



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 16, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the June 16, 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 from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. The City is interested in accommodating public participation to the greatest extent possible.

ROLL CALL

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

Staff members present: Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Chris Will, Tammy Noble, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot, Heidi Rose, Nicholas Eastham

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

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

[Motion approved 7-0.]

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. Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases.

TABLED CASE

1. Veterinary Emergency Group at 3800 Tuller Road, 22-056WR, Waiver Review

A request for a Waiver to reduce required street-facing transparency along Tuller Road on a 1.87-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, located northeast of the intersection of Tuller Road with Dublin Center Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for a waiver to reduce required street-facing transparency at 3800 Tuller Road. The 1.87-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, is located northeast of the intersection of Tuller Road with Dublin Center Drive. In February 2022, the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed and approved a Minor Project Review (MPR) for exterior modifications to the site for a new emergency veterinary hospital. In May 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) tabled a Waiver Request to storefront transparency for opaque window film. The Commission expressed concerns with the window film design and its integration with window signs, if proposed. The proposed window film location is on the windows on the west façade of the building facing Tuller Road. The existing building resembles a Commercial Center building type, which determines the façade transparency requirements. Since the previous meeting, the applicant has modified their previous window film design to a white, partially opaque window film applied to the interior of the windows. The film contains a vertical stripe pattern, which permits 61% light transmittance, where a minimum of 65% is required. It will extend the full height of the storefront window, integrating it with the architecture and concealing the internal wall against the windows. The applicant is not proposing any window signs with this application or a future application for signs. The revised modifications to the window film will reduce the transparency of the windows on the west façade to 29 percent. Upon the tenant vacating the premises, the waiver to transparency will not extend in perpetuity for future tenants. The waiver criteria is either met by the proposal or not applicable. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval.

Applicant Presentation

Ashley Schulz, Director of Design, Veterinary Emergency Group, 55 South Broadway, White Plains, New York, stated that they are proposing an amended window film approach, which they believe addresses the Commission's concerns. The film has been changed to be more aesthetically pleasing and has been extended full height across the windows on which it is operationally needed.

Commission Questions

Ms. Harter inquired if a new tenant wanted to keep the window film, would that option be available? Ms. Mullinax responded that any future tenant of that space also would need to submit an application for a transparency waiver for Commission review.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the interior wall would be finished, as it would be partially viewable.

Ms. Schulz responded affirmatively. The view would be of a fully finished wall.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if the partial opacity transparency requirement would, consequently, be irrelevant.

Ms. Mullinax responded that due to the waiver, it would be irrelevant.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that with the condition, the request appears reasonable.

Commissioners thanked the applicant for being responsive to their concerns. They expressed no further concerns.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of a waiver of the Section 153.062(O)(7)(d) requirement of a 65% transparency for street-facing buildings to reduce the street-facing transparency to 29%, with the following condition:

- 1) Upon the Veterinary Emergency Group tenant vacating the premise, the window film shall be removed and the waiver to storefront transparency shall not extend to any future tenant.

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

[Motion approved 7-0]

INFORMAL REVIEW

2. Stoneridge Lane Apartments at PIDs: 273-012289 & 273-012288, 22-068INF, Informal Review

A request for a multi-family development consisting of 69 units with 137 parking spaces on a ±3.11-acre site, zoned Planned Unit Development District, Stoneridge Village, located southwest of the intersection of Stoneridge Lane with Braelinn Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for non-binding feedback from the Commission on the proposed development. The site is comprised of two undeveloped parcels located within the Stoneridge Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) District. It is surrounded by existing development, including Sunnysdale Estates to the west, Martin Commons to the south and Office and Institutional Uses to the north and east. The eastern parcel is largely vacant; the western parcel is heavily wooded; and a 50-foot electrical easement traverses the site. Established in 1988, Stoneridge Village (Ord. 112-88) accommodated three, 1.5-story office condominiums along Stoneridge Lane and a 165-unit senior living facility along Martin Road. In 1995, it was determined that the senior living facility was not viable, and the 10 acres along Martin Road were rezoned Martin Commons (Ord. 95-22) to facilitate development of 72 townhomes with 202 parking spaces and 2.33 acres of open space, i.e. Martin Commons Park. The office condominiums were never constructed. These sites are zoned PUD. The sites to the north are located within the Bridge Street District, which has different zoning standards and future land use recommendations. The sites to the east and west are zoned R2, Limited Suburban Residential District. The Future Land Use for the site is Mixed Residential, High Density of up to 10 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is for two apartment buildings, 3 stories in height. One access point is located off Braelinn Drive. Parking is located to the north, east and west of the building, as well as between the buildings under the AEP easement. Additionally, there is a private pool amenity, a fire lane to the south of the buildings, and 137 surface parking spaces. The plan proposes a total density of 22 dwelling units per acre with a parking ratio of two spaces per unit. The conceptual architecture depicts hipped roofs with a combination of masonry, cladding and siding. The Commission is asked to consider the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Commission support the proposed land use and density?
- 2) Is the development compatible with the surrounding land uses and established character?
- 3) Does the Commission support the proposed site layout including building placement, parking configuration, open space and natural features?
- 4) Other consideration by the Commission.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Future Land Use plan allows potentially 10 units/acre.

Ms. Martin responded that it allows for a minimum of 10 units/acre.

Mr. Schneier stated that the minimum number of units is 10. Is the maximum number of units not stated?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. The Community Plan recommendations are responsive to the Bridge Street District to the north, providing a transition to lower density townhomes to the south.

Mr. Way stated that the Community Plan refers to a mixed-use residential, town center. How is a town center defined in relationship to this site?

Ms. Martin responded that the entire Bridge Street District's Future Land Use classification is intended to be mixed-use urban, walkable town center. The Future Land Use for this site is responsive to that, but does not replicate that character.

Mr. Way inquired if an open space requirement existed in the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) on the site. No open space is proposed with this project.

Ms. Martin responded that there is a requirement for open space in the subdivision regulations. Typically, as part of a PUD process, open space is negotiated. This PUD originally provided open space. The expectation is that additional open space would be provided on-site, should this proposal proceed.

Mr. Supelak stated that the site is currently zoned PUD. Should this proposal proceed, those PUD requirements would be revised for a new PUD.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. The new development would require a rezoning from the previous PUD to a new PUD, unless the applicant were willing to develop the site with two office condominiums, as permitted by the existing PUD.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if a traffic study had been completed and any traffic issue discussion occurred.

Ms. Martin responded that any rezoning for a PUD requires a full Traffic Impact Study (TIS). If the Commission were supportive of the proposed land use, the applicant would be required to complete a TIS.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if any other site access was contemplated in addition to the existing access.

Ms. Martin deferred to the applicant to respond to that question.

Applicant Presentation

R.J. Sabatino, Development Administrator, T&R Properties, 3895 Stoneridge Lane, Dublin, 43017, stated that T&R has owned the property for several decades. The site was originally zoned for 165 residential units and was later rezoned to Office. Over the years, T&R Properties has submitted a variety of proposed uses for the site, but staff was not supportive of the uses. Subsequently, they determined to submit a proposal, which is consistent with the City's Future Land Use Plan. Their proposal is for a 3-story, 69-unit apartment building. Northwest of the site are similar uses with 2 and 3-story residential unit buildings. Directly adjacent to the east is the T&R Properties building; to the south is Martin Commons Park and the Braelinn condominium community; to the west is the Lily Mar Court subdivision. Conceptual architectural renderings created by Humphrey Partners were provided in the meeting packet. Both 1- and 2-bedroom luxury units are proposed, as well as a swimming pool and fitness facility and clubhouse.

Commission Questions

Mr. Chinnock restated his question regarding contemplation of an alternative site access.
Mr. Sabatino replied that alternative site access has been considered, and they are willing to work with staff should a different access be desired.

Mr. Way inquired about the existing pathway on the north side of the residential development to the south. Is it located on that development's property?

Mr. Sabatino responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the relationship between the fire lane and that path.

Mr. Sabatino responded that their intent is to maintain the connectivity to the path as a benefit to potential future residents.

Ms. Harter requested clarification of the clubhouse location.

Mr. Sabatino responded that it would be integrated into the eastern building. A couple of units would be replaced with a leasing office and resident amenities.

Ms. Harter inquired if they would be located near the pool area.

Mr. Sabatino responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired if there would be covered parking or garages.

Mr. Sabatino responded that adding garages or covered parking would be an option.

Ms. Harter inquired if the applicant has had any conversations with the neighbors within the area.

Mr. Sabatino responded affirmatively. They have reached out to the adjacent neighbor in the Lilly Mar subdivision, Ms. Terry Bettinger. They are willing to continue any public dialogue with the neighbors.

Mr. Way stated that the information indicates two parking spaces per unit are proposed, but 50% of the units are one-bedroom. He inquired the reason two spaces per unit were proposed.

Mr. Sabatino responded that there would be additional parking spaces for guests and the property manager. However, this is only a Concept Plan, and the site plan, including proposed parking spaces, is approximate; changes may be made.

Mr. Chinnock stated the proposal significantly exceeds the minimum density per acre. Was less density considered?

Mr. Sabatino responded that the City's Future Land Use Plan reflects 10+units/acre. Although this proposal exceeds that density, it is substantially less than many other apartment communities within the area. Many apartment communities today have 200+ units to be economically viable; however, they believe this development can succeed with the proposed density.

