

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 12, 2012

AGENDA

- 1. MAG Planned District** **6335 Perimeter Loop**
Road Perimeter Center Planned District, Subareas D and J-1 **5825 Venture Drive**
Midwestern Auto Group PUD – BMW & Mini Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
11-049Z/PDP/FDP **Final Development Plan**
(Approved 7 – 0 Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan)
(Approved 7 – 0 Final Development Plan)

- 2. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification** **Administrative Request**
11-020ADM

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Todd Zimmerman, Warren Fishman, Joe Budde, and John Hardt. City representatives were Steve Langworthy Claudia Husak, Jennifer Readler, Gary Gunderman, Rachel Ray, Dan Philabaum, Justin Goodwin, Eugenia Martin, Jeannie Willis, Tina Wawszkiewicz, Eagan Foster, Kristin Yorke, Ken Richardson, Alexis Dunfee, Rachel Beck, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to accept the documents into the record as presented. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve the December 8, 2011 meeting minutes. Ms Kramb said the pages are not numbered. She said on page five, the second paragraph, Ms. Kramb noted, said she was trying to say if there is a lot of traffic it needs to be considered. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes pointed out that there was a memo from Mr. Langworthy about the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code and podium-style parking facilities.

Richard Taylor said we probably would not want these types of buildings with blank walls, but placing storefronts on the second floor with stairs coming down to the street level could help give the building a presence along the street. He asked if it would be possible to write something into the Code that states that there has to be an entrance on the wall along the street, since he agreed that a blank wall takes away from the cohesiveness of the street.

Steve Langworthy said there is a requirement for entrances every so often along a street to ensure that there is architectural interest and activity on the street.

Rachel Ray said the apartment building type requires one entrance per 75 feet of street frontage, and in the proposed language, Planning recommends some flexibility to potentially reduce the number of entrances because it is a residential building type with potentially less intensive activity in areas that are primarily residential. She said staff agreed with the idea of having the stairways and access to the sidewalk, and the Code accommodates that.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said such as an entry feature along the street should be more than just a doorway.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning had paid a lot of attention to the space in between the sidewalk and the building façade and the doorways, and were not just looking at stairs and doors.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the newsletter dates are laid out for the Board. She said to note yhat the special meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 26, has been changed to Tuesday, January 24.

Mr. Fishman said he is going to miss the meetings on January 19 and 24.

Jeannie Willis introduced Eagan Foster the new Engineer who works on traffic signal systems and operations.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. MAG Planned District	6335 Perimeter Loop Road
Perimeter Center Planned District, Subareas D and J-1	5825 Venture Drive
Midwestern Auto Group PUD – BMW & Mini	Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan
11-049Z/PDP/FDP	Final Development Plan

Chris Amorose Grooms said the following application involves incorporating approximately 8.73 acres to the Midwestern Auto Group Planned Unit Development District to expand the automobile dealership campus with a 45,000-square-foot building addition for the BMW and Mini franchises. She said the site is located on the south side of Venture Drive approximately 750 feet south of the intersection of Perimeter Drive. She said the application also includes a Final Development Plan for all site improvement details. She said the application consists of two components; the Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan. She said there will be two motions; the Rezoning Preliminary will go to Council for final decision. She said the Commission has the final authority on the Final Development Plan application.

Claudia Husak said this is a combined application for a Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan and a Final Development Plan for the MAG Planned Unit Development (PUD). She said the applicant did provide an informal introduction of this case in October 2011.

Ms. Husak said approximately 24 acres will become the MAG PUD District, we are incorporating the existing MAG campus which is about 15 acres and currently vacant land into a unified planned district for MAG. She said the applicant is removing portions of Subarea D, from Perimeter Center, which is primary an office center, and Subarea J-1, which was created for MAG in 2008 for vehicle storage while constructing the Volvo addition.

Ms. Husak said there will be two subareas; Subarea A remains unchanged, the development text for the subarea is the same one this Board approved in 2009. She said Subarea B, the new area, is the eight acres being removed from Perimeter Center. She said the development text for Subarea B is modeled along the lines of Subarea A. She said a lot of the language, development standards, and regulations are repeated. She said there is an access point on Venture Drive which is being incorporated with this rezoning; the intention is for customers to use the loop road around the site with primary access from Perimeter Loop Road and Venture Drive. She said there are two additional display fingers along the west side of the site to continue the design from the original campus.

Ms. Husak said the retention pond on the east side is included in this proposal; it is designed to manage stormwater for the site to be developed and the land to the east. She said the decorative pond along US

33 is also in this proposal. She said for the existing subarea the applicant did not have to provide screening along US 33 as required in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said staff has advised the applicant to place screening in this area for the new development site. She said in October the Commission was supportive of continuing what exists today and to provide a unified landscape area along the highway. She said the applicant is proposing three foot tall screening where the Code would require a six foot tall screen. She said there is a mound and landscape trees.

Ms. Husak said staff recommends the applicant continue with the screening as required in the Code due to the concerns of City Council. She said the applicant has provided a section drawing to give a preview of the site, the first section looks across the decorative pond toward the BMW portion of the building. She said there are a landscape screen and a drive aisle. She said the second section looks toward the first car display finger and the three-foot mound is included with the orchard like tree arrangement. She said there is a shrub hedge where the display area would start. She said the last section looks across the stormwater management pond toward the northern area.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is proposing a total of 44,000 square feet of building, they are proposing to construct 40,000 square feet and have included a 4,000-square-foot area which would be in the vehicle service area. She said the applicant has revised the floor plan of the building moving both show rooms closer to the highway. She said BMW is in the western portion of the building and the Mini showroom is in the eastern portion. She said all of the service function is towards the rear of the building; there is a non-retail car wash for customers only, and a truck route which would have vehicle delivery off Venture Drive.

Ms. Husak said the proposal meets the Code in terms of parking setbacks and lot coverage. She said they are including the lower level service drive currently on the premises. She said the modern look is continued with the same material as is on the existing building. She said the applicant includes the brightly colored accents in the Mini showroom which the Commission requested be removed. She said there is a condition to remove the brightly colored accents.

Ms. Husak said the applicant is continuing with the sign details which are in the existing development. She said the applicant is proposing a ten-foot dealership identification sign, which will be incorporated within the pond. She said the applicant currently has a dealership identification sign on their current campus, staff is requesting the text be revised to only allow one of the signs and for the Final Development Plan to be revised to show only one sign.

Ms. Husak said a campus identification sign is also being proposed, those signs do exist on the other entrances to the site and is an appropriate sign to have. She said there is a detail that shows the sign as 15 feet, 4 inches, it is in the Development Text to be 15 feet. She said we are requiring that is revised. She said the applicant is proposing a MAG Mini wall sign on the eastern elevation. She said there will be a BMW sign on the southern elevation. She said both signs have been revised to meet the 15-foot height limitation which is in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Husak said the applicant shows signs on the two ramps into the service area and those signs include the names of the franchises, staff requests those are removed because they are not permitted.

Richard Taylor asked if the signs are going into the service area.

Ms. Husak said a service sign would be permitted; it is the BMW and Mini signs that are not permitted.

Chris Amorose Grooms said she believes the signs already exist; and asked are those not approved signs.

Ms. Husak said they have free standing identification signs near the ramps.

Ms. Husak said Planning is recommending approval of the rezoning with the Preliminary Development Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the development text be revised to require property perimeter screening from US 33/ SR 161 as required by the Zoning Code;
- 2) That the development text be revised to permit tree replacement off-site on the adjacent parcel to the east; and,
- 3) That only one dealership identification sign be permitted to serve the entire site.

