



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. ID-2 & ID-4 - Kaufman Development** **Shier Rings and Cosgray Roads**
16-056WID-INF **Informal Review (Discussion only)**
- 2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, B5 Parking Structure** **6561 Mooney Street**
16-060MPR **Minor Project Review (Disapproved 0 – 6)**
- 3. Nationwide Children’s Hospital - Sign** **5675 Venture Drive**
16-070AFDP **Amended Final Development Plan (Approved 6 - 0)**
- 4. Ohio University Campus Plan Update Presentation**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were: Cathy De Rosa, Stephen Stidhem, Deborah Mitchell, Bob Miller, and Chris Brown. Amy Salay was absent. City representatives present were: Vince Papsidero, Jennifer Readler, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, JM Rayburn, Aaron Stanford, Rachel Ray, Mike Kettler, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the August 11, 2016, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the August 18, 2016, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 - 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the following cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda: Bridge Park, B5 Parking Structure and Nationwide Children’s Hospital Sign. She said members of the Commission have requested that the Bridge Park case be pulled from the Consent Agenda and presented in its entirety. She said the cases would be heard in the following order: 3, 1, and 2 but would be recorded in the minutes in the order they were listed on the agenda.

**1. ID-2 & ID-4 - Kaufman Development
16-056WID-INF**

**Shier Rings and Cosgray Roads
Informal Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a residential community including 192 detached units, 231 multi-family units, community spaces, and amenities on 62.7 acres on the north side of Shier Rings Road, east of Cosgray Road. She said this is a request for an informal review and non-binding feedback on a potential future rezoning and Development Plan application.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and noted the gap in the center of the site within unincorporated Washington Township that contains a farmhouse and outbuildings. He said the site was annexed to Dublin in 2002 and the City rezoned the parcel to the ID-2 and ID-4 Districts as part of the West Innovation area rezoning in 2011. He presented the current zoning map that shows 22 acres of the site zoned ID-4, which is the Research Mixed-Use District geared toward office and research uses but also includes residential and 41 acres zoned ID-2, which is a Research Flex District that does not permit any residential uses. He presented the Future Land Use map as it appears in the Community Plan and defined by Office and Research and Development. He noted the proposal agrees with the Community Plan as far as the east/west connector and the re-alignment of future "Research Parkway". He presented the West Innovation District that includes over 1,100 acres of largely undeveloped land that provides enormous opportunity for future growth of the City and noted the proposed site for Kaufman Development.

Mr. Rayburn said there was a public meeting on September 6, 2016, where the overview of this planned development was presented and on October 17, 2016, a planning/work session is scheduled to discuss the appropriateness of residential land use. He reported the applicant has met with the Ballantrae Homeowners Association. In general, he said the public response has been positive.

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed Site Plan that highlighted the location of the multi-family units on the western portion and the single-family units on the eastern portion. He explained the architectural style is contemporary with forward-thinking designs and efficient home layouts. He noted the range of modern and traditional exterior options allowing for unique customization for home buyers. He said the applicant is proposing natural materials and various styles while respecting the surrounding neighborhoods by providing generous open spaces, event lawns, community jogging trails, and community gardens. He presented a proposed site rendering to show the conceptual community character that could include yoga terraces, a coffee shop, or farmer's market.

Mr. Rayburn presented a land use plan reflecting staff's and the consultant's thoughts for the WID updates as a preview to the work session in October.

Mr. Rayburn reported the ART was concerned about the timing of this proposal as there are studies in the works for the West Innovation District. He said they were also concerned about the proposed amount of housing, a lack of buffering to the north and west along common property lines and the potential of incorporating the Shier parcel into the development. He said the street network that was planned years before Ohio University moved into the area may be shifting. He said the ART suggested the applicant consider switching the locations of the multi-family and single-family units so the multi-family units could be closer to Ohio University.

Mr. Rayburn concluded his presentation with the following discussion questions:

1. Is the proposed land use appropriate?
2. Does the Commission support a variety of residential uses within the West Innovation District and the arrangement of the units?
3. Does the Commission support the proposed architectural concepts?
4. Are there other considerations by the Commission?

