



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 5, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Supelak, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the May 5, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. Remote viewers should 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

Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Kathy Harter, Jamey Chinnock

Commission members absent: Rebecca Call

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Nichole Martin, Zachary Hounshell, Chris Will, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Michael Henderson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Supelak stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. There are two cases eligible for the Consent Agenda, Ohio Hit Dogs Baseball, Case 2, 22-037CU, Conditional Use and Bridge Park, Block G, Case 3, 22-044MSP,

Master Sign Plan. He inquired if any Commissioner wished to move one of the Consent Cases to the regular meeting for discussion.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he has questions regarding Case 3.

Mr. Boggs stated that if he has questions regarding that case, it should be moved to the regular agenda.

Mr. Supelak indicated the case would be moved to the regular agenda. He swore in members of the audience intending to testify on this evening's cases.

CONSENT CASE

2. Ohio Hit Dogs Baseball at 7007 Discovery Boulevard, 22-037CU, Conditional Use

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a Conditional Use request to permit the expansion of an Indoor Recreation use within an existing building on a 15.38-acre site, zoned Planned Unit Development District, Perimeter Center, Subarea C1, located southeast of the intersection of Holt Drive with Post Road.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Conditional Use.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

NEW CASES

3. Bridge Park, Block G at 6620 Mooney Street, 22-044MSP, Master Sign Plan

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a request for approval of amendments to a previously approved Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park to include Block G, a 2.88-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this application requests an amendment to the Master Sign Plan for the Bridge Park development to include Block G. This block is located west of Block C, south of Block H and north of Block F. It is defined by Tuller Ridge Drive, Dale Drive, Mooney Street and Bridge Park Avenue. Master Sign Plan amendments for Blocks A, B, C and D have been previously reviewed and approved by the Commission. Bridge Park, Block G is comprised of three buildings: G1 - office/retail, G2 - parking structure with three artist studios, and G3 – residential apartments. Mr. Hounshell reviewed the proposed signs, all of which are consistent with those in Blocks A, B, C and D. Staff has reviewed the proposed signs against all applicable sign plan criteria and recommends approval with five (5) conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock stated that there will be significant variation in sign types. He inquired if the variations are consistent with previously approved signs.

Mr. Hounshell responded that they are all consistent with the signs in Blocks A, B, C and D.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the statement regarding not restricting logo size or colors is consistent with previously approved signs, as well.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Commission would be included in any future reviews of the proposed signs.

Mr. Hounshell responded that they would not. Once the Commission approves the Master Sign Plan (MSP), flexibility is allowed for staff and the property owner to approve final signs for the tenants.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Starr, Executive Vice President Commercial Real Estate and Leasing, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH, stated that the current review process is working well. Crawford Hoying conducts 2-3 sign proposal reviews with the tenant before they submit an application to the City. The City subsequently submits the proposed sign to a consultant for further review, so there are multiple levels of review. He stated that although there are currently 24 office tenants at Bridge Park, they have only 12 signs. Typically, a sign is not permitted unless the applicant is leasing a full floor.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman inquired if there were any changes in the sign plan itself, or if the request was only for the purpose of providing more flexibility in colors.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Master Sign Plan remains the same, except for the addition of Block G, which is currently not covered by the sign plan.

Commission members had no additional questions/discussion.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with five (5) conditions:

- 1) The applicant update page 18 of the plan to clarify that upper story tenants are permitted a maximum of one wall sign at landlord discretion as architecturally appropriate;
- 2) The applicant update the plan note on pages 21-26 to clarify that final sign locations require both City and landlord approval and that Placemaking Art sign locations depicted are regulatory including number and location;
- 3) The applicant work with staff to select alternate precedent images on pages 8, 12, and 19 to ensure high-quality examples;
- 4) The applicant provide sign fabrication details for The Theodore Placemaking Art sign, subject to staff approval, prior to submitting a sign permit; and,
- 5) The applicant provide staff an updated plan reflecting all conditions of approval prior to issuance of sign permits.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

4. Dublin Village Redevelopment at 6800 Federated Boulevard and 6711-6815 Dublin Center Drive, 22-050INF, Informal Review