Ms. Husak said for the Final Development Plan, Planning is recommending approval with seven conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to eliminate the accent colors proposed on the building elevations;
- 2) That the applicant provide an accessible path from the BMW/Mini building to the public way and the plans be revised prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 3) That the proposed campus identification sign be revised to meet the 15-foot height requirement specified within the development text;
- 4) That the applicant eliminate either the existing or the proposed dealership identification ground sign along the US 33/SR 161 frontage;
- 5) That the brand names (BMW and Mini) proposed on the entrance walls leading to the service areas should be eliminated from the proposal;
- 6) That deciduous trees be incorporated every 80 feet into the 300-foot stretch of proposed vehicular use area along Venture Drive; and
- 7) That the plans be revised to show adherence to the Code-required property perimeter screening along US 33/SR 161 six-foot wall, planting, mound, hedge or combination thereof plus one tree for every 30 feet.

Ben Hale Jr., 37 West Broad Street, Columbus Ohio, said the applicant has tried to incorporate the comments from the last meeting. He said in earlier drawings there were cars that faced US 33, where the pond is located; those have been removed so there is not a display in the area of the pond. He said the pond is atheistic; parking faces the building for customers.

Brad Parish, Architecture Alliance, 165 North 5th Street, Columbus Ohio, said with the completion of the Volvo and Porsche expansion last year, it is the desire of MAG to relocate the BMW and Mini facility currently on Post Road to this site. He said the wall signs have been lowered to 15 feet, and removed the vehicle display pad. He said the design has been revised to include the overall footprint of the building by combining some of the programs within the building, which is why the Mini showroom is now located on the front of the building along SR 161.

Mr. Parish said we did not see a need to have an additional curb cut along Venture Drive, the elimination allowed customers to be controlled around the loop on-site and create all service traffic on one curb cut along Venture Drive. He said the mounding was reduced on the SR 161 frontage from six feet to three feet. He said the previous recommendation was to continue with what is currently there, which was zero mounding. He said a good compromise would be to propose a three-foot mound along SR 161 and continue the landscape orchard.

Mr. Parish said we agreed to have a six-foot mound on the adjacent property. He said the east side of the pond would start a three-foot mound which would gradually go to six feet at the east property line to Children's Hospital.

Mr. Parish said for the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan we would like to keep the three-foot mound as proposed, the development text will be revised to allow the tree replacement on the adjacent parcel to the east. He said the reason we have two subareas for this PUD is there are two different investor groups that invest in both subareas. He said from a tax and vesting standpoint it is best to keep them as separate as possible. He said there is a potential that BMW could be sold to another dealer. He

said they would like to keep both signs so MAG has an identity and the adjacent property, if sold, could have its own identity.

Mr. Parish said we agree with all of the conditions for the Final Development Plan except for the one concerning the mound, we would like to keep the mound.

Ms. Amorose Grooms asked if the signs are on the service bays in the other building.

Mr. Parish said they are, the word Service is at the top of the concrete wall, at the top of the ramp there are brand identification signs.

Richard Taylor asked if not having the signs will cause problems.

Mr. Parish said no, they were wanted on the wall to direct the customers.

Ms. Husak said staff is suggesting the signs can be used that are on the existing site. She said they are identified in the development text as Brand Identification Signs.

Mr. Parish said that type of sign it is a better solution for us.

John Hardt asked if the BMW being proposed is text or a logo.

Mr. Parish said text. He said it is his understanding the word service and the arrow would remain but the BMW would be removed.

Mr. Hardt asked why not have BMW Service in one line of text.

Mr. Parish said they are not objecting to removing the word BMW.

Amy Kramb said she is in agreement with the mound going from three feet to six feet. She said she agrees with two dealership signs; specify that only one sign can be placed in the pond. Ms. Kramb asked if wall signs can have logos.

Ms. Husak said yes.

Ms. Kramb said in the development text it states the logos may exceed size limits imposed by the City of Dublin.

Ms. Husak said that does not apply to the wall signs.

Ms. Kramb said we already allow them to exceed the logo limit in Subarea A.

Ms. Husak said some of the signs have just the logo. She said the wall logos cannot exceed 20 percent.

Ms. Kramb asked if the logos can have as many colors as necessary.

Ms. Husak said yes.

Ms. Kramb asked if the directional signs have logos.

Ms. Husak said no.

Ms. Kramb said in the proposed development text, page 14, D2, Standard Signs, Interior Signs; should we specify that means not attached to windows. She said this would mean they could attach something

to the inside of the window and it can be as large as they want, they can do what they want to the interior of the building.

Ms. Husak said it will be specified it is a certain distance from the window.

Ms. Kramb said anything can be placed on the interior of the window as long as it is a specific distance away from the window.

John Hardt said he is in agreement with the objective of City Council to have screens along SR 161. He said since half the campus has been developed with one type of treatment it does not make sense to change it in the middle of the campus. He said he would like the east and west to have the same treatment.

Mr. Hardt said he does not have a problem with two dealer identification signs, the design should match.

Ms. Husak said the Subarea A text limits the height of the sign to what is existing, we would have to revise the text to allow the signs to match.

Mr. Hardt said it looks like there are a few catch basins dumping into the pond, he was worried the water may stagnate. He asked what the intent was behind the stucco and materials not being the same as the existing building.

Mr. Parish said the intent with the new code of 2009, and making a continuous insulation on the exterior of the building was that EFIS would allow us to do that as opposed to stucco.

Mr. Hardt said Mr. Parish is talking about the Energy Code, in order to meet it one has to put the insulation on the outward side. He said he is not in favor of changing the finish materials on the outside of the building.

Joe Budde said he agrees that the transition of the mounding from three feet to six feet makes sense. He said the two MAG signs should be of similar material and change the smaller one to one of the brands. He said he likes the Mini colors on the front of the building.

Warren Fishman said he is not in favor of the two signs. He said if the ownership does change the applicant should come back to the Commission and apply for two signs. He said if the pond was made larger and made into a retention pond it would solve the flow problem, you said you were going to put a three foot mound behind the pond, it will make for a real dramatic look from the road. He said he would rather stick to the Code and make the mound six feet.

Todd Zimmerman said there has to be something that can be done for the stucco problem. He said he agrees with the conditions staff has. He said the mounding is half of what Code requires. He said if we stay with the conditions we can stay with the Code and we can allow Council to remove conditions.

Richard Taylor said he would prefer to see a single sign along SR 161 because it is a very distinctive building. He said the original intent of the screening in the Code was along the SR 161 along the lines of car dealerships that had large areas of cars sitting closer to the street; it was intended to avoid the parking lot appearance. He said in this case, there is a lot more architectural and decorative design and a lot of landscaping. He said he is inclined to not want to see the mound increase.

Mr. Taylor said by not having the mound it allows the new building to be the signage and stand out. He said he liked the transition to where there is no mound to where the mound begins with a pond and gradually transition up from the three feet to the six feet.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agrees with the step increase of the mounding, there are no indications in the drawing of any fixtures in the pond. She said it is going to need to have some water moving. She asked if there was a makeup well to assure the elevation of the pond.

Mr. Parish said yes, there is a well to supply this front pond.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see a bubbler on the west side of the pond; on the east end there should be a fountain. She said there needs to be something to help aerate the water to keep it a living system. She said the makeup well is not going to service the pond to the east, there will need to be some sort of aeration in that pond or it will cover with algae.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the pond is a great amenity along there and for that she is willing to sacrifice some of the mound. She said the intention of the mounds was to hide parking lots and there are not any parking lots here, the cars are tucked behind the building. She said she would like the mound on the blank parcel to be constructed at the time this building is constructed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Staff Report mentions a relocation of trees to the parcel to the east; why relocate the trees to the east, it is only going to cause a problem when the owners of the parcel build.