Mr. Fishman stated that two parking spaces are proposed for each of the 68 units, or 138 parking places, which this proposal essentially reflects. Are there any garages?

Mr. Sabatino responded that the current site plan for this Informal Review does not reflect garages; however, they anticipate adding covered parking, and perhaps some garages.

Mr. Fishman inquired how many of the parking spaces could become garages.

Mr. Sabatino responded that he does not have that information at this time. He noted that in regard to the staff report reference to heavy brush on the western parcel – recently, they had an arborist visit the site, who confirmed the vast majority of the brush was understory shrubbery or low-grade trees.

Public Comment

[Email comments received prior to meeting]

Lauren Alexander, 3006 Glenloch Circle, Dublin:

"I have lived in the Braelinn Green community for about two years, I am writing to express my opposition for the proposed development project on Stoneridge Lane. I am deeply concerned about how a development project of this magnitude will affect my family, neighbors and overall community. I am concerned about the increase in vehicular traffic, destruction of natural land, noise pollution during construction, and beyond. A three-story apartment building is inappropriate and uncharacteristic for the area. For example, of the condos in Braelinn Green, homes along Martin Road, Lilly Mar Court and the offices to the east, none of the buildings are above two stories. Further, the proposal plan cites that currently, there is an unpaved road to the south and there is need to further pave. Adding a road to the south would be destructive to the already small Martin Commons Park, making it even worse by connecting Ardenlee Court to Martin Road. Ardenlee is not currently a public road; it is owned by Braelinn Green and should not be used as a connection point."

Cynthia Babione, 3039 Glenloch Circle, Dublin:

"I wish to express my concern for the land development of Stoneridge Lane Apartments. This project will destroy and devalue the surrounding properties. I have owned my Braelinn Green condo since 2005 and was very disappointed to hear of the plan. The Martin Road Park, walking path, mature trees and the surrounding neighborhood of Sunny Dale Estates will also be affected by this project. The two apartment buildings will create more traffic, parking, people, children, pets, noise and crime. Most of all, the Braelinn Green condo owners who have units directly on the property line will experience the most adverse conditions, loss of privacy and safety. I am most adamant about voting this project down! Aesthetically it is all wrong. Progress and creating more apartments is not always the best for communities."

Terri Bettinger, 3100 Lilly Mar Court, Dublin:

"This plan adversely affects all areas surrounding it. It destroys all of the natural features including the existing mature trees; eliminates the connected walking paths between Martin Commons Park and the surrounding areas; provides zero buffer/setback/transition to the existing communities; the only open space is 137 parking spaces. It by far exceeds current density/intensity. The proposed 2-story buildings is excessive; 3 stories each is extreme; the bulk and height of the buildings is completely incompatible with the surrounding structures and settings; it is intrusive and deteriorates the essential residential character of Sunny Dale Estates. In my opinion, this development diminishes the neighborhood and its value."

Donald Blosser, 6266 Ardenlee Ct., Dublin:

"My wife and I have lived at our current address for 22 years and love it. We knew when we purchased it that someday the adjacent land would be purchased, and we accept that. The only thing we want is compatibility with the neighborhood, which is well maintained and quiet. Listed are a few things that, in my opinion, cause concern: 3-story buildings; no garages; many one-bedroom apartments; no direct exit to Stoneridge Lane; using Braelinn Green as the only exit will cause ingress and egress problems for the apartment folks, as well as the Braelinn Green drivers; many one-bedroom apartments with no garages would impact our property values."

Virginia Cermelj, 3056 Dunlavin Way, Dublin:

"25 years of having peace, quiet & tranquility.... would be destroyed by a 3-story apartment building..."

Ron Gardner, 3051 Glenloch Circle, Dublin:

"I believe in the City of Dublin and their review and understanding of the needs for growth and the provision of opportunities for the citizens and businesses and education and public spaces. Therefore, I am against this proposed multi-family development.

1. Dublin - commit to GREEN - outdoor space! This small space should be kept to have mature trees, attract birds and wildlife and walking paths for Dublin citizens.
2. The space is too small for ~ 70 units and ~ 140 parking spaces. The Ohio State University offices across the street parking is often full and people are looking for more parking.
3. There is increasing car congestion in this part of Dublin. There is no need for housing in this small acreage. Let's celebrate one of Dublin's reasons for living here - open green spaces - mindful of Dublin's green environment. Invest in this space and celebrate the achievement and help promote Dublin growth including public outdoor spaces."

Bryan Griffith, 3852 Carberry Drive, Dublin:

"Please hold this applicant to the same high standard as other Dublin apartments have been held. Here is my list of concerns with this application:

- 1) No indication in application how the facility will deal with trash disposal. This applicant has a poor track record of handling trash disposal at The Residences at Scioto Crossing, with many instances of trash left overflowing onto the ground, creating a public health hazard.
- 2) The fire lane for a 3-story building needs to accommodate the heavy equipment needed to get a ladder truck to 3rd story residents.
- 3) The parking should be enclosed, or interior to the structures, placing the more attractive building adjacent to the neighbors, rather than parking cars right next to the neighbor's properties.
- 4) Parking should be required to meet code at 2.5 spaces per unit. It is unfair for the applicant to assume they can park on the street, or use neighbor's parking lots without permission. Perhaps street parking should be prohibited along Stoneridge Lane.
- 5) Many of the units are going to be tiny, much smaller than any other apartment I have ever seen in Dublin, at less than 600 square feet. This appears to be some of the first truly urban dwellings like the tiny NYC apartments that are the butt of jokes. While I sympathize with those who need affordable housing in Dublin, increasing smaller and strangely configured spaces will be out of place in Dublin. Is there a minimum residential square footage required by the zoning code?
- 6) 22 units per acre is much higher density than the surrounding neighborhood."

Bruce Hamler, 6256 Ardenlee Ct., Dublin:

"I am one of 72 residents of Braelinn Green Condominiums who rely on the two means of ingress and egress, primarily Braelinn Drive. Your proposal would add an additional 69 apartment residents trying to utilize Braelinn Drive to access Stoneridge Lane, basically doubling the traffic of this community. The size and number of living levels (3) indicated is not in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood's residential look, and no garages are included. This will make it look like a parking lot next to a three level apartment building looking down on our community. Given the living space size and lack of parking garages, these units are being developed for lower-income families, which along with the above issues will have a negative effect on our property values."

Wendy Joye, 6254 Braelinn Drive, Dublin:

"This is regarding the informal review of a multi-family development consisting of 69 units and 137 parking spaces located at the intersection of Stoneridge Lane and Braelinn Drive. I have lived in the peaceful community of Braelinn Green Condominiums for 23 years, and the thought of apartments being built next door to our community is unsettling. We are not a gated community, so the traffic through our community will most likely increase, as those residents will most certainly cut through our private property to get to Martin Road. Aside from that, it will eliminate walking paths, nature and a buffer of mature trees. This would be an intrusive structure that will diminish the character and value of the residential community we all love. I am surprised that Dublin would consider this project, as the City of Dublin seems to care about the appearance of the City and surroundings. A better use of this space would be to develop a gathering area/park with a gazebo, benches, trees and flowers to enhance the surrounding properties. I am not in favor of this current proposal. Please vote against this development."

Farheen Kapra, 3071 Glenloch Circle, Dublin:

"As an owner and resident in the Braelinn Green Condominiums and in the immediate neighborhood of these proposed projects, I am completely opposed to the development of these projects for the following reasons:

1. It will destroy the natural cover in this neighborhood and lead to destruction of mature trees.
 2. It will impact the peaceful quietness of the adjoining neighborhoods, including the one where I live.
 3. It will detrimentally impact the serenity and use of the public park, Martins Commons Park.
 4. It will eliminate or negatively impact current walking paths.
 5. It will provide no transition or buffer to existing neighborhoods.
 6. It will completely destroy the residential character of my neighborhood and devalue our property.
- Please do not allow these new developments to impact the quality of life for residents of this area, who, like me, have enjoyed the quietness, natural features and character of my neighborhood and other adjoining neighborhoods. In light of all the above reasons, I oppose these developments."

Erin King, 3154 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin:

"There are three points I'd like to make:

1) PRESERVATION OF NATURAL FEATURES:

The application statement from T&R Properties fails to include or consider the single-family residences located west of the site in the adjacent, Sunny Dale Estates, a community that has been in place since the 1950's. This neighborhood features 22 houses with over 1 acre of providing mature trees and a habitat for the surrounding wildlife. The eastern parcel 273-012288 of 1.5 acres is heavily wooded, and the proposed plan does not include any preservation of natural features or tree-lined screening for Sunny Dale Estates. Our neighborhood features coyotes, deer, foxes, raccoons, skunks, possums, bats, and various other wildlife species. Just one single bat in that heavily wooded area can eat 1,000 insects every hour while hunting or remove 6-8,000 bugs each night. We are talking about clear-cutting 1.5 acres of heavily wooded mature land adjacent to a Dublin Park, Martin Commons Park, to build 69 new apartments. AEP was required to do a wildlife study as part of the Bethel-Sawmill Transmission line rebuild project (currently bisecting the proposed site) to understand the impact this new line would have on the wildlife as part of the 1.5 acres in question. Why was it important enough when AEP planned to run their lines through that area to require them to do a study to understand the impact on wildlife, but not now? Contemplate the impact cutting down the entire 1.5 acres of trees would have.