Mr. Supelak stated that this is a request for Informal Review and feedback for the development of attached townhomes and multiple-family residential with structured parking on an 8.17-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that the applicant is requesting an Informal Review and nonbinding feedback on their proposal. Dublin Village is located southwest of the interchange of Interstate 270 and Sawmill Road. The 54-acre development is bordered by Bridge Park Avenue, Village Parkway, Tuller Road and Dublin Center Drive. Dublin Village Center was approved in 1987, and most of the 400,000 square feet of commercial development was constructed in the late 1980s. Dublin Village (later, Dublin Village Center) was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) in 1987 as a Corridor Development District application. In 2013, a 6.4-acre residential development for the Edwards Communities was approved. The project involved the redevelopment of approximately 115,000 square feet of inline retail and an approximately 200-space surface parking lot within Dublin Village Center. The project included the construction of a four-story podium apartment building with 324 units, 325 podium garage spaces, and 72 off-street surface parking spaces. The project also would have provided an extension of John Shields Parkway and two new neighborhood streets connecting Tuller Road with the proposed extension of John Shields Parkway. However, that development was never constructed. Since then, additional projects approved within Dublin Village Center have included: the AMC Plaza Improvements (in 2013-2014); the Dublin Village Center West Façade (in 2021); and the Revelry Tavern Patio Expansion (in 2021). The site is located within the Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood.

The Bridge Street District street network indicates future connections in a block pattern layout. The applicant is proposing the construction of two, single-family, 7-story apartment buildings with 278 units; two, 3-story, single-family attached buildings with 14 units; the extension of John Shields Parkway and McCune Avenue; and expansions and modifications to existing surface parking lots. Staff has proposed the following questions to facilitate the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use & number of units?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed street network and circulation?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed parking?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed building heights?
- 5) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed massing, architecture, & character?
- 6) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed open spaces or fee-in-lieu?
- 7) Is the Commission supportive of the general site layout, framework and phasing?

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired, based on the Bridge Street Code, the difference between a podium building and a corridor building.

Mr. Will responded that in the Bridge Street Code, the podium building type would have parking below and development above the parking.

Mr. Way stated that a corridor building has partial parking beneath the building, as well. He was under the impression that a podium building provided only one level of parking beneath the development above, but that a corridor building allowed for multiple levels of parking beneath.

Ms. Martin clarified the difference between the two structures. The corridor building would allow for either no parking on lower levels and parking in a separate location, or it would allow parking to be within the building, to the rear and in-line with the principal frontage street.

Mr. Way stated that the graphics submitted show two levels of parking, not just one level. Would it then fall within the corridor building category, which would permit more levels of parking? Is the building characterized correctly, since that dictates the number of parking stories permitted?

Ms. Martin responded that staff believes the building is characterized correctly, as the Code permits latitude to determine the building type. However, if the Commission believes it should be categorized differently, staff could explore that further. The Code recognizes that design will not always look exactly like the form-based Code, in which case a determination would be made as closely as possible. The character of two stories of podium parking beneath five stories of residential development is most similar to a standard podium building.

Mr. Way inquired about the property at the intersection of Tuller Road and Village Parkway, which is not part of this property. Who is the owner of that triangular-shaped section of land? The City's Thoroughfare Plan indicates a future T intersection with Tuller Road, which may mean that land is being preserved for future right-of-way for that purpose. If that is not the intent, who owns that land?

Mr. Will responded that the land is owned by the City of Dublin. It is part of the right-of-way. He invited Ms. Wawzkiewicz to comment on the City's future street plans.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz stated that there is right-of-way in the corner where Tuller Road curves and intersects with Village Parkway. There is a future opportunity to straighten those roads into the perpendicular intersection format of the Bridge Street District. The City is currently studying this area for the purpose of future decisions.

Mr. Way stated that he asked the question because, if no future alignment were intended, there would be open space on that corner. If that condition should change in the future, however, it would result in a corner condition that does not currently exist. That should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Supelak stated that the area depicted on the drawings is referred to as greenspace, but it is actually open space. All of the parcels are not necessarily open space.

Mr. Will responded that open space is defined as space that is publicly accessible from a right-of-way.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there were any requirements regarding the length and proportion of the open space.

Mr. Boggs inquired if he was attempting to distinguish the difference between pocket plazas versus pocket parks versus greenspaces.

Mr. Supelak responded affirmatively.

Mr. Will stated that there are different types of open spaces. The intent of the open space/greenspace reflected in this plan is not defined at this point.

Mr. Supelak inquired if all the pervious surface on the site would qualify as open space.

Mr. Will responded that, with the limited material provided at this point, staff would not anticipate all the open space shown to meet the Code definitions of publicly-accessible open space or other space types.

Mr. Fishman stated that there is a certain requirement for open space. Does that space count toward their open space requirement?

Mr. Will responded that with the Informal Review level, it is unclear which spaces would meet that requirement. When it is refined to a Concept Plan, that detail would be clarified. Not all of the spaces would count toward their open space calculation, only the ones that meet the requirements. That analysis has not been done at the Informal Review stage.