Ms. Husak said the intent is to provide additional screening to the vehicular use area and accommodate tree replacement.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there are no other trees being relocated. She said it appears the trees are Seagreen Juniper that will be eight feet off the back of the curb, she said that is a great screening hedge. She said it needs to be held far enough off the curb that it can mature without growing over the curb lines.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is not in favor of a second sign on the property, if it were to sell; the new owner will need to come back with a sign package. She said she would like to see the buildings look as harmonious as possible and would like to see the stucco continue.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said in terms of the delivery truck turn around, she does not agree with how the truck drivers are expected to turn around in a parking lot full of new cars. She said in the long term the delivery issue needs to be solved.

Ms. Kramb said she does not understand why the drive aisle that runs parallel to Venture Drive was not extended so they can pull in and straight out.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the car wash will serve the entire property.

Ms. Husak said there is an interior car wash in the existing building.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the stucco issue is outstanding and there is disparity about the mounding.

Ms. Kramb asked if there was a way to connect the drive, but put up a gate that can be opened when the delivery truck arrives.

Mr. Parish said the applicant is in support for adding a *no loading* sign on Venture Drive.

Mr. Fishman said he would rather see pond rather than mound.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission would like staff to work with the applicant to pursue a resolution to use stucco.

Ms. Husak said it sounds like we can move forward with the Rezoning, the material they are proposing is a Final Development Plan detail. She said the applicant is on a tight timeframe and needs to be reviewed by Council.

Mr. Hardt said the resolution of the stucco issue is a technical issue about how the wall is constructed.

Mr. Parish said the applicant is okay with using stucco.

Mr. Hale said we would like to keep the sign in the pond and would like it to be fifteen feet. He said we would like to come back as an Amended Final Development Plan to add another sign.

Mr. Parish said we would like to increase the sign to fifteen feet.

Mr. Zimmerman said fifteen feet of sign is way too much in a pond.

Mr. Parish said along SR 161 for the duration of the pond there is a three-foot safety barrier will be installed which covers part of the sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said there is support for a ten-foot sign.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the first motion is with respect to the Rezoning with the Preliminary Development Plan and there are three revised conditions.

Motion and Vote – Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Mr. Taylor made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of this rezoning with preliminary development plan because this proposal complies with the rezoning/preliminary development plan criteria, provides the opportunity for the retention of a successful business within the city, and includes a cohesive campus development, with three conditions:

- 1) That the development text be revised to permit tree replacement off-site on the adjacent parcel to the east;
- 2) That the text be revised to permit only one dealership identification sign to serve the entire site; and
- 3) That the text be revised to require interior signs to be located a minimum of three feet away from any windows or exterior walls.

Mr. Parish agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Krumb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that the second motion is with respect to the Final Development Plan and there are nine revised conditions there were seven in the Planning Report and they have been amended.

Mr. Parish agreed to the conditions.

Motion and Vote – Final Development Plan

Mr. Taylor made a motion, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman, to approve the Final Development Plan because this proposal complies with the proposed development text and criteria and existing development in the area with nine conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to eliminate the accent colors proposed on the building elevations;
- 2) That the applicant provide an accessible path from the BMW/Mini building to the public way and the plans be revised prior to the issuance of a building permit;

- 3) That the proposed campus identification sign be revised to meet the 15-foot height requirement specified within the development text;
- 4) That the applicant eliminate either the existing or the proposed dealership identification ground sign along the US 33/SR 161 frontage;
- 5) That the brand names (BMW and Mini) proposed on the entrance walls leading to the service areas should be eliminated from the proposal;
- 6) That deciduous trees be incorporated every 80 feet into the 300-foot stretch of proposed vehicular use area along Venture Drive;
- 7) That the exterior building finish materials be revised to match what is used in Subarea A;
- 8) That a fountain and aerator be incorporated into the eastern portion of the decorative pond and an aerator be incorporated into the east stormwater management pond to provide sufficient aeration; and
- 9) That the applicant work with Planning to field-verify the installation of the proposed junipers along the north side of the decorative pond

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

2. Bridge Street Corridor – Code Modification 11-020ADM

Administrative Request

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes introduced this administrative request for review and recommendation to City Council of a proposed amendment to the Zoning Code to establish a number of new zoning districts and regulations for the Bridge Street Corridor (BSC). She explained that the Commission will review and make recommendations to City Council on the final draft. She said that the Commission would receive public comments first.

David Brown, 5100 Parkcenter Drive, representing Acura of Columbus, said that the Acura site was originally planned for BSC Office zoning, but the Commission was recommending that the parcel and others along State Route 161, east of Riverside, Drive be zoned BSC Commercial. He conveyed support on behalf of Acura to maintain the designation of BSC Commercial. He said they had been a dealership operating since the mid-1980s, and the parcel was purchased for retail, commercial purposes. Mr. Brown said although they understand and appreciate the fact that the zoning text reflects that if the use is continued arguably and theoretically in perpetuity, that the use can continue for retail automobile purposes; however, there are scenarios which play out that could affect his client's ability to use the land in a retail capacity, and therefore they would recommend and support that parcel designation as BSC Commercial in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that it was the Commission's recommendation in an effort to try to protect businesses like Acura. She encouraged Mr. Brown to stay engaged because the Commission does not have the final say.

Warren Fishman asked if an auto dealership ceased and was abandoned for a year, would it become a nonconforming use?

Steve Langworthy explained that the parcel would be considered conforming as long as the criteria for abandonment had not been met.

Mr. Brown explained that part of their concern was that, as a retail franchised authorized dealer, if a scenario plays out where they sell the Acura franchise and an entity that purchases the site wants to relocate the dealership to the outerbelt for example, his client is probably stuck with a piece of property whose highest and best use is retail automotive; however, there is such a saturation in the Columbus market with manufacturers having their own locations for their car dealerships, evidenced by the Chrysler and GM bankruptcies, whereas Byers Chevrolet and Byers Dublin Dodge were pulled because those

manufacturers said they did not need representation in those particular areas. He said it was a concern for them that the use would discontinue and they would not be able to use it in that capacity.

Mr. Fishman said that was even a bigger reason to keep those lots BSC Commercial.

Max Machuta, 957 Egret Court, Westerville, said he was just a concerned citizen, not representing any one. He said he was concerned with what was going on in the Dublin area along this Corridor in the area where he worked. He said he had attended several of these meetings and he was impressed with the interest that the Commission has shown and the courtesy that has been demonstrated to all of the property owners that have spoken at these meetings. Mr. Machuta said he respected the great amount of work that staff had completed to come up with the plan, but he wanted to wholly support and agree with everything that Mr. Brown just said. He said he was most concerned with how much vacant office space currently exists in Dublin, and questioned why we would want to have more areas designated for office when there is a glut of available office space now. He reiterated that he supported everything that the Commission has done and agreed with the conclusion that the group has appeared to have come to the conclusion that it would be in the best interest to keep these properties zoned BSC Commercial, contrary to what Planning has recommended.

Ben W. Hale, Jr., Smith and Hale, said he had worked closely with the staff on a number of issues, and they have been very cooperative. He said he worked with them on the language trying to protect those property owners whose zoning would change. He said he supported the BSC Code because he thought there were always details, but he did think that in this area there is a terrific opportunity in Dublin, and that we all are going to be pretty happy with what is going to happen there.

Mr. Hale said he thought something needed to be done relatively radical in this area, and this is a radical plan and a radical Code. He said he read the BSC again recently, and the lawyer in him was bothered that a section in the preamble talked about zonings of these properties, and essentially, it said today that if you want to rezone a property in the Bridge Street Corridor, the only thing you can do is zone it from one Bridge Street Corridor zoning district to the other. He said it specifically said you cannot file to establish a PUD and do something different. He said that bothered him, although he understood why it was that way because of the possibility of lawyers like him. He said he believed that if an applicant was willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on going through the PUD process, they ought to have the opportunity to do so. He said that section should at least allow someone if they are willing to go through the process, but otherwise, an applicant could default to the Code and the underlying development standards.