2) OPEN PUBLIC SPACE ACTIVE PEDESTRIAN ZONES: "High density mixed residential developments, where appropriate, create walkable and active pedestrian zones." The proposed plan features a maximum density plan of 22 units/acre, which more than doubles the current rate of 10 units/acre, while offering no additional pedestrian zones or community spaces. The proposed plan features a fire lane completely bisecting and cutting off the Martin Commons Park and its nearby residents from the existing walking path. The proposed plan by Humphries & Partners, while schematic, does not mention anything about re-connecting the path back for sufficient pedestrian walking, nor does it mention the addition of any shared public open space or active pedestrian zones for the community. What does the community gain from this project?

3) IMPACT ON DUBLIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: In January 2022, redistricting discussions took place in Dublin City Schools, and this email was received in March from the Hopewell Hawk News: "We have enrolled over 100 new students to Hopewell since the beginning of the school year. As a result of our continued enrollment, we are over capacity and will be shifting some students next fall to Olde Sawmill Elementary and Indian Run Elementary." School district overcrowding is a serious problem for the Dublin City School District, including Hopewell Elementary (less than 3 years old), the preferred school the children at these new Stoneridge Lane Apartments would attend. Just this spring, they redistricted kids away from Hopewell due to overcrowding. Where would these children go to school?"

Hilary Kirchner, 6400 Braxmar Pl., Dublin:

"I reside at 6400 Braxmar Pl., which is part of the Sunnysdale Estates neighborhood adjacent to the west of the proposed Stoneridge Lane Apartments. We have lived in this neighborhood since 2014 and have enjoyed the Martin Commons Park and the pathways around PIDs:273-012289 & 273-012288 almost daily since we moved in. While my husband and I don't oppose the development of these parcels outright, we do have some concerns about the current plan:

1. The Removal of the Public Walkway: It is unclear from the plans whether the walkway that goes from Martin Road through Martin Commons Park and around Braelinn Drive and Stoneridge Lane will be retained. We ask that the pathway remains intact to improve walkability and a sense of community within the neighborhood.

2. Rentals vs. Homeownership: 1-2-story condos would be preferable to a 69-unit apartment building. There is a major housing shortage, and many people are priced out of homeownership. As Dubliners, we should do what we can to make homeownership a reality. It would be great if there were more opportunities for Dublin residents to be homeowners. A smaller, affordable condominium neighborhood would also do a better job of maintaining the homey feel of the Martin Rd. residential area.

3. Environmental Impact: Part of what makes this little corner of Dublin so wonderful is how close it is to amenities at Sawmill and Bridge Park while still feeling spacious and close to nature. The parcels in question fortunately have a lot to do with this. The wooded lot is a home for all kinds of wildlife from deer with fawns to hawks and even the occasional coyote and bald eagle who stop by. Not to mention the grassland is a perfect home for pollinators like bees. I am concerned that the proposed development includes too many buildings and parking spaces and would have a negative impact on the wildlife of the area. I recommend the development be decreased in size to retain some of the woodlands and meadowlands, or at the very least require a thorough environmental impact study to ensure any development has minimal impact.

4. Traffic Congestion: If Stoneridge Lane Apartments moves forward as planned, the 4-way stop at Martin & Dublin Center/Krier needs to be re-evaluated, as does the intersection of Martin & Riverside Drive. At rush hour, these intersections get extremely backed up; there are accidents there every month. The added traffic of over 70 more households will make these intersections

even more problematic. We ask that the developer and the City do traffic studies and add traffic lights or other measures to minimize congestion and increase safety.”

Anthony Kirchner, 3275 Lilly Mar Ct., Dublin:

“While some higher density housing being built on this vacant lot might be a good use of the land, this overall site plan seems short-sighted, not designed with the community in mind. There are several features of this area that it does not take into account, specifically the amount that the parking encroaches on the residential lots to the west and what appears to be a removal of the existing multi-use trail. Regarding the western edge of the property, at a minimum, a tree lawn with mature trees and hedge should be preserved or installed between the parking lot and the residential lot. The current design maximized the parking and units and disregards the surrounding neighborhood. The western plot could be redesigned to sufficiently accommodate it.”

Ellie Kirchner, 3275 Lilly Mar. Ct., Dublin:

“As a citizen and taxpayer living in Sunnysdale Estates, I want to share some concerns about the Stoneridge Lane Apartments project. I'm not opposed to high density living in this area, but these plans take out way too many mature trees, and decimate the bike path that I use on a regular basis with my kids, making our desirable walkable area much less walkable. Martin Commons Park needs an upgrade, if this developer is going to cite it as a reason to not need green space (an actual playground is needed, as there are enough kids in the area. The apartments would just bring more kids). Perhaps this project could be scaled back or shifted to allow more mature trees and lively wooded areas to be kept in this area, or throw the idea out altogether. The City could acquire this empty lot and put a playground here instead.”

Lindsay Lee, 3155 Lilly Mar Ct, Dublin, OH 43017

“ The current proposal regarding the Stoneridge Apartments and the rezoning to High Density Residential would negative impact my residence along with the entire Sunny Dale estates in the following ways:

1. The increase in traffic would be catastrophic. With the implementation of the 161/riverside roundabout has already increased the amount of traffic crashes in and around our neighborhood. Let alone the volume of traffic increase on Martin Rd. Adding 69+ units would only add to this problem. You can count on an additional 2 vehicles per unit in addition to any guests they have. Getting in and around our neighborhood will be that much more difficult.
2. The quiet neighborhood we all love will be ruined with the addition of these units. The destruction of mature trees and quiet streets will be non-existent by adding these units. Please note we have lived in our home for 11+ years, before there was a Bridge Park and the hundreds of apartments and condos that were created by that addition. Cramming such a large number of units into a three-acre plot of land will destroy the make-up of this section of Dublin. Please consider building these behind what is already at Bridge Park and their open fields.
3. Finally, consider the human aspect of what this addition would bring. Would you want this in your backyard, where you would sit and drink a cup of coffee or relax? Rather, you look at a three-story apartment complex with a bunch of noise and additional people.
4. If you decide to move forward with this, I respectfully request a larger privacy fence be put in place to block out the sight and the noise.”

Catherine McQuade, 3260 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin OH 43017

"Thank you for allowing us to comment. Looking at the City of Dublin and the Dublin City School limits for the high schools, I notice one thing – most of the apartments in Dublin City Schools feed into Dublin Scioto High School. After completing our sessions on the Dublin Diversity Committee, one thing we concluded is that there is a very big economic disparity between the three high schools. One of those reasons is the large number of apartments in the Scioto High School district. With apartments comes more transient families as well. I have had two kids graduate from Scioto and I have two kids in the school now. The diversity in the school is AMAZING! Having grown up in Dublin, this was a big reason we bought our house where we did. However, are apartments what this area of Dublin needs? My answer would be no. If you poll the apartments in the area - Stoneridge Court, Scioto Commons, Sawmill Ridge, Grafton Park, Sawmill Crossing, Bent Tree Apartments, Dublin Square – many are not filled to capacity. It does seem that more apartments is what this area needs. It would be more beneficial for Dublin to invest in a field in which kids could play soccer, football, lacrosse and rugby -- an open space like that near Coffman Park. Just one field would be great and it would be right next to our small community park that has a small bike path and climbing structure. Even some small office space would be nice, but not apartments."

Nicholas Price, 3186 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin OH 43017

"I think that approving this project will adversely affect the current residence of the neighborhood, especially since there is no plan on leaving any green space between this project and current residences. I would support the zoning changes if it was to make single family living homes and not multi-family homes."

Megan Robinson, 6250 Braelinn Drive, Dublin, OH 43017

"As a resident of the community, I implore that you to not pass this zoning proposal. This proposed development would not be compatible with surrounding land, as it would destroy the natural terrain. Many residents enjoy peaceful quiet walks in the park and pathways this land provides. A new development here would destroy this established character. This would additionally bring more cars, congestion and noise to this quiet area, and impact property values for current residents. Multi-family apartments are not presently permitted under the existing zoning. Please protect and keep this area as is for the residents of the community."

Tina Searcy, 5328 Greenmont, Dublin, OH 43016

"Every building around this property are 1 or 2 story dwellings, so this 3-story building will tower over every other building around it. I cannot imagine any nearby homeowners endorsing this plan, as it would probably highly diminish the value of their properties. Walking paths will be built over, and a serious number of mature trees would be lost to this plan, affecting wildlife and residents. The huge amount of additional traffic is going to negatively impact the area. I'm sure there are dozens of options for the property development that would not adversely affect communities near it. Please deny this request."

Thomas Steele, 3052 Dunlavin Way, Dublin, OH 43017

"The project has extraordinarily high density for residential living in Dublin, outside the Tuttle West area where modest income housing is located. Such density will exacerbate the traffic problems in the morning with the OSU Health office and the traffic servicing the Reach Educational Building on Stoneridge Dr. Sixty-nine units on 3.3 acres is too high of a density for the adjoining residential area. Nearly 170 parking spaces are planned for this small parcel. All the one-bedroom apartments are smaller (<810 sq. ft.) than anything offered in the City limits, most of which are under 760 square feet; the two bedrooms are also just over 1,000 square feet. This is small even by New

York and San Francisco standards. 50% of the units will be one-bedroom, which will mostly likely be attractive to cash-poor young adults. The developer uses the term "luxury"; these are far from luxury. Luxury apartments have substantially larger units, better finishes and much more amenities than offered by this project. These very small units are targeted at young adults with very limited funds. A detailed study on the impact to our local schools should be independently undertaken. The property should remain in the office zoning category. If there were to be a change, residential housing similar to the condominiums to the south could be permitted with the maximum of 16 to 24 units."