Mr. Schneier stated that the proposal indicates open space areas of 15,000 square feet and 36,000 square feet. Is the 15,000-square-foot area proposed as open space?

Mr. Will responded affirmatively. The applicant may be able to provide more details regarding their intent for that open space. At this point, the materials submitted do not specify the intent for those open spaces.

Mr. Chinnock requested additional information regarding the current parking provided on the site.

Mr. Will responded that although that information also has not been provided at this point, it would be required for the Concept Plan.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he assumes a traffic study will be done. Traffic will be a major concern with this plan, as the current level of traffic is already heavy. Pedestrian safety between the AMC Theater to the Bridge Park area is also a concern. This development would be a benefit to the area, but there are some logistical questions that need to be considered before the project advances significantly.

Mr. Will responded that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is not required within the Bridge Street District (BSD), as a TIS study was completed with the initial rezoning of the Bridge Street District. The circulation and safety, however, are definitely within the Commission's purview to consider.

Mr. Chinnock inquired the number of building stories of the previously approved plan for this site.

Mr. Will responded that it was a 4-story building.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the four stories included the podium level.

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired the height limit on the corridor building type.

Ms. Rauch responded that the maximum height of a corridor building is six stories.

Mr. Supelak inquired if other stipulations existed with the corridor building type.

Ms. Rauch responded that the corridor building type requires that the parking not be visible; it must be fully wrapped within the building. That is not what is proposed with this development.

Mr. Fishman stated a 4.5-story building is permitted in the District. If the intent is to have two levels of parking, could those levels be provided underground?

Mr. Will responded that the parking could be provided below-grade. The Code counts only stories above grade.

Mr. Fishman stated that a building could be 4.5 stories high, and the required parking could be provided below ground level.

Mr. Way inquired if all the area within the scope of work was the same as the site being reviewed tonight.

Mr. Will responded that the applicant has indicated that this application likely would be part of a multi-phase redevelopment. The most refined piece of the development concept is the A and B areas with townhomes and podium apartments, as well as the expanded and modified parking lots. Mr. Way stated that the parking is intertwined, so it would have to be considered, as well. Additionally, it is only a portion of a bigger development, which is very challenging to understand.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, stated that he is representing Stavroff Land Development's interest. Matt Stavroff is present, as well as Michael Fite, F2 Companies. Mr. Underhill stated that this is an early stage of a multi-level review process. When the Bridge Street visioning plan was adopted, a long-term vision for this property was one of the drivers for that greater visioning effort. Over time, the Center has deteriorated for a number of reasons, including economic conditions and the rise of on-line retail. The Stavroff Company then purchased the property and stabilized it, although the applicant does not believe the property is at its highest/best use. Although they have stabilized the property and it is an amenity for the community, they would like to improve upon its use. The anticipated re-development of this property will occur in stages over a period of time. Therefore, the parking provided for this particular stage may be only temporary. In addition to the existing street network, there are many existing buildings with useful life remaining. Business decisions that must be made make the re-development more complex. They have attempted to identify the right land use and maximize a smaller amount of land by developing vertically and leaving open opportunities more likely to materialize when there are more residents living here in a walkable area. Retail, entertainment and restaurant uses are viable here, and the remainder of this site will largely consist of those uses. The applicant is looking forward to the Commission's feedback on the questions suggested tonight.

Matt Stavroff, Stavroff Land Development, 6689 Dublin Center Drive, Dublin stated that they have been a part of the Dublin community since 1981 and have watched it grow from a suburb to an incredible community. At one time, Dublin Village Center was a very vibrant place; however, it always lacked visibility and proper access for retail development to succeed long-term. As soon as the opportunity arose, their tenants moved to the other side of the road. The AMC Theater within the Center is the best in central Ohio. Stavroff purchased the Center in November 2009 amidst the financial turmoil in the market. At the time, it was 50% vacant, and half of the existing tenants were noncompliant. The following 3-4 years, they attempted to define the best development to pursue, and they developed a working relationship with The Edwards Company. Although an apartment community had been approved, at that time, Dublin did not have an agreement with the Schools that allowed for the type of revenue necessary to provide the public infrastructure for the type of prescriptive development defined by the BSD Code. That Code is flexible in some ways but very prescriptive in other ways. They have cleaned up the area, and it is vibrant today. He is proud of their tenants. He wants to advance the proposed development to benefit most of the existing businesses. However, they must honor certain legal agreements that are in place, including a reciprocal easement agreement. They have parking obligations to the AMC movie theater. The renovations completed a few years ago to that theater breathed new life into Dublin Village Center. Although the area is doing well, it is underutilized; there are presently a vast number of parking spaces on the site. The proposed infrastructure will not only benefit their property but the community, as well.