The Chair invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Brett Kaufman, CEO of Kaufman Development, said staff has been outstanding to work with for almost a year now, embracing what they are trying to do here. He said they want to be part of the broader plan for the West Innovation District. He said this type of development would thrive so near to technology and research type development as the type of people coming in for these jobs will want this type of community.

Mr. Kaufman presented their Opus Statement:

Kaufman Development is created on the belief that communities of high design built around wellness, philanthropy, sustainability and innovation can change the world. Our communities and the people that work and live in them will stand out in every way; beautiful from the inside out, filled with passion and inspiration everywhere you turn.

Mr. Kaufman presented his team identified by pushing product creativity, architecture, and a sense of community. He presented the demographic they serve: millennials, young active families, and empty nesters. He presented a glimpse of the communities they are completing or are under construction in central Ohio as well as those around the country. He indicated they would incorporate a coffee shop, yoga terraces and meditation spaces, artist studios, dog parks, and a host of amenities into the community. He said in addition they would provide a big community space and fitness space.

Mr. Kaufman presented their contemporary product with an urban barn angle to it. He said there are three different ranges of exteriors: mixed, traditional, and contemporary. He stated everything is focused to the common space. He presented the ranch home with a first floor master bedroom as a sample. He said the product has been designed to work on a production basis but not feel like a production community. He said with the different styles and color variations there can be 27 different plans. He explained the interior finishes are very open and range in styles from contemporary to traditional. He added the plans are very urban with lots of built-ins and light. He said the prices for the single-family units start at \$300,000 and sizes range from 1,660 – 2,260 square feet. He said the density varies between 5 – 8 units per acre, depending on the multi-family units versus the detached. He presented the multi-family product that is modeled after their Gramercy project in New Albany, Ohio.

Mr. Kaufman said they are gaining feedback about their site and there are things to work through relative to access and the location of the products. He indicated they are in conversations with the Shier family about acquiring their land this is producing the gap in their site.

Mr. Kaufman concluded by requesting feedback and offering to answer any questions.

Bob Miller asked for the applicant's reaction to the ART's suggestion of switching the locations of the two product types. Mr. Kaufman said he is hesitant to say it is not a problem at all but his instincts are that they can make it work. He explained they intentionally planned it as they did because of the current zoning but they do not have a strong preference either way.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the feedback received from community residents. Mr. Kaufman answered the feedback has been very positive and supportive. He said there are concerns about access, traffic, bike paths, and connectivity but generally the responses are favorable.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Ima Moore said she lives across the street from the corner lot. She asked how this development would impact traffic because two lanes is not going to work.

Victoria Newell said if this becomes a formal application and staff proceeds with rezoning as part of that, a traffic study will be conducted. She stated this is an Informal Review only and no votes will be taken

this evening. She said if this does move forward there would be a full review of the traffic studies to gain a better understanding of how this development might impact traffic.

Ms. Moore asked if the road were to be extended if it would encroach into their front yards. Ms. Newell indicated that is not known at this time.

The Chair closed the public portion of the meeting as there was nobody else from the public that wished to address the Commission.

Chris Brown answered Mr. Rayburn's first question about if the land use was appropriate. He said it was targeted this way but he was not fully comfortable with the density. He said he liked the single-family product overall but apartments are always a question. He said the WID may attract more millennials and this might be a place for them to live. He indicated the street grid was kind of odd but they would work through that. He concluded the land use is appropriate even though he would prefer lower density.

Mr. Kaufman emphasized he is hearing there is a need for this kind of product and he would like to work together to help fulfill upon the WID ideas. He said the more dense parts will attract and fill out the broader vision of the WID.

Steve Stidhem asked if this development would fall within Dublin City Schools. Mr. Rayburn confirmed it would be Hilliard City Schools.

Ms. De Rosa said the challenge for her is that this is such an undeveloped area at this point; it is so early in the process that the area has not yet developed its personality. She said she liked the contemporary feel and urban barn description of the architecture proposed. She said her vision was that the housing product would be more integrated with the university rather than a separate category. She said she understands this is early but it seems segmentation of the community is being perpetuated rather than the full integration of the community. She said she likes the focus on sustainability and wellness and would like to see LEED certification in the product itself.