Grant Bettinger, 3120 Frobisher Ave., Dublin, OH 43017

"This plan has an adverse effect on the entire surrounding area, as well. First is the destruction of the natural wildlife; it sits directly next to a park, which would be terrible for the community. Many people feed the stray cats, birds, squirrels and enjoy the calmness and beauty the grown trees provide, bringing a sense of security and calm to the community. It would also impede the walking paths that run all across that park that lead to the retirement community and connect many residents to the park itself. Second, the disruption that it would bring to the neighborhood and other communities would be substantial. The traffic between Krier Drive and Martin Road often is not too bad. The amount of traffic that the proposed plan would cause would be overwhelming to the lone 4-way stop that links the communities. The construction directly behind a residential neighborhood, would also cause significant disruption to daily life for any that use their home as an office or workspace. Especially in these times, being able to feel comfortable in one's own home is incredibly important. Third, this proposed plan for apartments is far too large for the area. There are no other buildings in the immediate area that are three stories tall. This directly affects the privacy and security of the residents of other communities surrounding this proposed complex. In short, this complex is unnecessary. Dublin already has plenty unoccupied apartments located directly off Sawmill Road, and this development would immediately reduce the value of the surrounding properties. The local residents are in firm opposition to this complex near their homes, and the destruction of the natural wildlife and trees would be a massive blow to the area's aesthetic and sense of community."

Ms. Martin read into the record an additional public comment email received:

Jonathan Bruffy, 2994 Glenloch Circle, Dublin:

"My wife, Christie Bruffy, and I are whole-heartedly against the proposed development of the land at Stoneridge Lane & Braelinn Drive. As per the proposal, such development of that land would eliminate considerable green-space and numerous mature trees, adversely affecting the wildlife present in the area, and ultimately diminishing the value of our residence. Furthermore, such a development would greatly exacerbate the traffic and noise issues already present along Stoneridge Lane and Dublin Center Drive. I understand that these properties are likely to be developed, but there are many other uses of this space that would not create the issues that this proposal introduces."

Public Comments

[provided in meeting]:

Bryan Dutro, 3220 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin:

Expressed disagreement with the proposed property use, for all the reasons stated previously. He believes there are better ways to use this property. They have lived in this area for ten years, and when we ask ourselves what would fit well here, what has been presented is not consistent. While

there may 2 and 3-story buildings in the area, that does not mean similar buildings should be continued. There is a character to the area, and something complementary to the area is needed to ensure a good greenspace and preservation of the neighboring properties.

Filemino Flor, 6267 Braelinn Drive, Dublin

Stated that she has lived in this location for 18 years, and has experienced a couple of break-ins. The most important issue is safety. In addition, the height of the proposed building will devalue the existing properties. Something different is needed. The 3-story building, increased traffic and noise are a concern to the residents.

Virginia Surmel, Braelinn Concominiums

Stated that she has lived in the Braelinn Condominiums for 25 years, and it is a very nice place to live. The area has been maintained in pristine condition. The homes are sold even before for sale signs can be placed. The residents enjoy the greenspace, walking trail to the park and the river. Those elements would be eliminated. This is an adult community, many single, elderly people. She is very concerned, as her property will back up to the proposed fire lane. When she moved in 25 years previously, she asked about the adjacent area. She was told that perhaps in the future, office development might occur, which could be 2-story buildings. The offices would be open regular business hours, none on weekends. However, the proposed buildings are 3-story and would result in an increase of traffic travelling through their neighborhood as a shortcut to Martin Road. Has this proposal already been decided, or is there any real opportunity for the residents to have an impact?

Cindy Solar, 3200 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin

Stated that they recently moved to Dublin. Dublin has always touted its greenspaces. She hopes that the Commission's vote is consistent with that. Although Dublin is growing, it is not necessary to lay cement over every inch of it. There must be a balance of its residential and commercial areas. Sunny Dale Estates is a small oasis; Dublin is losing all its little oases. Dublin should not permit its smaller neighborhoods with nods to the past disappear. The roots of Dublin reflect smaller houses on larger lots within small neighborhoods. Dublin was a village for many years. She hopes developments respect the residents that have been here for many years.

Terry Bettinger, 3100 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin

Sunny Dale Estates is a nice community, and the development that has occurred around Sunny Dale Estates has been outstanding. It has created a healthy transition between the residential community and the different zoned districts. Within the community, it is difficult to recognize that the surrounding area is commercial property, as the planning and development of it has been excellent, up to this point. She is opposed to this development. Besides its physical attributes, location and configuration of the building, its bulk and height is intrusive to the surrounding community. It is not harmonious with the existing development. The density is high and includes 137 parking spaces. She has surveilled the surrounding community and assessed the context of the community. There is a National Church Residences facility, a Sunrise Senior Living, and the Villa LaScala apartments. For those three communities comprising 10 acres, there is a total of 137 parking spaces. Additionally, there is also a very high tree to parking space ratio. Besides the physical attributes, the proposed plan fails to preserve the existing natural features; it does not promote connected communities or open space. The western parcel of the site is 1.5 acres of heavily wooded mature trees, which is a home for a significant wildlife population. The preservation of natural issues is her biggest issue with this property. The development will be very disruptive

visually and physically due to the resulting light, noise and traffic. The Hopewell Elementary School sent out a newsletter recently that stated they had enrolled 100 new students since the beginning of the school year. As a result, they are over capacity and will be shifting students next fall to the Old Sawmill Elementary and Indian Run Elementary. This development would add additional stress to the school district. In her view, the proposed development does not match the tenets and principles of the area; it is very incongruent.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock thanked the residents for their time and comments. It is helpful for the Commission to hear their concerns. He is also concerned with the density and traffic impact. He is also concerned about the character of the proposal. Dublin has had many great developments, and he does not believe this is where it should be yet; that is not saying it cannot get there, but the plan definitely needs some work at this point.

Ms. Harter stated that this area needs some updating, and that will happen in the coming years. That does not necessarily mean more residential density. She is concerned about the proposed height -- the nearby office structures are lower in height -- and the greenspace. The concept does not differ from what is typical. The architecture would really need to be improved. If the intent is that this be a walkable community, the architecture would not entice anyone to the area. The buildings are too high and do not have elevators, which would be needed by some people. The proposed parking has been placed around the perimeter. There are more creative ways to include it. There is no covered parking nor garages, which should be considered. With Ohio winters, most people prefer covered parking. There is insufficient open space and surrounding amenities. What is proposed is very different than the concept of luxury apartments.

Mr. Way stated he appreciates hearing from the residents of this community. He drove around the area and could see that this community has a very attractive setting; the park is very beautiful. The residents can be very proud to call this their home. This piece of property has a current zoning that permits office to be built on it. Due to the recent pandemic, however, the office market has been negatively impacted. Therefore, he would be supportive of a residential development. Wherever there are opportunities, residential should be considered. When he viewed the area, he noted the low density of the surrounding community, both residential and office, which has a sense of scale and materials that fit the landscape. A concept that is inconsistent with that is going in the wrong direction. Although he is supportive of a residential use, it needs to be designed with the intent to fit into the context of the surrounding environment. The proposed height exceeds the surrounding building heights. He would be supportive of a residential concept if it were more compatible in scale and massing with the neighborhood. That change would result in a lower density. The existing development is 6-7 units/acre; what is proposed is much higher. 10-12 units might be possible, if designed well. The concept reflects the traditional way of looking at this type of development -- apartment builds are located in the middle of the site and surrounded by parking spaces. In the original PUD with office structures, the office buildings were pushed up to Stoneridge, which created an architectural character along the street. That is much more appropriate than setting buildings back on the site and surrounding them with parking. He would encourage the applicant to re-consider the configuration of the site, pushing the buildings closer to Stoneridge and handling the parking differently. In the future, fewer people will be driving, but using other modes of transportation. We need to consider reducing the amount of parking. The parking is taking up a large portion of the site. Although there is a great park in the area, this site needs to incorporate an appropriate amount of open space, not only for the people who will live

here, but for the greater neighborhood. The woodland is a unique feature and is a home for wildlife. It would be preferable for the applicant to preserve some of that woodland. By reducing the amount of the parking and relocating it, that should be possible. It would be best if the preserved woodland is adjacent to the existing park.

Mr. Schneier stated that he agrees with his fellow Commissioners' comments. It is important to recognize the legitimate concerns. The property will be developed at some point, so what is now vacant will not remain vacant. We are considering the character of what will be developed on the site, which is zoned for a certain type of development. Because there is a surplus of office space, he agrees that a residential development would make sense. However, the proposed density is an issue. It is important to look at the surrounding, existing development character. We are holding developers to a very high standard. The intent is that developments be unique. There is an opportunity to do that here, proposing something that the surrounding neighbors will believe looks great. The applicant needs to come up with concepts that are not the traditional infill apartment complex of parking surrounding an island of buildings. Greenspace should be included in a way that is complementary and attractive to the surrounding area. In summary, the proposed development should be unique but also blend with the surrounding area and its transitional character.