Mr. Underhill stated that the questions posed by the Commission concerning the open space and building types will be investigated as the project advances.

Mr. Schneier stated that the dilemma is that the Commission is being asked to provide comments on part of a larger unknown development, and the applicant may not yet know what that will be. To what extent is the applicant able to provide a holistic concept of where the development may go from this point?

Mr. Stavroff responded that he assumes he is asking what they have planned for the entire development of 50 acres, not just the proposed 4-5 acres.

Mr. Schneier stated the proposed development would anchor this area for that future development. Will the next buildings be taller or shorter? The Commission would be creating a precedent here without a vision of what else is contemplated.

Mr. Stavroff responded that they have global land plans for an entire development. Sharing those plans might provide some clarity, but he is not confident how closely they would be adhering to them. Their plans of seven or eight years ago for retail development have changed dramatically; they are now looking at residential, hotel and restaurant uses. The challenge is the existing conditions. Improvements have occurred which have significant value, but some are performing at a higher level than others. Older cities have formed over time, in a quirky, eclectic manner, not planned perfectly. Eventually, this development will be a combination of existing, improved and newer buildings.

Mr. Way stated that this can be an eclectic redevelopment, but there must be a plan for that. The Commission is not comfortable with just letting it happen. It is necessary for the Commission to follow the guiding documents for this area. The anticipated development is for a larger area, which may not fit within the road grid. It is difficult for the Commission to understand where the applicant is going with the redevelopment. He commends them for having a vision for the future and taking on this endeavor. He believes mixed-use is the correct direction. A residential use would be appropriate here. People living within Dublin Village will significantly change the dynamics of it. His question is if it is the intent that, ultimately, there will be a plan that follows the planning documents that have been the vision for this area, including streets and open spaces.

Mr. Stavroff responded that they can provide the Commission with a plan, but the market will dictate their future direction. It is imperative, however, to extend John Shields Parkway through their site for it to succeed. It would benefit Bridge Park, as well, facilitating out-of-City visitors' access from the interchange to the District. Currently, there are many visitors to the Bridge Park District. There is a need for more efficient access to the District, or eventually, there will be traffic issues. They can provide more information about their global plans for the area at their next review.

Mr. Way stated that there are elements of this proposal that do not embrace the City's plans for this area, so the Commission needs some assurance that the applicant is paying attention to those guiding documents. John Shields Parkway, for example, is a major through street, so how will the proposed building address that street and make it a frontage street? The intersection with Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway is a gateway, so it is important how the development, including the architecture, will respond to that gateway. Although an Informal Review is very preliminary, he is interested in knowing how this development will be responsive to the elements of the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Stavroff stated that they are paying attention to the Code; however, Dublin Village already has existing elements with value. They are hopeful that Code compliance does not prevent their being

able to improve their existing development. Because 100% Code compliance is not possible, there will be a need for some waivers to the Code.

Mr. Chinnock stated that it will be important to provide better understanding of the vehicular and pedestrian traffic with the next plan review. Are the proposed building heights essential?

Mr. Stavroff deferred the question to the project architect.

Michael Fite, F2 Companies, 1550 Lakeshore Blvd, Columbus, stated that the building height is tentatively seven stories. There are many site nuances involved with the project, including a 10-foot grade change. Significant articulations in the building, patio spaces and various architectural elements will soften the feel of the seven stories. The proposed 3-story townhomes on the western edge will present a "step up" to the taller building. The parking in the podium building will provide parking for future uses. The bottom level will provide parking for the theater and other retail spaces, and the upper level will provide parking for the residential units within the building.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is an open space requirement, which does not include impervious surfaces.

Mr. Fite responded they have submitted a diagram depicting concrete vs. green surfaces. They recognize that the intent is that the space be usable open space, and the open space provided in this plan will be usable. It is important to consider the overall 50+ acres project area, and not this 5-acre parcel separately. The diagram they submitted depicts a substantial usable open space within the middle of the larger project area. In the future, the currently private plaza area in front of the theater could be designated as part of the public open space system. They see John Shields Parkway as being an open space connector, and they envision a north-south greenspace in front of the Revelry. The intent is not to solve the open space requirement of this site only, but for the greater project area as a connected and usable open space.