Mr. Kaufman said it is a huge part of what they do as well as inside the home, around the community with composting and recycling and they are investigating solar energy as an option here. He reported they just completed their first LEED certified residential project in Columbus; LEED certification for this product would not be appropriate but there would be other certifications. He emphasized sustainability and wellness are principles of their company and promised these principles would be obvious in this community.

Ms. De Rosa stated she thought this fits the personality of what the district is trying to do in terms of innovation so this project feels like it could be congruent with the WID on so many levels. She inquired about the multi-family designs.

Mr. Kaufman said the multi-family is comparable in design, style, and materials to the single-family units but they are attached appearing more as a townhome. He said they will offer one-bedroom stacked flats, which he believes Ohio University will really respond to. He said they will all be two-story connected buildings as they do not do any three story walk-ups. He explained every unit has its own front door and most have attached garages. He stated their belief is that these product types have to be integrated into the broader community so he will be sure that happens here.

Ms. De Rosa said there are a lot of the communities where the sustainability is in part the responsibility of the resident in terms of shared gardens, etc. She indicated there is a lot of effort behind the actual community building aspects of that. She asked the applicant for his vision of how that might work.

Mr. Kaufman said for them it starts with their own staff; every member of their team has been hired based on those core values that they share to build these types of communities. He said after they build it they will make sure it is in place and it is managed properly but they believe there is a strong necessity for the members of the community to work together with them and with each other to fulfill upon what the original vision is. He noted they provide this palette and then the residents take it further than they ever imagined; it is very uplifting.

Mr. Kaufman said he understands the concern about the early timing of this development in the district. He said it is their hope (chicken or the egg coming first) this will help move the deal forward in a way that is consistent with the vision of the overall district. He said seeing their site marked on the map as the district currently exists, it is on its own.

Deborah Mitchell said she really likes the single-family homes; the design is great. She said right now it seems a little monolithic. She said she is concerned that that kind of vibrancy can be achieved. She questions if live/work as well as single-family and multi-family and retail can truly be integrated. She said integrated vibrancy does not fall solely on this development but that is a concern. She said the map makes the district appear segmented and this development looks suburban because it lacks vibrancy at the moment. She encouraged the applicant to consider integrated vibrancy as a theme or issue. She said the company's whole brand platform and value space position on what they do is fantastic. She indicated that having that kind of approach attracts people that it resonates with and where the future is going. She concluded the development is very in line with what is desired for this district but it looks suburban.

Mr. Kaufman said they started off building residential communities but recently completed a couple of mixed-use projects - one in downtown Columbus that is half apartments and half office. He said they found that businesses that they would not traditionally think of like accounting firms are interested in how this company can build community. He said they are interested in volunteer activities as they are trying to attract and retain talent who care about these things. He said that building ended up with a collection of users that all valued that. He emphasized that if they can develop this like they know they can it will be an economic development tool to help attract talent to this district.

Mr. Stidhem said he loves the materials and the concept. He questions how this is going to interact or integrate with Ohio University and their plan. He said he believes this is what is needed in this location; therefore, absolutely agrees this is an appropriate land use. He said as the economy expands out that direction, people will want to live where they work. He noted he has a three-mile commute and he loves it. He said this is not without its challenges. He said the properties to the north are going to see a lot of golf balls in their yard because of the close proximity to the short par three golf course. He concluded he is a big fan of this development in this location but certainly traffic will be considered.

Mr. Kaufman reported there was some commentary from the neighbors that they were happy that this was residential as opposed to a more flex-tech manufacturing project that could generate even more traffic or not exist as that buffer. He concluded that while this may come first, it probably is the appropriate buffer as we get into more industrial spaces.

Mr. Miller said this was absolutely an appropriate land use. He indicated he hopes to see more from this applicant in some way, shape, or form. He said he struggles with the density because it is still Dublin. He encouraged the applicant to reconfigure this site a little bit to permit more green space and walkability into the overall design. He emphasized high quality; if a production based product is brought forward, it may not be well received by this Commission. He said the architectural design is very intriguing.