Mr. Fishman stated that he agrees that the development of this site should be residential, but does not think it should be a three-story building with 137 vehicles surrounding it. That is not consistent with the character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is unique, containing condominiums and offices. Dublin has a history of its existing subdivisions eventually becoming surrounded by even more attractive development. That is what we should expect to see for this neighborhood. The existing neighborhood is very nice, and any new development should not only fit the character of the neighborhood but also be something of which the residents can be proud. The development should have similar, low-level residential units, not three-story buildings. It should have garages, landscaping and take advantage of surrounding greenspace and wooded area. He is not supportive of the proposed density. The proposed 20 units is not compatible with the 10 units permitted by the PUD. A 3-story building surrounded by 137 cars is not compatible with the existing neighborhood; therefore, he is not supportive of the proposed layout. The only change to the PUD that might make sense is a change from office development to residential. Such a residential development must be very attractive and have garages, greenspace and amenities.

Mr. Supelak stated that he concurs with many of his fellow Commissioners' comments. The proposed residential land use development would be appropriate here; however, the proposed density is a concern, although something higher than what exists might be possible. The PUD is a set of rules for the site, and developments thereon should align with those rules. The proposed overall development is uncomfortable. It has 4-6 dead-end streets; would have pavement closely abutting the surrounding residential development on the west side; and a fire lane would be extended across the property. The proposed architecture is average, not potentially unique. Perhaps the PUD rules could become flexible if some of the elements were revised into a more compelling and agreeable site design. The proposed land use is acceptable. There is existing multi-family within the area. The Sunrise building within the area is a sizable development, but it has a robust buffer and greenspace and therefore is more sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood. The pedestrian path must be preserved and replicated. The Commission always advocates for connectivity throughout Dublin.

Ms. Call stated that she concurs with many of her fellow Commissioners' comments. Global changes have occurred during the last few years. There are potential uses other than office, such as civic, health, school and daycare uses. Therefore, she would not be in favor of adopting a PUD for a residential development in this area, unless it is stellar, conducive and complementary to the surrounding neighborhood. We want Dublin to remain as appealing as it was 25 years ago. The Commission shares all of the neighbors' concerns. The proposed application is intense and dense. Regardless of whether the interior of the units are luxurious, the development is not complementary to the surrounding uses or to Dublin. In the Commission's assessment, the proposed land use density is too high for a residential use in this location and is not compatible with the surrounding land use. The site layout is less imaginative than we would look for if we were considering a residential PUD in this area. Due to open space and natural features, this site is a gem for whomever develops it.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant requested any additional input from the Commission. Mr. Sabatino indicated they did not.

Mr. Fishman noted that it is a tradition in Dublin that a developer meet with the neighbors to the proposed development, as part of their process. Commissioners are influenced by the neighbors' comments. He would recommend the developer do so before proceeding further. Ms. Call reiterated his recommendation.

NEW CASES

3. Vista Church at 5626 Frantz Road, 22-082CP, Concept Plan

A request to permit Religious or Public Assembly and associated uses within an existing commercial building on a 6.67-acre site, zoned Mixed Use Regional 4 – Llewellyn Farms Office District, located northeast of the intersection of Parkcenter Avenue with Frantz Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble stated that the Concept Plan proposes a use that is not currently permitted in the District in which the 5626 Frantz Road site is located. A Concept Plan is the first step of a potential Rezoning, Preliminary and Final Development Plan. This is a proposal for a rezoning to accommodate a religious organization and associated uses on a 6.67-acre site located on the east side of Frantz Road, north of Parkcenter Avenue. The site is zoned MUR-4, Mixed Use Region. In December 2021, City Council approved a rezoning to MUR-4, Mixed Use Regional – Llewellyn Farms Office District. This site is located within that District. The surrounding uses are primarily Office to the west, south and north, and Residential to the east and south. Staff and the applicant are working with the surrounding residents regarding this proposal. The site currently is developed with a two-story, 43,384-square-foot building and approximately 445 parking spaces. Presently, the building is vacant. The site has a right-in-right-out access point off Frantz Road and a full access point off Bradenton Avenue. Sidewalk extends along the east side of Frantz Road and west side of Bradenton Avenue. The applicant has been working with staff for a considerable length of time, even when it was zoned PUD. The site has since been rezoned to MUR-4. The applicant is proposing a religious use for the site. Because that is not a permitted use, the applicant must submit a rezoning application. The primary use of the site would be a religious use with ancillary permitted uses that include day care, counseling services, and a food pantry, all of which would be incorporated in the existing building. The applicant is not proposing any modifications to the site

other than modifications that occur with new users such as sign improvements. The anticipated congregation for the church would be a maximum of 350-500, with services once on Sundays. There would be a potential for mid-week gatherings. The daycare would accommodate 25-30 children. The food pantry is proposed as a temporary use on the site. The counseling service would be provided in traditional office hours. The following questions are proposed for the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Do the proposed uses meet the objectives of the Community Plan including the Dublin Corporate Area Plan?
- 2) Are the proposed uses compatible with the surrounding community?
- 3) Are there operational considerations or use specific standards that the Commission recommends?
- 4) Is the Commission supportive of a rezoning for the property?
- 5) Any other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way inquired if there was a reason a religious use was not included as a Permitted Use in the MUR-4 District.

Ms. Noble responded that the use was not necessarily excluded. The Permitted Uses were minimized. The Suburban Office District permits approximately 80 uses, while the MUR-4 District permits 9 uses. The District focuses on the Office use, being conscious of the neighboring communities it abuts.

Ms. Harter stated that there is a Montessori daycare use in the area. Is the applicant also interested in potentially adding a daycare use in this facility?

Ms. Noble responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way inquired if staff has identified any potential challenges with the existing building for the proposed uses.

Ms. Noble responded that all of the uses proposed are common for a religious use. A daycare would need an outdoor space, but staff would work with the applicant to locate that in a sensitive manner.

Mr. Way inquired if there were any regulatory issues such as those related to amount of paving, or impervious surfaces. The initial structure occurred in 1980 and many of the existing requirements did not exist at that time. Would the current requirements be imposed, if the site were to be rezoned?

Ms. Call noted that some of those requirements might be water quality and stormwater mitigation.

Mr. Hendershot stated that if the applicant is not making any site modifications, they are not subject to stormwater management requirements.

Mr. Way stated that there would be changes to the flow of the traffic due to the hours of use.

Mr. Hendershot responded that if the project were to proceed, a traffic study would be required. They would consult with the Traffic and Mobility division regarding the specific requirements for this application.

Mr. Fishman inquired if this would be a permanent use. The associated uses might require play equipment, which would impact the exterior of the building

Ms. Noble responded that the religious use would be a permanent use. There are some questions regarding the potential ancillary uses. At this time, no site modifications are proposed.

Ms. Harter inquired if, with the Traffic Impact Study, the City would make recommendations regarding the ingress/egress to the building site. Which entrance would be recommended? Mr. Hendershot responded that the Traffic Impact Study also looks at access management.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, stated that he represents the applicant, Vista Community Church. This application has an interesting history and is the reason they are proposing a PUD versus another type of application. Pastor Mike Smith is present and will be able to address questions related to operations. The church has been present in the community since 2007. They have been meeting in Jerome High School and have not had a permanent home. They were looking at this property before the pandemic, and were unable to come to a lease price agreement. During the discussion process, however, this site was rezoned and did not include a religious use. The church was not informed by the property owner of the Code revision occurring, which did not include religious uses. Consequently, they have been engaged with City staff and the neighborhood on the proposed use. The general consensus seems to be that the use makes sense, but they had just completed a lengthy process, which did not include this use. There was little interest in deviating from the Code so soon. However, due to the fact that this property is positioned next to a residential community where churches are often located, and in the Suburban Office District, churches are Permitted Uses, they believe the proposed use is appropriate on this site. Because altering the Code would have ramifications for the greater area, staff recommended filing a rezoning request for this site only. They would incorporate the MUR-4 Code by reference and add the religious use. That preserves the opportunity for the site to be used in the future as Office. Although a PUD permits some site modifications, no exterior site modifications are proposed, other than signs and perhaps re-striping the parking. There may be opportunity in the future to add greenspace on the site by removing some of the parking area. There is one update; however. The proposed temporary use for a food pantry is no longer needed, as they have found another permanent location. The other proposed uses would benefit the community and help the church to grow. Counseling services and daycare uses currently are permitted on the site. The traffic impact of this use would be less than that of an office building with peak traffic hours of 8 am and 5 pm. The primary use of this building would be primarily on Sunday.