Mr. Hale said that applicants should default to the Bridge Street Code, and ask for very specific differences where necessary. He said he thought there was a Code process where the reviewing body could make minor changes, and another if more significant changes were sought, involving Commission review and approval. He said that when you have an administrative review, you have to have administrative standards, and you can use administrative discretion, but you cannot give people something that is not basically in keeping with the BSC Vision, because that is not what administrative bodies do when they are giving variances or exceptions.

Mr. Hale thought there ought to be some outlet to allow someone, if they want to do it, to come to the Commission and City Council and ask for the opportunity to do something different. He said however, he also understood why there was a concern with allowing PUDs at any time, because if the expectation is that we want to achieve the BSC Vision, most applicants should develop that way in most cases. He said however his experience over the last 40 years is that the world changes and people come up with new ideas, and sometimes they are good, and there should be some mechanism to allow good, new development.

Ms. Amorose Grooms said Mr. Hale made a great point and that there were certain sites that would lend themselves to that sort of activity better than others. She said she really thought that they were going to have that in the BSC at some point before they were finished with it. She said they were all thinking in the direction that there would be some avenue for another process, and she did not know if they would

call it a PUD process necessarily, but certainly an alternative process to the BSC Code, but the understanding would be that the standards are going to be very high and it would likely look a lot like the BSC Code, but perhaps for varying reasons, there might be some deviations.

Richard Taylor said he thought a lot of progress had been made, but he agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes.

Amy Kramb said her concern was for the person that came and asked for and paid for a lot of waivers. She asked why they could not just have them come in and ask for one PUD instead of a bunch of waivers.

Mr. Hale said waivers *should* be arduous, and not handed out easily and often. He said that applicants should have to prove their point if they are asking for something that is not minor if they can convince the Commission that it is necessary and would not change the basic intent of the Code and the BSC Vision Plan.

Mr. Taylor said they would review that later, but probably not tonight. He said the current iteration of this Code allows for an application to deviate from one or more of the requirements, so that you can package more than one waiver together.

Aaron Underhill, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, referred to Planning's January 12th memorandum regarding the BSC modification request to accommodate podium-style parking facilities. He said he was representing a developer who wanted to remain nameless, but different property owners throughout the community have come to know what it is going to mean for them when marketing their properties. He said there is a developer very interested in developing a product of this type and probably in more than one place. Mr. Underhill said it was a very real project that could happen quickly, and they have decided that rather than going through some arduous PUD process or asking for a number of waivers that could be accommodated by a code revision at this point, that it was best to bring it up now, despite the fact that it is coming in fairly late in the game.

Mr. Underhill said it was a project that he thought involved real ingenuity. He said that when a Code is drafted that is so comprehensive; it is basically a prediction of the future and what is going to happen. He said they were pointing out things that, in with conjunction with Planning, who have been very accommodating, they believe with tweaks to the Code make them able to accommodate the project. He said from the City's and the developer's standpoint, a project like this makes a lot of economic sense as opposed to building a separate parking garage, which is very expensive. He said by integrating this sort of parking into a building, it saves the developer costs which is money that can be used to enhance the design of their project. He said from the City's standpoint, it does not use valuable land elsewhere that could be used for additional development.

Mr. Underhill explained why they thought this was a good product. He said most of the issues they were talking about were design issues that would not meet the current Code just because this was not contemplated originally. He said some of the things that need to be done to park in the lower level of a structure do not necessarily jive with making things pedestrian-friendly in terms of allowing people to walk inside and out of a garage like this, because of security reasons, and the fact that this is going to be someone's home, and they do not want to have people walking in and out freely. Mr. Underhill said that they thought many of the design requirements, as have been suggested, can be met as long as they have the ability to retain some privacy with gates, codes, and things to get into these areas. Mr. Underhill said he would stay in case the Commission had specific questions later.

Steve Langworthy said Mr. Underhill was told that the BSC Code was still in progress and that was something that could still be built into the text. He explained that they were very close in language and the idea and they agreed with most of what the developer wants to do and how it wants to do it.

John Hardt confirmed with Mr. Underhill that the buildings were residential. He said most large scale residential buildings have other non-residential components, such as community rooms, fitness centers, and leasing offices. He asked if the developer realized those kinds of uses would be available as opportunities to keep activity on the ground floor.

Mr. Underhill said he thought almost all of those uses would be above the ground floor, but he was sure they could investigate that layout. He said he did not know enough about the detail and design of the building to say definitively.

Mr. Taylor suggested adding to the list a public entrance, elevator/stair lobby, and other items that could have a presence on the street.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she thought it was great to get something like this included in the Code.

Amy Kramb said she did not want to see something like at Creekside, where there is a very noticeable parking garage below the apartments.

Ms. Ray explained that the Code currently allows podium parking, but the problem is that the Code also has occupancy requirements on the sidewalk, which require 15 or 20 feet of occupied space. She said the request that the developer has made is to not require that occupied space. She said that Planning is suggesting that the architectural requirements and landscaping help obscure any exposed parking or vents to help mitigate the appearance of the garage. She said however, they would like to maintain entrances on the sidewalk to enhance pedestrian activity. She said that was the nature of the Code modifications recommended in the memo.

Ms. Kramb asked if an entrance to a parking garage would be allowed on a principal frontage street.

Ms. Ray explained that the vehicular access would be required from an alley or a side street. She said it would not be permitted on the principal frontage street.

Ms. Kramb referred to Creekside where the two main entrances are on the main street where pedestrians are crossing and have to dodge cars.

Mr. Underhill said they would agree with that. He said another thing they were trying to accomplish was the transparency requirement on the first floor. He said they did not want to have it there because it would be unattractive to the residents to pass by. He said he hoped they could enhance everything architecturally, but with opaqueness there on the first floor instead of transparency into the garage.

Mr. Hardt said he could support this in principal, but he would like to see attempts made to put whatever functions could be made down at street level. He said his fundamental concern would be the architectural treatment of the first floor along the public street. He said he, and probably the residents, would not want to see portals every 20 feet where they look in and see vehicles. Mr. Hardt said he would like to see some kind of architectural treatment, even louvers or shutters that limits the limits the view into the garage.

Mr. Hardt suggested that instead of a variety of different exceptions to allow this type of parking facility that a separate building type should be considered instead.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning had considered whether they should create a separate type, but were considered about all of the potential iterations that could result from each building type. He agreed to take a look to see if a new building type would be a possibility.

Mr. Hardt said he understood, and agreed that they would not want to create a building type every time something new came along. However, he said as they look at the building types that have been defined, one of the fundamental characteristics of each that differentiates them from each other is where the

parking is allowed to be. He said in fact, on the diagrams, red indicates where the parking can and cannot be located.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the Commission was generally in favor of the proposed modifications, and she invited further public comments regarding the memorandum. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the review of the Code would begin on page 14 with Lots and Blocks.

Ms. Kramb said that she had already given her comments, which were mostly grammatical, to Ms. Ray earlier, to save time.

Section 153.060 Lots and Blocks

Mr. Hardt said it was his understanding that the BSC Vertical Mixed Use District was not intended to exist on day one, because it is intended to be brought online later. He asked then, why the block dimensions were being defined separately, because if it is zoned later on, it likely have already established lot and block where it is intended to be zoned.

Justin Goodwin agreed with Mr. Hardt's comment, and said that Planning had struggled with how this district actually will get implemented, and because they have increased some of the blocks in other districts, he agreed to make the maximum block dimensions consistent for this district as well.

Mr. Hardt referred to the mid-block pedestrianways requirements on page 16 and pointed out that one subsection said *they shall be aligned* and the other says *they may be staggered*, which seemed to conflict unless where it states, *they may be staggered* was intended to refer to the trees.