Ms. Newell indicated she did a lot of research over the past year regarding innovation districts because she knew this development was forthcoming. She found that innovation districts that incorporated residential components intermixed were all successful. Therefore, she said she agreed this should be rezoned for residential use as long as the goal is to support the ultimate development we envision for this

innovation district. She stated the style of the residential units was terrific. She said she is not so concerned with zero lot line clearances. She explained if the land between the units is treated really great with personal landscape amenities and emphasizes the walkability within the community she supports units placed really close on one side and expanded on the other. She said this development has really great potential and equally because it is so unique it also really fits within the WID. She indicated she did not see the same creativity in the multi-family units. She said it is important to have some live/work units that can be rental properties and encouraged the applicant to explore those possibilities. She said she is struggling it is one huge chunk right now but this is the first project to come in. She said she has concerns with the way the roadway cuts through the property as it seems disjointed. She said the City is acquiring a huge quantity of apartment housing currently and she is uncertain how well it will be supported and how it will integrate with the WID having apartment housing, not knowing yet how this area is going to develop.

Mr. Brown said he is a huge advocate of zero lot line clearances. He said the layout is a little utopia. He explained we all want these walkable districts. He noted that none of the amenity buildings have any parking. He gave an example of an artist's studio where the paints and canvases will be driven there. He said even in athletic club parking lots, in winter, people try to get the closest spot to the door to go in and exercise. He said Ohio has bad winters so there needs to be parking added, which potentially lowers the density; that would apply to every amenity building proposed here. He suggested swapping the northeast segment of single-family residential with the multi-family since it is closest to the campus and the whole southern portion would be single-family. He explained that graduate students and doctor interns are likely to live in an apartment as they do not have time to maintain anything and that would provide them the opportunity to walk to campus. He concluded he is in favor of having some residential out there and he likes the unique and contemporary architectural style and referenced Seaside, Florida.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the lack of sidewalks as they are favored in Dublin. He encouraged the applicant to incorporate more solar power.

Mr. Kaufman restated they are really excited about solar power, too. To address the utopia comment, he said this proposal is conceptual and there is a lot to this proposal that still has to evolve. He said there will be parking, open spaces, and sidewalks. He said the feedback was really helpful and hoped to be back in front of the Commission, soon.

**2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, B5 Parking Structure
16-060MPR**

**6561 Mooney Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for exterior modifications to a previously approved parking structure to revise architectural elements and building materials for building B4/B5 in the Bridge Park Development, northwest of the intersection of (future) Banker Drive and (Future) Mooney Street. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Lori Burchett said the Administrative Review Team had determined the application warranted the Commission's review due to its overall aesthetic change as well as the fact that the parking garage is a public facility.

Ms. Burchett presented the graphic showing the site location within Block B of the Bridge Park development. She reviewed the procedures for Minor Project Reviews in the Bridge Street District Code. She reported the ART had concerns with the overall design and aesthetic including the randomness of the

pattern that was discussed with the applicant. She said the applicant revised their plan, which the ART determined on September 8, 2016, was more appropriate because it created more visual interest.

Ms. Burchett presented the development history for Blocks B & C.

Ms. Burchett outlined the changes requested by the applicant that included changes to: the brick; the screen style and materials; and the living green façade. She explained the proposed changes are for the eastern and southern elevations only. She said the east elevation faces Mooney Street and the south elevation faces Banker Drive. She affirmed there are no changes proposed for the northern or western elevations; they contain the residential liners. She presented a graphic for context - the previously approved plan that showed the east elevation of the building clad in brick with an overlay of stainless steel mesh screens and the southeast corner that included a full height vegetated screen wall. She explained the spandrel panels were covered with metal mesh rails at the entry points. She explained the south and east facades remain clad in brick, but additional masonry detail has been added; the screen panels have been changed; and the vegetated wall has been decreased in size. She presented a split screen showing the previously approved and proposed east elevations for comparison. She presented additional detail on the modular façade trellis system.

Ms. Burchett concluded the ART found the MPR criteria had been met and is consistent with zoning regulations of the BSD. She said the ART recommended approval with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant stain the concrete on the crash walls to match the color of Brick #1, as shown on the elevation details;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to create more randomness to the pattern of the metal screens; and
- 3) That the applicant remove any signs in all the materials and meet the stipulations of the approved Master Sign Plan.

Chris Brown asked what a crash wall was. Ms. Burchett answered it is a wall to keep the cars contained within the structure. She clarified that the ART had concerns that if there was a perforated mesh panel that one could see through that and they did not want it to be a stark contrast with unstained concrete.