Public Comment

John Phillaman, Llewellyn Farms Civic Association president, stated that the civic association board voted not to support the Vista Community Church rezoning request for two reasons. The community was recently engaged in a rezoning effort of this District for over three years. The MUR-4 achieved what the residents desired. Although they empathized with the applicant, and a religious use had been a Permitted Use prior to the MUR-4 rezoning, the request was not timely. Before the rezoning was approved, ample opportunity was provided for any interested party to participate in the associated discussion process. Essentially, the applicant is requesting a re-do for this specific property. We do not want to set that precedent, which will encourage future requests for zoning carve outs. Although the intent may not have been to exclude religious uses, at this point in time, we have a new zoning law with which we need to comply. The question for the Commission is if the religious use is consistent with the intent of the MUR-4 District.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Way stated that he understands that there was a lengthy rezoning process and a resolution was achieved to which the City agreed. However, this is a vacant 1980s office building. He is questioning whether an office tenant will want that building. He suspects it is a market challenge, which is the reason it is vacant. Seeing a use in this building, and having it no longer vacant, would have a positive impact on the area. He has no issue with the religious use. It was on the table previous to the adoption of the MUR-4 Code. He is supportive of continuing the existing conversation with the applicant. He believes the use would fit the building, site and greater area. He appreciates the applicant's comment about potentially moving some parking and increasing the greenspace. He would appreciate conversations about how this site could be improved and become a better asset to this part of the community. He is supportive of the proposed use because of the history associated with it; however, he is unclear about the process. Would approving this use permanently include it in the MUR-4 list of uses or approve it only for this site?

Mr. Boggs stated that the reason the applicant is proposing a PUD for this site is to avoid having it added to the MUR-4 District. If something similar were to arise in the future, it also would include specific review by the Commission. As proposed now, rather than a text amendment to the use table for the MUR-4, we are looking at a potential PUD that would allow religious uses and adopt the MUR-4 by reference for this site only. Any property owner has the ability to come before this body and staff to try to undertake the rezoning of their property. While that can be frustrating for the neighbors that were involved in work of the MUR-4 process, that would not factor into the deliberation of the Commission on this application. The Commission needs to consider the planned district criteria and compatibility.

Mr. Way inquired if, even though not be approved for the entire district, the precedent would still be an encouragement to do the same.

Mr. Boggs responded that an applicant could always make that argument, but any application would have to stand on its own merits. There would always be different site characteristics.

Mr. Way stated that due to that clarification, and the history of this application, he is supportive of the Concept Plan.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it would be more appropriate to make this a Conditional Use.

Mr. Boggs responded that he does not know if making it a Conditional Use in the MUR-4 would be advisable or not, as we don't have that type of application for review.

Ms. Call noted that making it a Conditional Use would apply to the greater MUR-4; it would not be specific to this application. As it is being approached, the application is narrowed to this single parcel.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is divided in his position, because the MUR-4 rezoning was initiated by the City for the neighborhood property owners. He is supportive of this use but is concerned about the process. If we make a change, it is essentially negating our earlier agreement. He believes the use is appropriate but is unsure of his position on the rezoning.

Ms. Harter stated that this is an opportunity that should not be missed. The site has been vacant for approximately two years, and now there is an opportunity to fill it. She is supportive of the proposed use. She is encouraged with the possible changes that could be made to the site, i.e. the greenspace. The church has been a good tenant at Jerome High School and has had a positive presence within the community. Having them locate to this permanent location would be good.

Mr. Fishman stated that if the Commission approves the different use, he assumes that the existing MUR-4 zoning would remain. Staff has indicated that the proposed rezoning would be more narrow than a Conditional Use. In similar situations in the past, the Commission has added a Conditional Use to the zoning. If the property owner vacated the site, it reverted to what it originally was. He does not believe a use should be changed based upon the fact the building is empty. The use must be compatible to the site and meet all the requirements. Although Office is the preferred use, he believes the church is a compatible use; it will generate less traffic and have other positive impacts. At this point, he is tentatively supportive of the Concept Plan.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he believes this is a compatible plan and a good use for the site. He believes the decision should not be made solely on not setting precedent. The Commission needs to be adaptable. There is a vacant building on this site, and there is much less need of office space. In such cases, changing the zoning to accommodate what we believe is a good use would improve the use of the property. In his view, there are more positives than negatives with the proposed use.

Mr. Schneier stated that there was an earlier reference to process over substance, and while the Commission would advocate for substance over process, we are following the prescribed City rezoning process. We are not setting a precedent by considering a rezoning matter. He believes both logic and equity call for this use in this particular circumstance with these particular facts. He is not concerned about the precedential nature, because a rezoning always has its own particular specificity. The next rezoning case within this area will have to stand on its own merits, as is occurring here. He, personally, has no concerns about the merits of this proposal. He is supportive of the Concept Plan moving forward.

Ms. Call noted that her employer is moving nearby to 5555 Frantz Road. She echoes Mr. Schneier's comments. The Commission is asked to judge this application based on certain criteria. In regard to the proposed discussion questions, the use is not only compatible but also complementary. It will have less of a traffic impact on the area. Complementary uses will lower the overall intensity of the neighborhood. Each application must be judged on its own merits.

Ms. Call stated that no action on the Concept Plan is requested. She inquired if the applicant desired any additional input from the Commission.

Pastor Mike Smith, 6480 Scioto Court, Westerville, OH stated that he oversees two churches; one is the Dublin campus. He is encouraged and thankful for the process. City staff has been responsive and helpful. Their church has been a part of this community and wants to continue to be a part of it. They are hopeful of locating on this parcel, but would not want to be there if it did not fit, did not work with and was not conducive to the community. He is very glad to hear that the Commission believes that it is. He finds that welcoming. The ancillary uses are proposed because people have expressed an interest in them. That is what they will continue to do in the future -- they want to do things that are helpful, provide a service, and work cooperatively with the City. They enjoy this community; it has been a blessing to serve it.

Mr. Fishman asked confirmation that a change in zoning would be preferable to adding the church as a Conditional Use in the MUR-4.

Mr. Boggs responded that a rezoning is what the applicant has requested. In his view, it accomplishes the objectives of allowing this use on this site and not changing the Permitted or

Conditional Uses within the MUR-4 District altogether. This would be more limited and conservative in the sense of not over reaching. If approved by Council, this building would be a church as long as this organization remains on the site. If they leave, the site would revert to the office use that is otherwise permitted in the MUR-4.

Ms. Call stated that she is supportive of keeping the tree to parking space ratio high and considering opportunities to restore some of the greenery that is native to Dublin.

4. 6801 Village Parkway, 22-041CP, Concept Plan

A request for a conceptual plan for a multi-family development consisting of 184 units with a combination of podium and surface parking on a 3.71-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and located southwest of the intersection of John Shields Parkway with Village Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that a new development in the Bridge Street District follows a three-step review process, beginning with a Concept Plan. The applicant is requesting review and approval, so a determination would be required. If approved, the project would advance to the Preliminary Development Plan application. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway. There is a greenway along the south edge of John Shields Parkway. The undeveloped site lies within a mature stand of trees on the south property line, which demarks the boundary with a City-owned parcel with a shared-use trail to the south. A little further south is Greystone Mews. The applicant engaged with the neighborhood association early in the planning stage. This site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is subject to those standards. The Bridge Street District Code provides a hierarchy of requirements for establishing a gridded street network. The Bridge Street District Code identifies three families of streets: Corridor Connectors, District Connectors, and Neighborhood Streets. Additionally, the Code designated Principal Frontage Streets (PFSs), which contemplate additional design measures to ensure a continuous, pedestrian-oriented block. Village Parkway and John Shields Parkway are both district connector streets and principal frontage streets. Three buildings are proposed. Building A is a 4 to 5-story podium apartment building, with a 260-space single-story parking structure base. Buildings B1 and B2 are 3.5-story apartment buildings with 24 end unit garages. There are an additional 30 surface parking spaces on the site. A total of 314 parking spaces are being provided. For 174 units, the Code requires 260 parking spaces with a maximum of 350, so the proposal meets Code. In regard to the architectural character, there will a mix of vertical and horizontal façade treatments and a mix of roof types. The upper story of Buildings B1 and B2 is a loft style. The proposed building materials are brick and stone; and there will be stoops on the front facades. Access is proposed from John Shields Parkway, opposite the future Grafton Street, which is being constructed with the recently approved Towns on the Parkway development. Waivers would be required for access from a principal frontage street and for the block size. [Discussion of proposed site plan continued.] The applicant is proposing to meet the greenspace requirements via the existing greenway and the pocket park. They will be providing 45,500 square feet where 35,000 square feet is required. The City will comprehensively design the greenway corridor throughout the Bridge Street District. The neighborhood standards design framework recommends a gateway location at John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. The standards also provide guidance on terminal vistas; there are three on this site. Staff has reviewed the plan against

the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Concept Plan with two waivers and five conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired about past approvals of the use of public space as open space.

Mr. Will responded that the greenway has been permitted to meet the open space requirements.

Mr. Schneier inquired if it is staff's recommendation that the applicant not dedicate more of the property for open space.

Mr. Will responded that the recommendation is that the greenway be included with that area where it is consistent with it. They are not indicating that more open space not be provided, only that the greenway be included and be consistent with the other treatments.

Ms. Harter inquired if the mature trees in the neighborhood would remain.

Mr. Will stated that they would remain. The site plan indicates additional plantings would be added, as well.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the property line versus the existing tree line. Many of the trees are on the property to the south.

Mr. Will clarified the portions on this property and those on the City-owned parcel.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the architectural character of the lower-level parking garage in Building A. Will the view of it from John Shields Parkway be screened?

Mr. Will responded that where the garage can be seen, it will be clad in brick.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the height requirements for podium buildings in the District.

Mr. Will responded that 4.5 stories are required.

Mr. Supelak inquired if that would be inclusive of the podium.

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the greenspace provided would be only on this property or if some of it would be on the City property.