Mr. Goodwin confirmed that the trees may be staggered within the design of the mid-block pedestrianway.

Mr. Taylor referred to the same subsection and said that he was still not in favor of purposefully requiring that mid-block pedestrian crossings align perfectly, only because that means the first person that builds the building gets to determine the alignment of the second one. He suggested the sentence be changed from "*...shall align to facilitate to facilitate continuous pedestrian pathways*" to "*...as nearly as practicable.*"

Mr. Taylor said he had difficulty understanding (6)(b), as it was written.

Ms. Kramb said she had suggested the rewording "*Mid block pedestrianways shall be publicly accessible at all times and shall be located within the middle-third of a block accessed from any side of the block exceeding 400 feet.*"

Mr. Goodwin explained that the intent was that if the block was 450 feet by 300 feet, a mid-block pedestrianway would be required on the longer side of the block that is 450 feet long. He said it did not have to be on both axes of the block, and that could be clarified.

Section 153.061 Street Types

Mr. Hardt asked if the intent was to include the street type illustrations or any information about the street types in the Code, or if that was expected to be referenced elsewhere.

Mr. Langworthy said they have that noted to include in the applicant guide.

Mr. Hardt referred to Existing Streets and asked if a developer constructed a project along an existing street, if there is anything to indicate who is responsible for upgrading the sidewalks, the frontage, and the front of the street.

Mr. Langworthy explained that was not typically done through the Code, because they are generally worked out on an individual basis, sometimes by the applicant and sometimes by the City. He said it depended upon the circumstance that created the need for those modifications to happen.

Mr. Goodwin said as part of the Site Plan Review process, they would be working closely with the applicant to determine what the appropriate design details would be, regardless of who is responsible for constructing them.

Mr. Taylor referred to the graphic on the bottom of the page on the right. He said his comment applied to paragraph (a) and also to similar paragraphs on some of the diagrams included. He said his concern was that we are at the same time saying 'this is not what we really intend as the final street network pattern, and yet it is our *desired* pattern. He said it went on to say, it was not intended to locate precise locations of streets. He said it seemed as though they were being specific and non-specific at the same time. He said he would rather see removed in every case, the part stating 'representative of the desired development pattern.' He said he did not know if we had enough information on what the *desired* development pattern is at the street level yet. He said that, and the fact that he still had questions as they got further into this about significant areas on the street network map.

Mr. Goodwin suggested "representative of a general development pattern."

Mr. Taylor suggested "*a general development pattern*" because the street network did not necessarily represent everyone's "desired" street pattern.

Mr. Taylor referred to the requirement at the top of page 19 stating that all lots, blocks, and associated development with frontage along a street or street segment which also has any open space type frontage shall be required to meet the applicable principal frontage street requirements. He asked if this would require any property to conform where ever open space exists or is provided on a street. He said the first time he read it, he thought it said that *any development* along *any street* which has some open space frontage would require *all development* to meet principal frontage street requirements.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the key phrase was *street segment*, which would require the City to make a determination of how much of that overall street is impacted by the open space type presence. He said if the street segment was one long block and there is open space frontage on the opposite side of the block, whatever is on the other side of the street across from the open space would now be required to be developed as though it had frontage along a principal frontage street.

Mr. Taylor confirmed with Mr. Goodwin that *street segment* will be defined the way Planning thinks is appropriate, which might not refer absolutely to the segment of a street between two intersecting streets.

Ms. Krumb referred to the crosswalks requirements on page 20 and reiterated that she disagreed with any requirement for mid-block crosswalks, and she preferred that they be minimized. She said a maximum block size is 500 feet for most of the Corridor, and 200 feet in the Historic District. Ms. Krumb said she thought it would be reasonable to expect pedestrians to walk an additional 250 or 300 feet to an intersection to cross instead of having to cross mid-block. She said that people should not be encouraged to cross in the middle of a block.

Mr. Hardt said he agreed with Ms. Krumb in principle, but people will walk across streets whenever they can, regardless of whether there is a crosswalk, so we might as well do all we can to make those crossings safe because it will happen anyway.

Mr. Langworthy agreed that Engineering typically did not like mid-block crossings either, but ultimately, they discussed that if they were going to be provided, that they should be made safe.

Ms. Kramb referred to the requirement stating "*Crosswalks shall be required at mid-block locations for areas with heavy pedestrian traffic,*" and said she did not agree that they should be required.

Mr. Goodwin said that the language could be generalized so that it is less of a requirement. However, he pointed out that there is a big difference between a mid-block crosswalk on a four-lane arterial and a mid-block crosswalk on a small, tight, densely developed two-lane retail shopping corridor where pedestrians are going to be walking and will likely cross whenever and wherever they feel comfortable.

Ms. Kramb reiterated that she did not think they should be encouraged, and that pedestrians should be forced to cross at intersections.

Mr. Langworthy pointed out that it said "*as determined by the City Engineer,*" so the placement would really be at the discretion of the City Engineer.

Ms. Amorose Groomes commented that one of the values of a crosswalk is that it alerts the driver that pedestrians are crossing in the general vicinity.

Warren Fishman agreed that they encouraged pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Kramb reiterated that she thought crosswalks were unattractive and unsafe.

Mr. Zimmerman pointed out that some crosswalks give people false sense of security when crossing.

Mr. Taylor referred to the street network map on pages 22 and 23 and said that he had previously commented that he did not understand the conceptual street network shown on the school site, which does not make sense to him since with the proposed area rezoning, that site would be zoned BSC Public. He thought it was a huge missed opportunity to not develop that area for a purely public community/town center-type of use, which he thought would be a wonderful thing to have in the city and happens to be sorely missed. He believed a town center would be one of the things that pulls the whole plan together over the long term.

Mr. Taylor said he still had not from anyone, either on staff or City Council, a satisfactory explanation why the whole Indian Run Estates is completely left out of the planning for the whole Bridge Street Corridor.

Mr. Goodwin explained that in the earlier stages of the planning process for the Corridor when Goody Clancy began to reach out to property owners, particularly residents within the Corridor, there was quite a bit of input from residents that live in that neighborhood who recognize that the area is changing and is going to change around them. He said the residents generally commented that they are pretty pleased with the planning for the Corridor as long as nothing is shown that indicates that their neighborhood should not be there in the future. Mr. Goodwin said they have tried to respect existing residential areas, of which there are not very many in the Corridor.

Mr. Taylor stated that his argument against that reasoning is that the neighborhood is left out, but then several major district connector streets are shown surrounding their neighborhood basically on four sides. He said at the point where the area surrounding the neighborhood on all sides becomes highly developed, it will not be a very viable neighborhood.

Mr. Taylor said he absolutely understood the residents' concerns; however, he was aware of several properties on Avery Road whose owners did not sell to the Tartan Fields developers, and so the development went on around them. He said that when those property owners decided to sell, the properties were nearly worthless because of the way the streets were developed, around them, and they could not be developed an extension of Tartan Fields. He said he was concerned that by purposely going around this neighborhood, there might not be very much we can do with it later on in the event that the owners decided to redevelop because we have not figured out how it fits into the plan.

Mr. Taylor stated that the Commission has identified from the start of this process the extremely high public value of the Indian Run, and that includes the side that the residences are on, and he would hate to see a situation be created where the opportunity to engage both sides of the Indian Run as a real amenity for the city be lost.

Mr. Fishman recalled that in the beginning, they had earmarked the Indian Run as a green space that would continue through the city to eventually cross the river, and that had disappeared from the map.

Mr. Langworthy clarified that this map was the street network map and not an open space map. He said there was a provision in the Code that states that when a road goes along the Indian Run, that there cannot be any buildings on that side of the street, requiring access and frontage along a greenway.