Victoria Newell noted a crash wall that was brick on the previously approved plan.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the green wall. She noted the previously approved wall was more substantial and now it appears as a green door.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant told the ART that the vegetative wall had to be decreased in size in order to provide more ventilation for the parking structure.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, presented new samples of the screens. He explained the B5 garage is becoming significantly more expensive than the C5 garage with 30 spaces less so they have gone back to the drawing board because the cost was out of reach for Crawford Hoying. He said they still tried to make it appear less like a parking garage. He noted the original mesh panel system would have cost almost \$1 million. He said the new perforated panel is similar to what they used on C5 and will be a frameless panel installed more vertically and closer to the facade. He presented a raw panel and one that had been powder coated to show two types of finishes. He explained they lowered the screen wall to reach the 40% ventilation requirement but the green segment still reaches 14 feet in height, which is far above the pedestrian eye at street level. He said 2 – 3 panels will be installed within each bay of different types. He said panels with LED lighting become an accent to the façade at night.

Mr. Briya restated they have added a significant amount of brick detailing. He said the piers have been pushed out a little bit to provide relief to the plane. He concluded, overall this change alone is exceeding \$500,000 allowing it to be more in line with the C5 garage. He presented a brick sample board that included the third brick type.

Mr. Brown asked if the new brick matches the C2 office building. Mr. Briya answered the brick did not match.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the color considered for the panels. Mr. Briya said the design intent would simulate an anodized aluminum finish and the type two panel would be two – three tones up from it for a subtle differentiation.

Steve Stidhem asked for clarification of the reason the green wall size was decreased per ventilation.

Mr. Briya said naturally ventilated garages require 40% of the perimeter of the garage to be open. He said they are constricted on two sides because there are liner residential units. He said the requirement is actually 20% on each side so when two walls are ineligible, the other two walls have to make up for it, making it 40% of open space for each of the two walls. He explained the original metal screen panels were being suspended off of the façade of the building so the panels were not expected to be counted as closed space.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the installation could be the same as originally proposed to provide the ventilation required. Mr. Briya said the proposed panel is a little heavy so it could not be installed the same way.

Ms. De Rosa clarified the original installation with the original panel would have met the natural ventilation requirement so the issue is just cost. Mr. Briya affirmed that cost was the issue.

Mr. Brown said the decreased green screen does not make as much of a statement and all of the facades appear to be two-dimensional. He indicated this was the one structure that had a dynamic façade. He said he has worked with perforated panels and mesh screens and asked why the panels are not being angled in and out for variety. He said there are other ways to value engineer and this proposed revised plan is a big disappointment. He said he understands it is a parking garage but it is in close proximity of the hotel, etc. and does not provide for a very dynamic streetscape. He disagreed the brick was highly detailed and instead was very flat and everything in Bridge Park so far is very flat. He indicated he misses articulation and character. He referred to the Arena District that is a higher dollar per square foot but every one of the buildings has some detail, variety, and articulation of their façade.

Mr. Briya said the stacked soldier courses and detailing down the center of the piers are not showing up on the rendering.

Mr. Brown noted there are stacked soldier courses of brick elsewhere on the other buildings. He said this brings a sameness to it and all the buildings have too many similarities. He said the design is supposed to be urban and urban is not the same.

Deborah Mitchell said one thing about the original design of the garage was that it appeared woven with a lot of texture and vibrancy and did not look flat. She said she is missing that with the proposed revisions.

Ms. De Rosa agreed the design went from a building with great personality and interest to one that does not. She asked if there were other alternatives that the applicant may have considered.

Mr. Briya said a number of parking garages in the area and around the country are bricked with a little bit of detailing. He agreed the Nationwide parking garage in the Arena District that was built a long time ago

had a lot of different elements to it but with that comes with a cost. He said this parking garage provides free in and out access and when a cost per parking space is determined this is a lot to take on.

The Chair said the Commission cannot consider cost; their responsibility is to follow the goal of the development, the intent of the BSD, and compliance with the text.