Mr. Will responded that it includes the City property, as the greenway is within the City property. The applicant is proposing additional greenspace outside of the greenway.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the aforementioned 45,000 square feet would be on the applicant's property, and the greenway is additional.

Mr. Will responded that it is the opposite. The pocket park, which provides public open space on the site, provides 4,500 square feet. The remainder of the calculation is provided by the greenway, which is City property.

Mr. Schneier stated that if the applicant did not use any of the greenway, they would be required to provide 35,000 sq. ft. of greenspace on their property. However, they are providing only 4,500 sq. ft. on this property. The rest of the requirement would be met by including the City greenway.

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Ms. Martin clarified that the Zoning Code provides that option as an opportunity for the property owner to request. It is specifically for public open spaces that are within 650 feet of the main entrance of a building. Those spaces potentially can be used to meet either a partial or full requirement. The applicant can also attempt to pay an open space fee in lieu, improve an existing

open space or provide the public open space on their site. It is not that they are not meeting Code; it is how they would meet the Code.

Mr. Way stated that the staff recommends that the plan be revised to provide a mid-block pedestrianway to Building A. He requested clarification of the intent.

Mr. Will responded that the intent is to provide that pedestrian connection in the area between John Shields greenway and the City open space to the south. That would reduce the massing of the building and potentially provide another opportunity for open space.

Mr. Way inquired if the intent is that it be at grade, or extended up/over the parking.

Mr. Will responded that is not currently detailed. If the desire were that it be included in the public open space requirement, it would need to be accessible to the public right-of-way.

Mr. Way stated that he believes all the other mid-block connections within Bridge Park are at grade.

Mr. Will responded that there are grade changes, but none that are up/over parking.

Mr. Way inquired if the intent is that there be an at-grade connection through the block that allows publicly-accessible pedestrian movement.

Ms. Martin responded that the condition preserves the opportunity for the applicant to solve with that solution, but perhaps it is not at-grade.

Ms. Call stated that it was mentioned that this would change the massing of the building. Could the same mid-block connection be achieved with a breezeway or another method that would not change the massing of the building?

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if that would impact the block size.

Mr. Will responded that it would not, as it would not be at the public street. These are mid-block crossings.

Mr. Chinnock noted that a waiver would be requested due to exceeding the maximum block size.

Mr. Will responded that the maximum block size will be exceeded because a street would not be added at the required point. That exception is being made due to the existing residential development.

Ms. Martin clarified that a pedestrian connection does not break a block.

Mr. Supelak requested clarification of the proposed density in this District.

Mr. Will responded that 174 units are proposed. The Bridge Street District does not contemplate density, but addresses it indirectly through building type requirements, open space, block sizes and pedestrian crossings.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the terminal vistas.

Mr. Will pointed out the terminal vistas on the site map.

Mr. Way inquired if the corner of John Shields and Village Parkway would not be considered a terminal vista but a gateway location.

Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Aaron Underhill, Underhill & Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, stated that he represents the applicant, Casto Communities. He will provide some history, and other representatives for Casto Communities are present to address the details of the plan. He has been involved with four other projects in the Bridge Street District, and much has been learned. The framework for this last piece within the area essentially is already established. This site was the former Byers Auto Dealership.

When the Bridge Street District was in its infancy and Casto was working on the Tuller Flats development, Mr. Foegler approached them and shared that the City was having difficulty convincing the Byers Auto property owner to negotiate on the acquisition of their site. The site, as it existed, was not consistent with the Bridge Street District vision. Casto succeeded in getting the site under contract themselves, and the contract was assigned to the City with the understanding that at some point in time, it would be transferred back to Casto. Despite the many complexities, a development agreement was eventually approved by Council. Land swaps occurred that allowed Casto to transfer that greenway easement area to the City. In exchange, the City transferred some of its property south of the office buildings to Casto, which enabled them to build east-west on the southern portion of John Shields. The City was able to provide a greenway connection between Riverside Drive up to Village Parkway. In regard to Casto using the greenway to meet some of its greenspace requirements, it was always contemplated that although the City preferred to retain and plan the broader greenway area, it would be part of the Bridge Park development and could be included in its greenspace calculations. John Shields has been designed, built and is now a great public street; however, they are now "painted into this corner." It can be difficult to meet this type of a Code, but they have met most of the requirements. The block length and perimeter issues are due to existing site conditions. The Greystone Mews residents were concerned about protection of the mature trees and, because of the private drive, the extension of a public street at the rear of their backyard. Their intent is to protect the existing trees on their southern property line. The Thoroughfare Plan and Bridge Street Network Plan do not contemplate any public street in this area. The public drive is really a technicality of the Code. Tonight, they would like to discuss three items. The first is the mid-block pedestrianway. In that area, there will be an internal amenity space for the apartment residents. Bifurcating that space would diminish the amenities they are trying to provide that community. It is not possible to separate that apartment building into two buildings. The site has an east-west grade change of 22 feet. The podium parking is accessed from the private drive. On the eastern side, the podium parking is largely below grade; on the west, it is more above ground. Bifurcating the building would limit the access to the podium parking and the vehicle circulation. Extending it behind the buildings would negatively impact the community behind the buildings. Their solution was to make this one larger building with one access point that did not create more pavement and access issues. Secondly, there may be some encroachments into the greenway, although the design discussions are not yet completed. The third item in need of discussion is the gateway feature. He believes the proposed architecture is good, but if something further is desired on that corner, it can be added. However, it is difficult to include a gateway feature, when the City has not yet completed the design of the greenway area. It may be redundant or inappropriate for them to add a gateway feature when the City ultimately controls what will happen in that area in front of the site.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan Brock Architects, 8 South Grant Avenue, Columbus, stated that they have been involved longer with the Bridge Street Corridor development than anyone else. Their first project, Tuller Flats, was the guinea pig for applying the Bridge Street Code. Although it took some time to get through the review process, it was a valuable process that resulted in a quality development on John Shields Parkway. Additional developments occurred, and the Code has been updated. However, he continues to be amazed at the vision Dublin had and what has been accomplished within the Bridge Street Corridor. They are excited to be back now to complete the last piece on John Shields Parkway. There are some unique aspects of this site, including the 22 feet of grade change from east to west. Because of the bend in the road, there was a need to identify a solution that would not only accommodate that, but also front John Shields Parkway in an effective manner. Additionally, the access points were limited. It made sense, therefore, to have

only one access from John Shields Parkway and eliminate the potential conflict of vehicular traffic with pedestrian traffic. They have treated the pedestrian access as a plaza rather than a road. Although pavers and bollards would be used, there will be no curbs. Consequently, it will not feel like a street. [Continued description of the proposed architectural design.]

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Way stated that the west end of the podium building is actually five stories, which exceeds the 4.5 stories permitted. Would a waiver be necessary?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Way stated that Buildings B1 and B2 are stepped and not in the same plane. What is the reason?

Mr. Sullivan responded that they have rotated the west building to create more of an orientation toward John Shields Parkway. That rotation also opened up the pocket park to John Shields Parkway. Each unit in that building has a garage within the building footprint. Maneuverability into the garage on the west end also was improved by rotating the building slightly.

Mr. Way pointed out that retaining the existing landscaping on the south side will be important, as it could provide some screening of the south elevation of the podium building, which is quite long and tall. From a massing standpoint, it will be quite different from everything else.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is concerned about the scale of Building A next to Greystone Mews and even Tuller Flats. Those residential communities do not have large units. Building A is very large and very tall. Have other options been explored?

Mr. Sullivan responded that due to the grade change, a parking structure made sense. However, on the west end of the elevation, the parking is exposed. Consequently, the lobby was placed at that parking level. Therefore, the main entrance will be where the new drive extends. The intent was a 4.5-story building, but the Code does not consider the sloping site. It assumes the site is flat. This building is 4 stories on the east elevation and 5 stories on the west. The garage would meet the Ohio Building Code definition of a basement. Although the building is taller on the west side, it is somewhat mitigated by the fact that on the east side, it is shorter. They believe that the development that will likely occur and revisions to Dublin Village Center, making it a more intense commercial use, having a strong building scale opposite it would be appropriate. They have stepped the buildings down to the west, making a transition from this building to Tuller Flats and the 3-story buildings to the west of this site. With the City's investment in John Shields Parkway, having strong buildings facing the street is warranted; adding some density with it also would be appropriate.

Ms. Call inquired if the chimneys are architectural features or functioning chimneys.

Mr. Sullivan that they are not actual chimneys. The elements are used to define the edge to the steep-sloped façade and to provide character.

[Brief meeting break.]

Mr. Sullivan stated that the mid-block pedestrianway on this site would not lead anywhere. This site is at the south end of the Bridge Street District. There is a multiuse path along the southern edge of the site and 3 different pedestrian connections between that area and John Shields Parkway. He understands the Code requires a mid-block connection, but he does not believe it would be used here.

Public Comments

[Email comments received preceding the meeting]

Edward Griffin, 4210 Troutbrook Dr., Dublin, Ohio

"My family and I live on the north side of Troutbrook Drive adjacent to the proposed property development site. We have thoroughly enjoyed the park-like, idyllic setting behind our condo. We are absolutely against any building on this buffer area between our home and the existing construction north of John Shields."