Mr. Supelak stated that the space depicted in the diagram is not yet thoroughly planned. Open space must be integrated within the City fabric, which includes its street network. Although it is not possible to predict the future, the Planning Commission and developers attempt to plan for the future in a flexible manner. At this point, the project does not mesh with the City's fabric. Three sides of the building show a 2-story parking garage, which is not consistent with a pedestrian-oriented district, and the thoroughfares and open space are not articulated. The open space depicted demonstrates that the site is presently over-built. Their intent to grow vertically will require approval of a building type waiver. The question for the Commission is whether this project would add vibrancy to the pedestrian nature of this District.

Mr. Fite stated that a major pedestrian and bicycle connector of greenspace and parkway will be John Shields Parkway. It is their intent to continue what has been done to the west through this site. The extension of McCune Boulevard between the apartment buildings will have a pedestrian-oriented streetscape.

Mr. Fishman stated that he recalls that the consultants involved with the development of the Bridge Park District plan warned against letting Bridge Park become too big. What is the vision for Bridge Park? Does the City want something similar to downtown Columbus or Chicago, or is the vision for a district that looks like Dublin? The consultants stated that because the District was being zoned with the minimum amount of greenspace, it would be essential not to give up even a small amount of that. The plan also indicated a maximum building height of 4.5 stories. Has that changed and

do we now want 7-8 story buildings? Doing so would result in a different look for this District. What is the intent for the remainder of the development? Will that include another block of 250-unit, 8-story buildings? That would result in a significantly different look for the District. He cannot be convinced that there is a need for building heights greater than 4.5 stories. The parking can be provided underground and the buildings could be 2-3 stories in height. There are many such underground parking garages. While he appreciates their efforts, it is the Commission's task to require what is best for Dublin. In summary, he sees no need for buildings higher than 4.5 stories nor a need to sacrifice any greenspace. As emphasized by the consultants for the District and Planning staff, the plan for this District calls for street-oriented buildings, which encourage walkability. To date, developers have attempted to propose that type of development. He feels very strongly about both the height and greenspace elements.

Mr. Stavroff noted that the previous plan by Mr. Edwards was approved for the site.
Mr. Fishman stated that he does not believe the plan advanced to a Final Development Plan.
Mr. Stavroff responded that site was platted, however.

Ms. Rauch confirmed that the site plan was approved, so the development is now at a point equivalent to a Final Development Plan.

Mr. Stavroff stated that the Edwards' plan reflected one, very large, 4-story building with street-facing sides. Their intent was to improve that plan and propose something more interesting.

Mr. Fishman responded that he believes this plan will be better than the previous plan, but, as the consultants emphasized, the maximum building heights cannot exceed 4.5 stories.

Mr. Supelak stated that the City made the decision to align development in this District with that plan.

Ms. Harter inquired if the proposed building would be a large obstacle blocking the sight line for people wanting to access the area.

Mr. Stavroff responded that the view down John Shields Parkway is unhindered, and he does not believe that will change. The road will curve, however, which may create some challenges at the same time as being interesting.

Ms. Harter inquired if condominiums rather than apartments might be a possibility for the site.

Mr. Stavroff responded that he believes that could be an option, as well. Pulte is developing approximately 100 condominium units to the west, which they will be observing. He anticipates they will be successful.

Ms. Harter stated that car dealerships have frequently parked their excess cars in the Dublin Village Center parking lot. Could that be a future problem?

Mr. Stavroff responded that they do not anticipate it will be a problem. The excess parking has met temporary needs for the dealerships.

Ms. Harter responded that it could present a problem for the dealerships in need of the parking, and she is concerned about the Commission receiving future requests for remedying their situation.

Mr. Stavroff responded that he does not anticipate that occurring, as the auto sales industry also is changing.

Mr. Way inquired if it is the applicant's intention to redevelop the entire Center during the next 20 years.

Mr. Stavroff responded that it is; however, they are not in a hurry. Their intent is to do it correctly.

Mr. Way inquired if over that expanse of time, the present one-story shopping center could become a multi-story, mixed-use development.

Mr. Stavroff responded that he anticipates 20 years in the future, the development will be much different. While redevelopment could occur quickly, market conditions will dictate the timeframe. They have continued to invest in the Center, because they care about this site.

Mr. Underhill summarized the points that he had heard from the Commission. The land use seems to be satisfactory; the proposed building height is an issue, but if done correctly, the proposed density is not an issue. It is important for the applicant to have the Commission's feedback on the extension of John Shields Parkway. It is essential to ensure the Commission is supportive of its extension, as that element would drive subsequent decisions. They have heard the Commission's views on the building heights, but the architecture would be articulated in an artful manner. He would ask the Commission to be open-minded on that element.

Mr. Fite stated that the proposed height is important. He has had the opportunity to see the view from the rooftop of the Pharmor building, and the view westward down to the river valley is beautiful. They would like to maximize the number of people who can enjoy that view. Limiting the building height to four stories, would limit the number of views. He is confident in their ability to make a 7-story building great.