Ms. Newell said she did not consider this a minor change; this completely changes the rhythm of this building. She recalled when they considered variances, they were looking at the buildings in congruity with each other. She said part of the reason they got to the design they did was to get rid of the vertical emphasis on the buildings. She said the goal in the BSD is to have different buildings without sameness. She said these modifications are repeating a very prominent vertical pattern that goes all the way down the street. She restated this is a huge change to the architecture of the building. She said it had great energy before, there was a playfulness through the shadows on the façade, and they had requested the parking garages not appear as parking garages. She said several designs of this building were discussed during the review process and it was the playfulness of the panels and the green wall that sold the Commission on the final design. She indicated this seems like a 'bait and switch' tactic.

Ms. Mitchell said she agreed with Ms. Newell's comments.

Mr. Stidhem indicated that he thought this building would be torn down in 10 – 15 years and other buildings will be put in its place as there will no longer be a need for parking garages. He completely agreed this is not a minor change as this is dramatically changing the look and feel of the building. He asked if there were other options to consider or a different approach to accomplish the same goal.

Mr. Brown said a lot of people have used stainless steel mesh panels around town.

Ms. De Rosa asked if a green wall could extend all the way up because it appears as though they painted green half way up a wall.

Mr. Briya said it was doable; they would have to redesign the rhythm of the metal panels.

Ms. Newell asked if all the panels would be placed right next to each other on the same elevation with no relief to the plane. Mr. Briya said that was the proposed revision but there could be potential to have undulation in a subtle way but not three feet off the building like originally proposed without adding significant building structure back up.

Ms. Newell indicated she did not know the limitations of how far the panels could be pushed but that is part of the reason the applicant is struggling with the openness is because now they are relying on the open space between the panels. She concluded the proposal is not meeting the review criteria.

Mr. Brown said he was surprised part of the value engineering solution was not to eliminate some of the stainless steel panels. He asked if there was a reason those spaces needed to be closed off in some fashion.

Mr. Briya said the applicant does not want the design to appear as though they ran out of money; the randomness of the pattern makes sense.

Mr. Brown stated the proposal looks as though the applicant ran out of money.

The Chair called for a motion and the Law Director asked that the motion be stated in the affirmative.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the proposed Minor Project Review to alter the parking garage as presented with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant stain the concrete on the crash walls to match the color of Brick #1, as shown on the elevation details;
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to create more randomness to the pattern of the metal screens; and
- 3) That the applicant remove any signs in all the materials and meet the stipulations of the approved Master Sign Plan.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Mitchell, no; Mr. Miller, no; Ms. Newell, no; Ms. De Rosa, no; Mr. Stidhem, no; and Mr. Brown, no. (Disapproved 0 – 6)

**3. Nationwide Children’s Hospital - Sign
16-070AFDP**

**5675 Venture Drive
Amended Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for the replacement of a monument sign for an existing medical office due to a right-of-way expansion and roadway construction within the Perimeter Center Planned District, Subarea M, on the south side of Venture Drive ±500 feet southeast of the intersection with Perimeter Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

The Chair swore in anyone wishing to address the Commission regarding this case.

Steve Stidhem asked if this type of illuminated sign was consistent in the area. Logan Stang explained internally illuminated signs were consistent for properties along US 33 and that only portions of the sign are illuminated. He said the butterfly logo is halo lit and the text “Nationwide Children’s” will appear black during the day and will light up white during nighttime.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Brown motioned, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve an Amended Final Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the sign contractor coordinates with ODOT regarding the timing for the installation of the ground sign.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

4. Ohio University Campus Plan Update Presentation

Shawna Bolin, University Planner and Director of University Planning and Space Management, Ohio University, said she is presenting the Ohio University Dublin Framework Plan. She said the goal is to provide an update of where they have been in their process and share the plan itself. She said she is requesting feedback because they are conducting a series of meetings to get this plan approved.

Ms. Bolin said OU came to Dublin with the start of Osteopath Heritage gift with the College of Medicine in 2012. She explained they entered into an Economic Development Agreement with the city of Dublin to

acquire land once they purchased the 15 acres. She said the city of Dublin gave OU 45 acres in Subarea 1. She said part of the agreement is that OU will acquire Subarea 2 when the Master Plan is completed and approved and Subarea 3 will be jointly developed with the City.