Mr. Goodwin referred to Mr. Taylor's comment regarding the school site, shown on the map with a conceptual street layout, and said that this site was similar to the way they are dealing with the other neighborhood districts, deliberately showing a general framework of streets entering the area, but not really showing a detailed grid through those sites, because they do not know how it will develop. He said this was one depiction and there were pros and cons to this approach, but that they were trying to paint a picture without being too specific.

Mr. Goodwin explained that what they were trying to achieve in the area of the school site in the Historic Transition Neighborhood District is specify where the major open space corridors would go, how other types of open space would be integrated into the area, preferably including some type of significant open space of community value. He pointed out that when looking at this map, people using the Code would need to keep in mind that they would need to refer to multiple sections, specifically the neighborhood districts, and understand how those two sections work in tandem.

Mr. Taylor said his concern was simply that a street network was drawn on the map, because he had seen things that had been drawn, and it is very difficult to erase from people's minds what has been drawn. He said if the intent is to put streets on the school site on this map, he was totally against that. He said to take it one point further, it was well known that he believed this site should be used for some sort of community gathering space, and that is not happening with this layout. He was concerned that it is still being left up the planners and developers to see how the streets will evolve over time, and while he thought that was okay for everything on the east side of the Scioto River, Historic Dublin and the areas surrounding it are a community asset. He stated that the City needs to put their foot down and say what that the school site is going to be, and that will be open and accessible and usable by and for the public.

Mr. Langworthy commented that they have been very hesitant with talking about the school site for other reasons, but he thought it was clear that whatever happens on that site would be some sort of public/private partnership where the City would have the opportunity to have significant input into the way that site were to redevelop. He did not necessarily think that redevelopment of that site would be a completely private project by the time it reached the point of redevelopment.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if the grid portions of the street network could be removed from the street network map, and that the area be labeled with something else instead, such as "to be determined through a public/private development partnership."

Mr. Goodwin agreed that some type of label could be applied to the map, but perhaps not as specific as stating a "public/private partnership." He suggested generalizing the street network even more in this area, because he understood the concern that the grid in this area in particular appears to be more detailed than elsewhere in the Corridor. He stated that the map does however show a major district connector street that could potentially connect to a bridge, and that was pretty important to include based on the implications for the larger Corridor street network model, but he believed that the map could be generalized to a greater extent.

Ms. Kramb commented that she did not like to see all of the potential future roads intersecting with Riverside Drive, and she did not like the roads dead-ending north of Tuller Road before I-270. She said she did not think all of those intersections should be encouraged on Riverside Drive over such a short distance.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said that many roads would be disruptive to that scenic route.

Ms. Kramb stated that Riverside Drive was a major road corridor and was not just a Dublin street. She pointed out that there is a huge amount of travelers along that road that are not familiar with the Bridge Street Corridor and what they are trying to build here.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was less concerned with the streets shown to be intersecting with Sawmill Road because she did not think the area would develop that way anyway.

Ms. Kramb agreed with Ms. Amorose Groomes and said that her issue was that she did not understand why we would put streets down on a map that she highly doubted would ever develop that way. She thought that we would end up with terrible access management issues if we have this many blocks with streets intersecting with Sawmill Road, which is within the City of Columbus' jurisdiction anyway. She said showing the map this way would give developers the sense that they could have an intersection every 500 feet on Sawmill Road, and that did not seem right to her.

Jeannie Willis said that with regard to the access points shown on Riverside Drive, if they were full access points, she would agree with Ms. Kramb's concerns, but the intent was to have those intersecting streets be restricted to right-in/right-out. She said some of the street type sections that would be applicable to Riverside Drive in this area would include medians or boulevards that would provide a physical restriction to left turns. Ms. Willis explained that some of this has to do with how the street types and street families interact with the street family diagram and how those pieces fit together. She acknowledged that the street types and street families would need to be finalized soon to best understand how everything fits together.

Ms. Kramb pointed that the map does not clearly indicate that the intersections will be right-in/right-out, and she did not like right-in/right-out intersections. She reiterated that just looking at the map would give a developer the understanding that they could have full access every 500 feet along this major road. She suggested not showing the intersecting streets.

Mr. Langworthy requested that Ms. Willis comment on the number of streets shown, and why they are important for the purposes of traffic distribution.

Ms. Willis said the purpose of a street grid is to manage traffic more effectively with an inner-corridor trip capture rate of up to 40 percent. She explained that even though the streets are smaller and traffic speeds will be quite a bit slower than what we have seen in suburban Dublin up to this point, we could 40 percent fewer trips within Corridor because of the traffic distribution and the number of new routes provided.

Mr. Taylor commented that he did not know that anyone disagreed with the concept of the grid and the advantages of traffic dispersion, but he thought Ms. Kramb's comment related more to a concern with changing the character of Riverside Drive.

Ms. Kramb agreed and stated that she was concerned that when developers submit their development plans, one of the review criteria that the Commission is required to consider is whether the proposal is consistent with the street network map, and she did not want to be put in the position of having to explain that the graphic did not necessarily allow them to have full access.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked what would happen if a developer came before the Commission today before anything was done to Riverside Drive, and there is no street boulevard. She asked how the access would be managed in that situation.

Mr. Langworthy noted that there would likely be a temporary condition where that situation could certainly occur. He said that Planning and Engineering had already discussed that, and stated that there would be the understanding that a road may need to be built knowing that eventually, the access and alignment could change depending on what happens with Riverside Drive.

Mr. Hardt said he was not as concerned with all of this because this is a highly conceptual and diagrammatic drawing in a zoning document. He said that anyone coming in with a Development Plan or Site Plan would have to go through an engineering review, and all of their access points and roadway alignments would be subject to much more scrutiny than you ever will find in a diagram such as this.

Mr. Taylor said he disagreed. He said he understood that this was all up in the air to a certain extent, but the label states that this is the *desired* street network for the Corridor. He said that he did not desire this layout and Ms. Krumb does not desire that the character of Riverside Drive be changed.

Ms. Krumb pointed out that several bridge crossings are shown across Scioto River, yet I-270 is a complete barrier with dead end streets north of Tuller Road.

Mr. Langworthy said that street access north of I-270 was beyond the scope of what they were dealing with on the street network map, but he did not think that Planning and Engineering would forget that a future street connection to the north could be desirable at some point in the future.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said certainly as Emerald Parkway is completed, it would be nice to have another bridge over I-270 providing access to the Dublin Village Center area, taking traffic pressure off of Sawmill Road.

Ms. Krumb commented that I-270 was not any more intensive of a barrier than the Scioto River, where there are more environmental issues.

Mr. Langworthy said he did not think anyone disagreed with Ms. Krumb, but he thought the issue currently was that that was not something that should be addressed at this time since it was not within the scope of the Bridge Street Corridor transportation analysis.

Ms. Krumb said at the very least, they should plan to avoid creating a large wall of buildings along I-270, because then a future connection would never happen across I-270.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the Commission was in favor of seeing something more general on the school site, and that there should be a note referencing the access points along the major roadways.

Mr. Hardt pointed out that part of the Commission's issues with the map may relate to the way the graphic is drawn, and perhaps it felt too much like a map. He suggested the use of fuzzier lines to allow it to feel more like a diagram than an official map.

Mr. Goodwin agreed to make the changes requested by the Commission.

Section 153.062 Building Types

Mr. Hardt referred to the General Building Type Requirements, Existing Structures, where there is a discussion of nonconforming structures. He asked if there would be such a thing in the Bridge Street Corridor, after all of their discussion about Existing Structures and avoiding the creation of nonconformities.

Mr. Langworthy said that there is a difference between Existing Structures that would be created after the adoption of the Bridge Street Code, and nonconforming structures that could result later on after future Code modifications, but he agreed to take a look at the language again.

Mr. Hardt noted that there is a reference to the Administrative Review Team, in the same section, but everywhere else, that had been changed to required reviewing body.