Public Comment

Mr. Rauch responded that one public comment was received preceding the meeting and included in Council members' meeting packets.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak noted that seven questions were provided for the Commission's discussion.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission must have a Conceptual Plan for the whole development. He finds it difficult to review it in a piecemeal fashion. In response to the questions, he has no objection to the proposed land use and number of residential units. However, significant work must occur with the street network and circulation, and a parking plan will be necessary. The proposed building heights are a two-sided issue. Building heights might relate to future surrounding buildings and, therefore, make sense, but a 6-7 story building across the street from 3-story buildings, and from there, one-story buildings would not appear to fit within the area fabric. He would encourage the applicant to consider how the edges of the proposed development would transition to the surrounding development. It is too early to comment on the proposed massing and architectural character. However, the organization of the proposed U-shaped blocks must provide building faces along John Shields Parkway, which recognize the importance of that street. Much work needs to occur on the open space element, which presently is not clarified. In general, the layout of the two residential blocks appears to be taking the right direction.

Mr. Fishman stated that he is supportive of the proposed number of residential units; however, he is not supportive of varying from the Code. He has no objective to the street network, but there is significant work to do to make the buildings street friendly. As has been emphasized previously, the intent is that this be a walkable community. He is concerned about the parking. Does the theater have sufficient parking?

Mr. Will responded that the theater currently has sufficient parking. As the development plan is refined, that element will be reviewed to ensure that it meets Code.

Mr. Fishman stated that street parking is not desirable. He has already expressed his objections related to building heights, and it is too early to comment on the massing and architecture. He is adamantly opposed to any fee in lieu of open space. He is not supportive of the site layout. As expressed by Mr. Way, the buildings must face the streets. He is concerned about deviating from the Code requirement regarding height in any way with this initial development, as that will set a precedent for subsequent development on the site. He drove the site earlier and was impressed with how much a 7-story building would change the character of the District. While the developer would produce a good product, it is essential to adhere to the Code created for this District with the input of professional expertise. Consultants warned about the importance of maintaining the amount of greenspace, building heights and pocket parks delineated by the Code in order to ensure that the District resembles Dublin.

Mr. Chinnock responded he is in agreement with those comments. Driving up John Shields Parkway, the building heights will be even more exaggerated from the lower view. That is an important consideration. He is supportive of the concept. We do not necessarily want this to be an extension of Bridge Park, which does not reflect the Dublin character. It is important not to set a precedent for greater building heights and density. It is important to adhere to Code and reflect the Dublin character. For him, it will be necessary to look at the larger concept for the development before commenting further on the project.

Ms. Harter expressed agreement with the comments offered by fellow Commissioners. The Commission is supportive of their interest in redeveloping the site, but it will be important to move slowly. She would be supportive of their consideration of an opportunity for condominiums. If apartments are pursued, she would like to know how expensive they might be. She is supportive of the land use but concerned about the number of units. Contacting the school district would be advantageous to the applicant. She is supportive of the proposed street network, although much work remains to be done with it. In regard to the parking -- covered parking is preferred, so she is supportive of the stacked parking. It will provide a close and safe option for the theater. She is concerned about the large building that is proposed. The proposed height would be impactful to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The open space is very important, including the pedestrian connection aspect. In regard to building heights — there could be issues for safe evacuation of the residents of that building. She appreciates the applicant's efforts to communicate with the public and inspire further communication.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is generally supportive of fellow Commissioners' comments. Dublin Village Center and the Metro Center are the two greatest opportunities for redevelopment. He would encourage the applicant to think broadly and differently about this project, which has unique opportunities because of its location and size. He is supportive; however, of not following the Code at all if the project merits it, if it presents an opportunity to make a statement for the next 20+ years in Dublin. He is not adamant about building heights. It is too early to make a call on that item, as he would prefer to see what else is proposed. He would encourage them to do something incredibly grand. The applicant controls so much property, that they could make it the next place that people want to come to in Dublin. This is a grand opportunity. If there is one item on which he is not flexible, it is the fee in lieu of. The Commission is more interested in greenspace as a subset of open space. In regard to height, density, uses – all have options, if accompanied with the right WOW factor.