Ms. Bolin said at OU they talk about Ohio for Ohio and their presence across the state and this is a key area for them given the City's interest in innovation for this area. She said the goal of this Framework Plan is to provide a vibrant and sustainable community for both OU and the City. She presented the purpose of the plan and explained it is a planning tool that illustrates campus district vision and creates a comprehensive approach to guide future development, establishes a sense of place, and establishes Campus Planning Principles. She said Dublin programs will reinforce their colleges and the state-wide system and Academic Program growth will generate net resources to Ohio and support Dublin campus investments. She said capital from development partners (City of Dublin; private developers) will support campus infrastructure and non-academic buildings.

Ms. Bolin reported engagement with the City began in January 2016 and a couple of weeks ago they participated in the WID Open House. She presented stakeholder engagement that included college forums, Facilities Planning Advisory Council, Faculty Senate, City of Dublin, Osteopathic Heritage Foundation, Ohio Health, and Columbus State University. She presented an expanded timeline that illustrated various approvals achieved. She highlighted the recent approval from the OU Board of Trustees for the draft Framework Plan as well as anticipated dates for the City of Dublin's approvals. She said final approvals from both OU and the City are anticipated for January 2017.

Ms. Bolin said OU is a major engine of innovation in its community, the region, and the state. She said there are things they can do here that cannot be done in Athens, Ohio to expand their offerings. She said they have had great conversations with other universities including The Ohio State University who have program compliments to what OU offers and can imagine partnerships. She noted Dublin's Guiding Principles and said the physical environment of OU should support the community partnerships and innovations. She said a knowledge community to OU is the integration of ideas and practice and includes a mixed-use environment (academia, workplace, hospitality, retail, housing); academic, corporate, and public partners; great streets, connectivity, and public spaces; and access to parking and transit.

Ms. Bolin presented the campus planning principles:

- Establish a vibrant community
- Encourage proximity and walkability (compact and pedestrian oriented but not wall-to-wall buildings)
- Create connections (integration between open space and buildings as well as other areas in the WID)
- Foster innovation
- Accommodate varying initiatives (support OU's strategic plan, Dublin's initiatives, and partnership activities already embraced)

Ms. Bolin presented location context illustrating: Dublin in relation to Columbus, Ohio; the WID within Dublin; and the existing OU campus within the WID. She said the WID is going through an update and it is important for OU to understand what the City is contemplating. She presented initial planning concept sketches: one being a Main Street Concept and the other the Ring Road Concept. She said this was a way to contemplate movement across the campus and the Main Street Concept was selected. She described the series of steps that build up the campus in layers:

1. Major street network
2. Open space network
3. Development parcels
4. Building frontages
5. Visibility and views
6. Parking and Service (parking garages would be necessary to support these buildings but they plan to hide them)

7. Retail shops

Ms. Bolin presented the existing conditions on campus where four buildings are located as well as the proposed framework full, build-out plan for comparison. She said the latter shows the potential for the campus that will take many years to achieve.

Ms. Bolin presented the seven programmatic themes:

1. Health and Wellness campus
2. Partnership with City of Dublin and Ohio Health
3. Academic Partners such as Columbus State
4. University programs that may be offered at Dublin to expand outreach
5. Emerging or new Ohio academic programs (such as urban agriculture)
6. Other partnership opportunities in Central Ohio
7. Uses that support the above to provide for a vibrant campus

Ms. Bolin presented site typologies identified as:

- Highway view sites
- Main street sites
- Iconic sites
- Core sites

Ms. Bolin presented what could happen in a 5 – 10 year window and one of the first things would be to re-route the street in Eiterman around and begin to think about the buildings at that first core site of the campus. She presented a graphic that illustrated the flexible phasing including the existing development and three phases to follow as the Dublin campus is intended to be built-out over time. She said early phases should be focused at the core of the site and along the “Main Street” to maximize activity and density as soon as possible. She indicated the direction of the build could go anywhere as long as the infrastructure can be put in place. She illustrated how the campus could be connected to the Kaufman Development proposal that was heard informally this evening and how the university could introduce housing around the parking garages that would border the informal green or perhaps on the third or fourth floor level along “Main Street” at the south end of the campus. She said they would work with developers to consider connectivity.