Eileen Mazzocco, 4198 Troutbrook Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017

"We would like to render our opinion regarding the proposed development on this property. Although, we know it is valuable land, we would love to see it stay greenspace. We highly disagree with a 6-story building right outside our back yard. We feel the height of those apartments are too big for the space and the surrounding development area. All the other developments on this east end of John Shields Parkway are townhomes. A townhome residents park would be a better fit for this piece of property. If another townhome building were to be built instead of the 6-story apartment building on the east side of the property, that would be much more desirable for us on the north end of Greystone Mews."

Natalie Rich, 4214 Tuller Ridge Dr., Dublin, OH

"Do not let this development occur. We do not need more housing in this area. We need greenspace, a City park in this area for the already dense housing in this area."

[Meeting comments]

Jessica Peffer, 4250 Troutbrook Drive, Dublin, OH

Stated that she lives in Greystone Mews directly adjacent to the proposed development. She is relieved that the mature stand of trees will be retained, which somewhat alleviates her concern about the scale of the buildings. The trees would provide some screening of the view. She is happy to hear there will be no public road, only a drive into the site.

Kelly Griffin, 4210 Troutbrook Drive, Dublin, OH

Stated the development will contain tennis courts, a swimming pool and a park. Will there be significant lighting for those areas? If so, how would that affect those units that abut that development.

Brian Bernstein, REALM Collaborative, Principal, 100 E Broad St Suite 1710, Columbus, OH 43215, responded that they would provide sufficient lighting but be sensitive as to how that lighting carries off the site. The intent is to light only the amenity area.

Mr. Call requested staff clarification of the lighting requirements for this development.

Ms. Martin responded that with the Final Development Plan, the applicant would be required to submit a photometric plan with a comprehensive analysis of light levels at the ground. Light levels are required to be 0 at ten feet past the property line, meaning that the light trespass would not impact surrounding property owners.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that the Commission is asked to approve two waivers -- a height waiver for the podium building is not requested at this time -- and a Concept Plan.

Mr. Schneier stated that overall, this is an excellent effort, given the location and grade change. With respect to the mid-block pedestrianway, it is difficult for the Commission to vary from what has occurred in the past; however, that is the purpose of a waiver. In this case, he sees the value of not having a mid-block pedestrianway with Building A. With respect to the massing of that building -- in view of some of the building heights in the Bridge Park development itself, the nearby Dublin Theater and the anticipated Dublin Center redevelopment -- he has less concern about the proposed building height. In regard to the chimney features, he would suggest finding some way to make them less obvious as an architectural feature, perhaps better integration into the façade.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would prefer to see more greenspace in the proposed development. When the Pulte project occurs, which will have a significant number of units, this will become a very dense area. However, the proposed concept is probably the best that can be achieved on this site.

Mr. Supelak stated that, in response to the discussion questions, he is in agreement that there needs to be a mid-block pedestrianway. The architecture and massing need refinement. The massing is too much for what exists around it. The terminal vistas and gateway also need to be addressed. The proposed conditions may present an opportunity to achieve more open space; however, there is no condition specifically related to the open space. He would recommend such a condition be added. The architect is doing a good job making the grade and the single access point work. There are many nice elements to this concept, but there is some work to do on the massing.

Mr. Chinnock stated that there are too many outstanding issues for him to be supportive of the Concept Plan at this point. He is very concerned about the massing of Building A, in particular the height. The faux roof and chimney add even more height. He would like to see the height lowered. He does not believe Building A fits well within the area. Because of these issues, he is not ready to approve the plan at this time.

Ms. Harter stated that she agrees with fellow Commissioners' comments. The building height, in particular, is an issue. There are some elements of the proposed direction, however, that she appreciates, such as the brick and the protection of the mature trees on the site. If necessary, protective fencing should be used to ensure their protection.

Mr. Way stated that there are many items in play within this area. The Pulte Homes site has been approved, which will have some very unique architecture, and with the roof, the building height will be approximately four stories; so it also will have some mass. Those buildings will have a relationship with John Shields Parkway. If this plan were to advance, it would be beneficial to visually show the edge of John Shields Parkway that will be formed by the Pulte site. That would better inform the Commission as to how this site would relate to it. The proposal for the Dublin Center development also reflects a podium building at the corner of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway. That intersection will have three new projects on it, and there is opportunity to discuss how those projects address the corner, i.e. a gateway, strategic corner or a terminal vista. To ensure all this investment comes together in a positive manner, it is important to address that corner. While he struggles with a podium building on this site, he sees a relationship to the other

projects that will occur; therefore, it might make sense. He believes this is a large block, however. The renderings show that it could be broken down into different masses. His concern is that the massive wall on the south edge would not be broken down. The pedestrianway connection might provide a way to address that building mass differently. He would suggest that, instead, it could be made two buildings, perhaps of different heights. If one of the buildings were stepped down, that could eliminate the issue with the 5-story height. He referred to the Casto project at River Ridge, Phase 2, which has two podium buildings with a connection; that might be a precedent worth considering. However, he is also struggling with Buildings B1 and B2. Looking at all that is happening along John Shields Parkway, there appear to be too many things occurring. He has not seen the proposed architecture style elsewhere in the area. He would encourage the architect to consider something different with Buildings B1 and B2. The other buildings along John Shields Parkway have a relationship to the street. The two buildings he refers to are not exactly aligned; they step up/down, which is a different pattern. From the project-massing standpoint, the applicant should think about how these buildings factor in it. A significant amount of space has been dedicated to vehicle circulation. Perhaps that area should be redesigned in a manner that replaces some of the circulation area with open space. The mid-block pedestrianway will help with building massing. The open space that runs along John Shields Parkway is a simple, pure space. He does not believe the applicant should attempt to dress it up, as it would make it look different. He prefers its present continuity. He has already commented on the need to address the terminal vistas and gateway intersection.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission has provided the applicant significant feedback. They have pointed out the building massing issue several times. With a Concept Plan, there is opportunity for the applicant to work with staff to address the massing. She suggested re-wording Condition 5 regarding the gateway element to indicate that they would work with staff to revise that element. She inquired if a majority of Commissioners were supportive of requiring a midblock pedestrianway. [Four members responded affirmatively.] She stated that often a Concept Plan is not yet something of which the City can be proud, but that is not the case here. This is a beautiful project. Although the building mass is significant, there is great attention to articulation and detail. In addition, there are front door stoops and activation of all the levels. The City's development review process has multiple steps, which provides opportunity to refine the design. She would recommend the next two review steps not be combined.

Mr. Underhill indicated that they would not do so.

Mr. Supelak indicated that a condition should be added requiring the open space to be addressed. Mr. Underhill indicated that they would attempt to do so but might not be able to provide the total amount on site that the Code requires.

Mr. Fishman stated that the open space is a significant concern, as the development of this area is almost completed. The vision and intent of the Bridge Street Code was to create a dense area with the feeling of a significant amount of greenspace. That is particularly important on this site, due to the proposed building size and the other project immediately across the street.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the courtyard, which will be comprised of hardscape and planters, would provide a great open space for the residents, although it will not be a public open space. They have provided a large civic greenspace in the Tuller Flats development, which is in very close proximity to this site. Rather than just providing greenspace to meet a requirement, it should be meaningful greenspace, and he is not convinced adding greenspace to this site makes it a better

solution. He requests that the Commission keep in mind all the greenspace provided in the greater development area. However, they will certainly work with staff to identify a solution that works.

Mr. Underhill stated that they would take the Commission's feedback and earnestly attempt to address it to the extent possible. They may not be able to address it entirely as suggested, but achieve something more in the middle.

Ms. Call reiterated that Dublin values its greenspace. All of its 65 parks are used and appreciated.

Mr. Way stated that the parking edges of this project need to be addressed to avoid their becoming a blank, uninviting edge. He appreciates what they are attempting to achieve with the single entrance; however, he would recommend they have a more inviting entry drive to the site, to the parking and the units to the west.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of two waivers:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) Maximum Block Dimensions - Required: The maximum block size within BSD-SCN is 500 feet in length and 1,750 feet in perimeter.
Request: To exceed the maximum length ($\pm 1,008$ feet) and perimeter ($\pm 2,590$ feet) for the modified block.
2. §153.061(D)(2)(a) Vehicular Access - Required: Vehicular access shall not be permitted from a principal frontage street, unless determined that access from any other street is impracticable.
Request: To permit a drive from John Shields Parkway, a principal frontage street.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, no; Ms. Harter, no; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, no; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion carried 4-3.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Concept Plan with six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the plan to provide a mid-block pedestrianway through Building A, between Village Parkway and the proposed access drive;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to refine building architecture and massing to respond to the surrounding context and building character;
- 3) That the applicant revise the plan to eliminate buildings and site circulation within the John Shields Parkway Greenway;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to refine all terminal vistas within the development;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to revise the gateway at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Village Parkway; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to revise the design to provide meaningful public open space on-site in addition to the off-site open space.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would vote affirmatively on the Concept Plan; however, he is not in agreement with requiring the mid-block pedestrianway.

Mr. Fishman clarified that his affirmative vote would be based on the understanding that all the conditions would be met, including the addition of more open space on the site.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Chinnock, no; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 6-1]

Communications

Ms. Martin introduced new Planning Assistant, Nicholas Eastham.
The Commission welcomed Mr. Eastham to the City.

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, July 7, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 p.m.

Rebecca Call
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith Beal
Assistant Clerk of Council