Mr. Supelak stated that the property owner has been successful in breathing life into the floundering development. The residential development advancing up the hill from Bridge Park is becoming closer and, eventually, will become enmeshed with the Dublin Center site, which will be a benefit. The proposed residential element of this plan has merit, and the Commission is supportive of that use. He agrees with Mr. Schneier. The Code is in place for a reason, but we recognize when an application warrants not following the Code. The Commission can potentially support such a project if it is earned. The Commission is not supportive of a fee lieu of, although a certain portion of the Commission could be supportive of centralizing the open space within the greater development. That would require provision of a broader plan. It is important to see how the development could mesh with the City fabric. He is concerned about the massing and height, but his primary concern is with the project's inward-facing character. The center boulevard where the units face each other is where all the pedestrian action is. On the other sides of the building, pedestrian traffic would be next to the parking garage, which will not encourage pedestrian traffic. There are ways to improve that element for the benefit of the greater District, as it becomes more residential. Presently, the project has configuration, open space, layout and scenic thoroughfare issues. Perhaps the buildings could provide mixed use on the lower level. It is important to focus on the pedestrian nature and how to generate energy in the District, as opposed to placing residential units at such heights upon a podium. The project recognizes the value of the east-west streets, particularly John Shields, but the development should also solve the north-south street needs. Currently, there are many dead-ends and barriers that do not interact with the City fabric, but focus only on the internal site interaction. Consequently, the project is closed and uninviting, an inward-facing experience. The site needs to be integrated with the City. In summary, the street network and pedestrian level need improvement; the building height and massing are elements to be earned; the fee in lieu of is discouraged, so the open space should be improved; and the units should be angled toward open space. Improving those elements would produce a more holistic project. Context matters.

Mr. Will requested clarification. Does the Commission's request for a larger project framework apply to the street network and any deviations therefrom?
Commission members responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak thanked the applicant for their efforts with this site.

5. Higher Ground Montessori School at 6000 Memorial Drive, 22-031AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Mr. Supelak stated that this an application for review of site and building modifications to accommodate a daycare within an existing building on a 1.21-acre site, zoned Planned Unit Development District, Muirfield Village, located northwest of the intersection of Memorial Drive and Muirfield Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that is a request for review of an Amended Final Development Plan for the Higher Ground Montessori School. This building was constructed in 1979 as Office Use, is zoned in the Muirfield Village PUD, but defaults to the standards of the Suburban Office District. The site is fully developed with parking provided to the west and north. Sole access to the site is from Cromdale Drive to the south. [Views of the site shown.] The parking lot will be modified and the

existing sign removed. This is a daycare use that will fill the existing office building. The applicant is proposing two outdoor recreation areas, which will aid the daycare use. The larger recreation area will be 3,470 square feet and be located south of the building adjacent Cromdale Drive. A 1,870 square-foot recreation area would be located on the northwest side of the building, fronting Muirfield Drive. Outdoor recreation areas are regulated within the Suburban Office District. One of the use requirements is that they be located to the side or rear of the principal building. Because the site has three frontages, the only buildable area for outdoor recreation space would be within the area depicted. This area is currently built out with a drive access to the parking area, so there is very limited opportunity to add these recreation areas on the site without redeveloping the site entirely. A text modification of the PUD is requested for the proposed location of the two recreation areas. Although construction of the south recreation area would necessitate removal of four existing parking spaces, the application would meet the parking requirements. An update of the lighting plan is proposed. The landscape plan proposes the removal of 11 caliper inches of protected trees on the site, replacing them with a mix of evergreen, deciduous and ornamental trees. The required screening of the play area will be provided by evergreen and deciduous trees. The applicant also is required to provide one tree per 30 linear feet of fence. Images of the proposed play equipment were provided in the meeting materials. As required, the colors of the items will be subdued earth tones. The applicant is proposing the addition of an elevator within the building, which requires a minor modification to the west (side) elevation roofline. The roof penetration is minor in scale, and does not increase the height of the building. The elevator improvement will be finished in wood shake shingles and lap siding to match the building. Additionally, a new window will be added on the west elevation for one of the classrooms. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing ground sign located on Memorial Drive and install a new ground sign further north, at the intersection of Memorial and Muirfield Drive. The proposed ground sign will be 15 square feet in size and approximately 3.5 feet in height, meeting Code size requirements. It will be two colors, bronze and tan, and be constructed of non-illuminated aluminum panels and aluminum square posts. Staff is requesting revision of the sign design to provide a monument base clad in stone to match the building. Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Text Modification and the Amended Final Development Plan with the five stated conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Fishman inquired if the applicant had obtained plan approval from the Muirfield Design Review Committee.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes the applicant has been working concurrently with that committee.