Ms. Bolin presented the next steps:

1. O'Brien Atkins Report on WID Update
2. Council Work Session – October 2016
3. Dublin PZC Vote – November 10, 2016
4. Council Vote – December 5, 2016
5. Final Approvals:
 - a. Quarters 1 & 2 - 2017
 - b. WID Plan and Zoning Amendments
 - c. OHIO Board of Trustees

Victoria Newell inquired about the development planned for “Main Street”. She asked if that was being earmarked to be intermixed with businesses and retail other than campus buildings to which Ms. Bolin answered affirmatively. Ms. Bolin said a coffee shop or a book store could supply some of the vibrancy desired as well as other amenities that could support their business partners that may be on the campus as well. She clarified these would not be university owned structures but additional development.

Cathy De Rosa said she liked the innovation integration idea. She inquired about the architectural style being considered. She said the Athens campus has an ivy-league look and feel to it. Ms. Bolin said the

personality for the Dublin campus would be “Not Athens”. She explained they would want to compliment Dublin’s WID style. In the framework plan, she said they were purposefully non-descript on the architectural style because they believe there are a lot of opportunities and the architectural style already on the campus is more modern.

Ms. De Rosa agreed it is a more modern feel but it still feels classic/academic. She said it would be fantastic even if it is a drawing for imagination or conversation to do something that is more edgy even if it is just for illumination for what can be done. She said there is a wonderful opportunity to set the tone and a precedent.

Ms. Bolin said they are considering the idea of the sidewalks and buildings that could ‘talk to people’ and deliver educational information. She said the working groups from Athens would speak one way in Athens but have totally different ideas while in the Dublin site.

Chris Brown said he loves Court Street. He said “Main Street” could have the vitality of Court Street if they incorporated mixed-use ranging from academic down to the bars, restaurants, book stores, and the people living above all those buildings. He said he likes both the formal and informal greens. He said he was surprised at the divider between east and west but overall was excited about the plan.

Ms. Bolin indicated there are a lot of radius’ that are not represented on the rendering. She said ponds will be needed for stormwater management.

Ms. Newell said she really liked the plan, has no objections to what was presented, and appreciated the presentation.

Ms. Bolin summarized the feedback:

- Consider pedestrian connectivity and make sure that is emphasized
- Consider the radius line and what the end iconic sites might be to capture the experience there
- Understand the mixed-use zone
- Invite edgy architecture

Ms. Newell said edgy architecture would fit into the current framework of the WID.

Communications

Vince Papsidero said City Council is conducting a work session on October 17th, which the Commission is invited to, to gain Brian Adkins’ final recommendations on a general concept for updating the WID. He said the conceptual drawing presented earlier was the basis for that. He said Shawna Bolin will also complete her final presentation regarding the OU Master Plan. After that meeting, he said Mr. Adkins will be working with staff to update the plan for the WID. He reported they agree to the residential buffer for that south side to some degree. He said the roads east/west will be shifting, moving up north to the southern boundary of Sports Ohio.

Mr. Papsidero noted Greg Dale will work on updating the Zoning Code under a separate contract. He said these updates will work in tandem and hopefully come before the Commission in March or April of next year.

Mr. Papsidero said the Kaufman Development as an outlier will take its path as it sees fit based on the input received tonight and Council’s input October 24th. He explained they appeared before the Commission tonight later than what they wanted but staff was slowing them down to get the updates to the WID further along.

Regarding the Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana Regional Conference, Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any members in addition to Chris Brown interested in attending October 5 – 7.

Claudia Husak said there is a Commission meeting scheduled October 6th but staff is contemplating consolidating the two meetings because they are back to back and maybe focusing on the October 13th date. Both Ms. Newell and Ms. Mitchell said they had prior commitments and could not attend the conference. Ms. Husak said the meetings would not be consolidated if it meant seven cases on one night but was fairly certain there were not that many cases in the queue.

Ms. Husak introduced Planning's new employee, Mike Kettler, in a brand new position of Planning Technician that will assist with application intake/outtake and technical reviews.

Chris Brown said he knows that finances are not the Commission's purview but asked when the Commission is the final review and case approval is denied, does the case go back to City Council if the applicant's proposed changes were purely based on economics. Mr. Papsidero said a case would go to Council only if the applicant chose to appeal the Commission's decision. Victoria Newell clarified that even if a property is partly owned by the City, the Commission must be respectful of the Code that is in place but certainly Council could overturn the Commission's decision.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on October 13, 2016.