has issues, due to the roadway access, Currently, it curves in front of the DCRC; perhaps it could be straightened and extended to Downpatrick Street, it might provide ability for vehicles to move out of the main travel area. He agrees the architecture does not need to be consistent with the DCRC building. The branding opportunity should be taken advantage of but in context with the environment.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant or contractor required any additional feedback.

Mr. Robbins stated that they required no additional feedback.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

~~Ms. Rauch thanked Commission members for their service this year, and provided a reminder of City Council Member Greg Peterson's Retirement Reception at 5:00 p.m., Thursday, December 16, 2021.~~

~~Ms. Fox reported that due to the recurring issues with insufficient area in some developments for patios, City Council has requested the Commission to consider and then provide recommendations for amendments to the design guidelines related to setbacks and lot coverage. The PUDs are not providing the level of product intended. She has driven by several areas within the City to review developments. The frontages are not being varied; houses are lined up across the front. With the~~