



**To:** Members of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission  
**From:** Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager *MG*  
**Date:** September 13, 2013  
**Initiated By:** Justin Goodwin, AICP, Planner II  
**Re:** Bridge Street District Code Review

## Background

The Planning and Zoning Commission continued discussion of the Bridge Street District Zoning Code on September 12, with additional review of Code Section 153.066 – *Review and Approval Procedures and Criteria*. Meeting minutes will be provided for Commission review at an upcoming meeting. The Commission discussed with Planning various issues with both the Commission (*i.e.* PUD) and Administrative Review Team (ART) processes with regard to the goal of creating an expedited and predictable review process. Commission members felt that additional opportunities for Commission review and public input for proposed development projects should be incorporated into the Code. Specifically, the Commission discussed the potential for a 'dual track' review process, in which the Commission would review a project early in the process (*e.g.* Basic Plan) and determine whether the project should proceed through an administrative (ART) approval process, or should proceed through a Planning and Zoning Commission approval process. This would be based on the scale and complexity of the proposal along with other review criteria. A version of this approach was considered during the original review of the Code in 2012. The Commission requested that Planning draft a revised version of Section 153.066 that incorporates the dual track concept along with other technical revisions identified by Planning. The Commission also requested that Planning follow up with additional information as discussed at the September 5 meeting.

## September 19 Review Materials

Planning provided a portion of the information previously requested by the Commission in the September 6 packet. Additional requested materials are included in this packet:

1. Examples of projects comparing the original proposal to the final approved outcome. Where available, this material includes the earliest version of plans as presented at the pre-application stage. Approved plans are provided as reviewed by the ART; generally, these versions do not reflect revisions required to meet conditions of approval. Among the examples provided, the Edwards Apartment Project is the most complex, and includes additional requested information, such as Architectural consultant analysis, staff correspondence, and a record of the detailed Code review conducted for this proposal.
2. Examples of development review processes and related Code requirements used for urban mixed use developments in other local communities, including:
  - Columbus Downtown Development Commission
  - Upper Arlington Planned Unified Development Ordinance
  - Grandview Heights (Grandview Yard Planned Development)

Memo re. Bridge Street District Code Review  
September 13, 2013  
Page 2 of 2

Planning will begin drafting amendments to the Review and Approvals Procedures over the next week, with the goal of distributing a draft to Commission members in advance of the September 19 meeting.