Mr. Langworthy explained it was deliberate, since this is one of the few places where the ART is expected to make that determination.

Ms. Kramb referred to the requirement on the right side of page 24 stating that if a property or building owner demolishes more than 50 percent of the gross square footage of an Existing Structure, then all of the improvements on the property must be brought into conformance with the Code. She said as she read this, if someone demolished more than 50 percent of an existing building on a property, then *all* improvements on that property, not just that existing building, must be reconstructed and brought into compliance. She asked if that was truly the intent.

Mr. Langworthy said that was the intent.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the way it reads, if there are three buildings on the property, and they demolish 51 percent of one building, then all three buildings would need to be brought into conformance.

Mr. Langworthy said that they could clarify that only the improvements associated with the demolished structure would be required to be brought into conformance.

Mr. Taylor referred to *Determination of the Building Type*. He noted that the ART may designate an Existing Structure as consistent with a specific building type. He asked if a building that was nonconforming could be an Existing Structure.

Mr. Langworthy explained that if any improvements were made to that building, they would have to comply with improvements applicable to the determined building type.

Mr. Taylor referred to the reference to the Residential Appearance Standards on page 25 and said that he would like to delete it. He said he was not a fan of the Residential Appearance Standards, and he thought if there were going to be standards for roof pitch, roof materials, details, window locations, size of windows, etc. in the BSC, it should be right here and a Code that he hoped would disappear someday should not be referenced.

Dan Phillabaum said he did not think that would be a problem, because he thought it was included to ensure that there was nothing in the Residential Appearance Standards that would be left out that would be desirable. He said the BSC Code would have to be silent on an item for the Residential Appearance Standards to be in effect, but he thought there would be very few areas like that.

Mr. Taylor said he knew the intent of the Residential Appearance Standards was to make buildings better and different, but they end up requiring a developer pick two or three bland houses and repeat them over and over because they are approvable.

Mr. Phillabaum agreed to review the Residential Appearance Standards and determine whether there is anything else that should be addressed in the Bridge Street Code if that reference is deleted.

Ms. Ray pointed out that on the table of permitted building types on page 25, Planning would like to add the single-family Attached building type to the Sawmill Center Neighborhood since it was permitted in the other two neighborhood districts.

Ms. Kramb asked if the reason they did not allow the Historic Cottage Commercial in the Historic Transition Neighborhood was because buildings that height were not desired in that district. She thought they could be appropriate along the borders of that district.

Mr. Phillabaum said the objective of the Historic Transition Neighborhood is to be slightly more intensely developed with a slightly larger scale than the Historic District. He explained that the potential building relationships with three-story buildings across the street or next door to a single-story building could create some difficult urban design situations.

Ms. Kramb said that there already will be issues with that because you could already put a three-story building next to a one-story cottage in the Historic Core. She said in the Historic Core now, there are one-story buildings, and in the Historic Transition Neighborhood she thought there should be the choice to do a one-story building.

Mr. Phillabaum said it related to the character of the area. He said that the Historic Transition Neighborhood is intended to be transitional, because development is getting more intense as it moves to the west toward the Indian Run Neighborhood District, and the slightly larger scale helps preserve the smaller, quainter character of the existing Historic District by not allowing the smaller cottage-type commercial buildings.

Mr. Hardt reiterated his preference that the podium-style parking facility be a separate building type.

Mr. Hardt referred to *(D) Roof Type Requirements* on page 26. He suggested that the height of a parapet roof be modified to specify that the height is measured from the highest point of the adjacent roof deck. He said if there is a complicated building form, the parapet is really relevant to the one immediately adjacent to it, not some other roof on the other side of the building.

Mr. Hardt referred to the requirement stating that "*parapets shall be no less than two feet and no more than six feet high, except as necessary to screen rooftop mechanical equipment.*" He said that told him that if he had a giant piece of rooftop mechanical equipment, he could make his parapet as high as necessary but he did not think that was what they wanted. He suggested adding a statement requiring that in instances where six feet is insufficient to screen rooftop mechanical equipment, then alternate screening techniques must be used.

Mr. Hardt referred to *(1)(b) Horizontal Shadow Lines* and suggested deleting "*to create the shadow line,*" since the title of the paragraph infers that intent.

Mr. Hardt stated that as a general comment, the term "building type" should refer specifically to the building types defined in the Code, while elsewhere, the style of the building should be referenced differently, such as "the character of the building style" or "the building's architecture."

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning had taken note of that as well.

Mr. Hardt suggested that with respect to pitch measure for pitched roof types, the requirement should state *...unless determined by the reviewing body.*

Mr. Hardt referred to *(2)(b)3: A pitch greater than 3:12 is required on roofs, storm roofs, and said the type vs. style appears there.* He said the last sentence, *Eye brow roofs are acceptable for these locations, and sloped to drain in all directions* is not necessary.

Mr. Hardt referred to *(2)(c) Parallel Ridge Line, ...Perpendicular ridges lines or dormers shall be incorporated to interrupt the mass of the roof as appropriate,* and said the rest of the paragraph was not needed.

Mr. Hardt referred to (2)(e) Gable Ends, *An architecturally appropriate element such as a vent, window or other decorative element is required on a street-facing gable end.* He said to stop the paragraph at that period.

Mr. Taylor referred to the top right of the page 27. He said he did not know how to resolve it, but his intent was to avoid the appearance of the building on High Street of Bri Hi Square that, when viewed from the south, looks very unfinished and incomplete when the gables do not come together. He said perhaps something should require that although you do not have to close that you do not have to have a closed ridge, but it has to look like you have a closed ridge.

Ms. Kramb referred to (E), Materials, on page 28 and asked if it was appropriate to call out where secondary materials should be applied, or if that would be too restrictive.

Mr. Hardt said elsewhere in the Code we enumerate what primary materials are permitted, and we say that you have to have a certain percentage of primary materials, so by definition, as far as he was concerned, everything else could apply a secondary material.

Mr. Phillabaum asked if the two concerns related to the list of permitted secondary materials, or if it had to do with specifying where those materials can be used.

Mr. Hardt said he was more concerned with trying to specify where they can be applied.

Mr. Phillabaum confirmed that the Commissioners were okay with listing the secondary materials, and then leaving it open to state that they can use them wherever they feel is appropriate is along as it does not exceed 20 percent.

Mr. Hardt agreed, but commented that EIFS not being permitted in the Historic Core was a separate issue that should be addressed separately.

Mr. Hardt referred to (3), Flat Roofs, on page 28 and said he renewed his objection to requiring flat roof eaves to have a minimum depth of 14 inches. He said if they are talking about flat roofs, then they are talking about flat roofs and the notion of an eave of 14 inches or so is he thought was just a random and baseless requirement.

Mr. Phillabaum said it was probably not a huge issue to take out the requirement, but if they kept it, their thinking was in talking with Building Standards, when less than 14 inches are provided, the eave really does not function as an eave anymore because it no longer provides the functional aspects of an eave.

Mr. Hardt said he understood and agreed, but that is a building detailing issue in terms of managing where water goes, and he did not think it belonged in the Zoning Code if that was the concern.

Mr. Phillabaum said they would delete the sections referencing eaves for flat roofs.

Mr. Hardt referred to Tower Height and Tower Width on page 28 and said he realized that although this section had been amended based on his and Mr. Taylor's feedback, he thought that what was left is not necessary.

Mr. Phillabaum said he wanted to make sure that they were able to define what a tower is, which is generally more vertical than horizontal in proportion, but he appreciated that most architects will understand that and do that anyway.

Mr. Taylor agreed and said that it did not hurt to include it.