Applicant Presentation

Lionel Kraft, Palos Verdes Capital Land Group, Managing Principal, 1767 Moose Hollow, Draper, UT, 84020 stated that they have been working with the Muirfield Association and after several revisions, they have approved the current site plan with two conditions. One condition was the play equipment colors, as shown in the image. The visual of the canopy shown is tan, but it will actually be a Hunter Green, to match the slide, consistent with Muirfield Village requirements. The second condition was that the signage meet the setback requirements. With those conditions, they have full approval of the fence, sign, playground and site plan.

Mr. Fishman inquired if all exterior modifications were approved by the Muirfield Association.

Mr. Kraft responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier stated that the proposed sign is metal rather than wood, yet all the Muirfield signage is wood. Is that a concern?

Mr. Hounshell responded that the signs are reviewed per the City's standard sign code, which do not require the signs to be wood. The Muirfield Association may have different requirements; however, they reviewed and approved the proposed sign.

Mr. Boggs clarified that the City and the Muirfield Association have their own zoning, design and development standards. Neither enforce the standards of the other.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is customary that an applicant within the Muirfield Village PUD obtain approval from the Muirfield Association before the Commission reviews and approves the application. If the applicant has done so, he has no objection. He assumes they approved the metal sign.

The applicant responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if the 11 trees that are proposed for removal are located along Muirfield Drive. If so, what is the reason for their removal?

Mr. Hounshell showed the Tree Preservation Plan.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the Muirfield Association had approved the landscape plan.

The applicant responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter indicated her question had been answered.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the existing versus the proposed sign location.

Mr. Hounshell showed a slide depicting both locations. The applicant cannot use the existing sign within the right-of-way, as it is larger than what they will be permitted. The new sign must meet current compliance standards and will be located at the intersection. It will meet the minimum setback requirement of 8 feet on both street frontages. The proposed sign meets City Code requirements and was also approved by the Muirfield Association.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the sign location depicted as #22 on the diagram.

Mr. Hounshell responded that he believes it is a Muirfield Village sign.

Mr. Kraft confirmed that it was a Muirfield Village sign.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the two canopies were classified as accessory structures, and if so, do they meet the Code's maximum size requirements.

Ms. Rauch responded that they are not considered accessory structures. They are considered part of the building.

Mr. Kraft thanked the Commission for their time. The Montessori school is excited to be adding a location within Dublin. Their nearest school location is located in Powell, Ohio.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman inquired if the landscape screening would hide the playground equipment.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the proposed screening meets Zoning Code requirements. Only the color requirement has yet to be met.

Ms. Harter inquired if the play equipment could be seen from the road on the south side of the site. If so, perhaps arborvitae could be added to the screening.

Mr. Hounshell clarified that the applicant is not required to screen the play equipment. However, their landscape plan provides some trees on the south side of the site.

Mr. Fishman noted that if the Muirfield Association approved the landscape plan, he has no concerns.

Mr. Schneier stated that there is also a daycare facility located to the west, which has playground equipment visible from the road. He has no objection to this proposed project.

Ms. Rauch responded that the applicant has met the City's Code landscape requirements for the project. She would like to clarify Mr. Bogg's earlier comment. If the applicant met Muirfield Association's requirements, but the City's Code requirements were greater, the applicant would be required to meet the City's requirements.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Minor Text Modification:

- 1) Modification of the development text to permit outdoor recreation areas associated with daycare, adult or child uses to be located forward of the building approximately 40 feet along Cromdale Drive and approximately 8 feet along Muirfield Drive for the property located at 6000 Memorial Drive.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0]

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with 5 conditions:

- 1) The applicant select a subdued, earth tone color for the shade structure, canopy, and surface of the play area, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The applicant finalize the lighting plan, meeting all Code requirements, prior to submittal of a building permit, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The applicant continue to work with staff to finalize the landscape plan, subject to staff approval;
- 4) The applicant revise the sign design to provide a monument base clad in stone to match the building and to provide the required sign landscaping, subject to staff approval; and
- 5) The applicant restore the area along Memorial Drive where the ground sign is being removed.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Rauch reported that at Council's meeting on April 18, 2022, staff shared the Commission's proposed approach re. Single Family Residential Development Standards. Staff is working on additional revisions per Council feedback. They have requested that the proposed Code amendment be brought back to the Commission for additional review.

- The 2022 Central Ohio APA Annual Planning and Zoning Workshop will be held at the Knowlton School of Architecture on Friday, May 20, 2022. Registrants are able to select the sessions they wish to attend. Mr. Way will be leading one of the sessions. Contact the PZC Clerk to register.
Ms. Martin noted that the plenary session will also include Ms. Rauch, and the keynote presentation topic will be LinkUS.
- The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, May 19, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Mark Supelak
Vice Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal
Assistant Clerk of Council