Mr. Taylor recalled the Commission rewording the use of other materials as long as they were used in comparable climates, but he was not sure that he was happy with it. He suggested that *comparable*

climates be deleted. He said he understood someone could come in saying that this is high-quality adobe and it gives us a chance to say that is not from a comparable climate, but he thought the objective was simply to approve good examples of materials.

Mr. Hardt said he had suggested *comparable climate* and said the rationale for it was that someone could come in with a lot of pictures and brochures about something that was absolutely wonderful, but if every single installation was in Key West, there is no guarantee that it will hold up here in Dublin, and it could end up looking bad.

Ms. Amorose Groomes and Mr. Zimmerman agreed that it was important to have it in a like climate.

Mr. Taylor referred to (f), regarding tower roofs, on page 28 and stated that the requirement should read *towers may be capped by any permitted roof type*.

Mr. Taylor referred to (E), Materials, on page 28 and stated that “full modular brick” suggests a particular size and shape of brick. He asked if that is the intent.

Mr. Phillabaum said the intent is to prohibit thin brick veneer as a permitted primary material, rather than list all of the permitted materials and excluding a very specific type material that is not full modular dimension.

Mr. Taylor said modular brick is a certain kind of brick, so the term “thin brick” should be use.

Mr. Zimmerman (4), Color, on page 29 and said that he has a problem with stating that the colors can be selected from *any* historic color palette, because that could result in some bizarre colors.

Mr. Hardt suggested, *select from historic color pallets from any major paint manufacturer*.

Mr. Zimmerman said that would work.

Mr. Hardt referred to (2), Façade Material Transitions, on page 29 and thought it should say *Vertical transitions in façade materials*.

Mr. Hardt stated that on the same page, under (3), Roof Materials, it should say *roof gardens* instead of green roofs.

Mr. Hardt referred to (F), Entrances and Pedestrianways, and stated that entrance design should specify location *within a bay of unique width*. He said he understood that the intent is to make the entrance stand out from the rest of the building.

Mr. Taylor referred to (2), Recessed Entrances, and said that could occur when the building is on the property line, except when you define what an entrance, there is a lot listed. He said that could be construed that the porch or stoop while others can be recessed. He suggested adding *entrance door* to be clear.

Mr. Zimmerman pointed out that on page 30, (H), Windows, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies, for windows, Low E glass is not a tint - it is a coating. He said window makers are starting to use triple glass to meet the energy credit requirements, so it ends up being is three pieces of glass with coating on it.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to the wood window requirement, and asked if the intent was for *all* wood windows.

Mr. Phillabaum said the Architectural Review Board had noted that many of the commercial buildings currently have aluminum windows; therefore the requirement will be eliminated as a result of their comment on this requirement.

Mr. Zimmerman said old wood windows are first generation lumber which do hold up, but they are now being made of third generation lumber and do not have the same integrity.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to (f) regarding window proportions in residential buildings, and stated that he did not want to see horizontal windows prohibited.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested limiting horizontally-proportioned windows to non-street-facing façades. He explained that vertically-oriented windows help create balance, while horizontally-oriented windows can create more awkward building façades.

Mr. Hardt referred to (H), Windows, Shutters and Awnings, on page 30 and asked if the reference to canopies should just say *canopies should be clad in glass, metal or wood*.

Mr. Hardt referred to the requirement limiting tinted or spandrel glass, because allowing clear glass would be in contrary to our sustainability and green initiatives. He agreed that we do not want heavily tinted glass, so he said asked if there is a number of tint percentage that we could require.

Mr. Phillabaum stated that Planning would look at whether *spandrel or similarly tinted glass* could work.

Mr. Taylor referred to the requirements for mid-building pedestrianways at the top of page 30 and asked if the articulation along the pedestrianway is intended to be required to keep the walls from being blank walls.

Ms. Ray said that was part of the intent, in addition to safety and visibility.

Mr. Taylor referred to the requirements for shutters on page 30 and commented that wood shutters are the least desirable from a maintenance standpoint. He suggested *shutters shall be wood or engineered wood*.

Mr. Hardt referred to (I), Porches, Stoops and Balconies, on page 31 and stated that the text that relates to Juliet balconies should be relocated.

Mr. Fishman asked why balconies should be limited to six feet deep.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that six feet is the *minimum* standard in order to end up with usable space.

Mr. Hardt said (b), Connection to Building, and asked why it was not okay to have pairs of balconies.

Mr. Phillabaum said we are trying to avoid balconies sharing a support to the ground.

Mr. Hardt referred to (J), Treatments at Terminal Vistas, and suggested, *If the terminus does not occur at an open space type...*

Mr. Taylor commented that for (L), Vehicular Canopies, on page 32 paragraph two and three, he does not agree with the 22-foot canopy roof height maximum, because he thought that was comparable to requirements for gas stations. He suggested aligning the maximum heights with the permitted ground story heights for each building type.

Mr. Taylor said he was trying to understand how a hotel would fit with a building zone set back far enough so that they could have a porte-cochere at the front of the hotel. He said that a vehicular drop-off area would be desirable for a hotel.

Mr. Phillabaum said that vehicular drop-off area presented a difficulty for accommodating that type of structure while encouraging the type of building siting that the Code requires.

Mr. Hardt referred to paragraph 6 at the top left of page 33 and stated that there should be something that states that building components that hang over the side cannot interfere with requiring landscaping.

Mr. Hardt referred to paragraph (d) under (2), Height, on page 33 and requested clarification.

Ms. Ray stated that it means that each building type is required to have a minimum and maximum story height, and the required minimum has to be located within the RBZ. She said if they do have a step back it does not have to fall within the RBZ. She said that can be clarified.

Mr. Hardt referred to paragraph 2 under (e), and stated that he does not agree with the last part that states *to the tallest point of the ceiling on parapet and flat roofs*. He said the front façade that can be seen from the street is where the story height should be measured. He said the paragraph could read *to the eave line on pitched roofs and to the tallest point of the roof deck on the front façade*.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that the intent was to avoid punishing people for roof trusses being included in the floor height.

Mr. Taylor asked if the goal was to get as much height as possible for the upper story.

Ms. Ray said that was not necessarily the case; rather, Planning was trying to determine the best way to determine how to measure height from the exterior of the building and its overall appearance.

Mr. Hardt said it is the overall physical presence of the building whose height we are trying to determine.

Ms. Amorose Groomes suggested checking codes from other cities to see how they have addressed this issue.

Mr. Phillabaum said he had spoken to Jeff Tyler, the Chief Building Official, who confirmed that there are just so many different roof types and interior ceiling treatments, but Planning would give this some more thought.

Mr. Hardt referred to (b), Façade Divisions, at the bottom of page 34 and stated that it should read *surface of the façade*.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed that the Commissioners did not have any further comments on the Building Type requirements.

Mr. Hardt asked when the next draft would be provided that includes the Commission's comments on this round of the review.

Mr. Langworthy said that Planning is correcting as we go, so as soon as the Commission finishes their review.

Ms. Amorose Groomes confirmed with Mr. Langworthy that the Commission would have revised, clean copies by Friday, January 27 if the expectation would be to potentially vote on the Code on Thursday, February 2, 2012. She stated that the Commission would then plan to review the area rezoning on February 16, 2012.

Mr. Langworthy said he have to check with Council and the City's administration on that in order to maintain the schedule that they provided to City Council.

Ms. Krumb stated that she thought the intent of postponing the vote on the area rezoning was to let the public absorb the fact that the properties going to be rezoned, and to understand what that means for them.

Mr. Langworthy said he understood Ms. Kramb's reasoning, but at this point, property owners in the Bridge Street Corridor are very well aware of the process and the timing, and those that are concerned have remained very engaged throughout the process.

Ms. Amorose Groomes noted that there are two readings at City Council as well to assist with the timing and to allow property owners more time to understand the implications of the Code and area rezoning.

Ms. Amorose Groomes adjourned the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.